

Course-Section: SOWK 240 0301
 Title INFO TECH IN SOCIAL WO
 Instructor: LARSEN, KELLI
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1382
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	5	0	1	4	1	4	6	3.63	1356/1522	4.08	4.53	4.30	4.34	3.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	935/1522	4.51	4.60	4.26	4.29	4.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	12	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1285	4.67	4.67	4.30	4.36	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	3	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	971/1476	4.43	4.55	4.22	4.20	4.08	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	12	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	****/1412	3.50	4.19	4.06	4.00	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	4	4	6	3.81	1008/1381	4.16	4.52	4.08	3.97	3.81	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	425/1500	4.72	4.66	4.18	4.20	4.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	9	7	4.44	1136/1517	4.68	4.72	4.65	4.63	4.44	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	7	4	2	3.62	1233/1497	3.92	4.30	4.11	4.11	3.62	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	1	7	7	4.25	1047/1440	4.55	4.65	4.45	4.42	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	1215/1448	4.75	4.85	4.71	4.78	4.44	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	751/1436	4.63	4.67	4.29	4.29	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	1	1	0	0	8	6	4.20	928/1432	4.45	4.65	4.29	4.31	4.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	0	0	1	8	6	4.33	408/1221	4.59	4.17	3.93	4.02	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	1	0	5	6	3.86	849/1280	4.06	4.54	4.10	4.08	3.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	2	5	6	4.14	879/1277	4.21	4.68	4.34	4.33	4.14	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	2	3	4	5	3.86	981/1269	4.18	4.73	4.31	4.33	3.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	9	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/ 854	3.13	4.14	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.62	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 228	4.67	4.67	4.35	4.56	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 217	4.00	4.00	4.51	4.57	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 216	5.00	5.00	4.42	4.72	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 205	****	****	4.23	4.37	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	4.67	4.67	4.58	4.58	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 77	5.00	5.00	4.52	5.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 65	5.00	5.00	4.49	5.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 80	****	****	4.11	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 47	****	4.00	4.41	4.83	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 45	****	4.20	4.30	4.58	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 39	****	4.75	4.40	4.75	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	4.00	4.31	4.75	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.17	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.63	****	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 33	****	4.50	4.69	****	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	****	****	

Course-Section: SOWK 240 0301
 Title INFO TECH IN SOCIAL WO
 Instructor: LARSEN, KELLI
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1382
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	21	Non-major	13
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOWK 240 0401
 Title INFO TECH IN SOCIAL WO
 Instructor: LAUR, JOHN A.
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1383
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	970/1522	4.08	4.53	4.30	4.34	4.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	623/1522	4.51	4.60	4.26	4.29	4.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	8	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1285	4.67	4.67	4.30	4.36	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	435/1476	4.43	4.55	4.22	4.20	4.55	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	2	1	1	4	0	3	3.33	1257/1412	3.50	4.19	4.06	4.00	3.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	2	1	0	1	1	6	4.22	633/1381	4.16	4.52	4.08	3.97	4.22	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	154/1500	4.72	4.66	4.18	4.20	4.82	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	855/1517	4.68	4.72	4.65	4.63	4.73	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	602/1497	3.92	4.30	4.11	4.11	4.30	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	643/1440	4.55	4.65	4.45	4.42	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	737/1448	4.75	4.85	4.71	4.78	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	341/1436	4.63	4.67	4.29	4.29	4.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	0	2	7	4.40	758/1432	4.45	4.65	4.29	4.31	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	99/1221	4.59	4.17	3.93	4.02	4.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	442/1280	4.06	4.54	4.10	4.08	4.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	827/1277	4.21	4.68	4.34	4.33	4.22	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	547/1269	4.18	4.73	4.31	4.33	4.56	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	0	2	1	2	0	3.00	779/ 854	3.13	4.14	4.02	4.00	3.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.62	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	4.67	4.67	4.35	4.56	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	4.00	4.00	4.51	4.57	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	5.00	5.00	4.42	4.72	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	****	4.23	4.37	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	4.67	4.67	4.58	4.58	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	5.00	5.00	4.52	5.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	5.00	5.00	4.49	5.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.11	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.00	4.41	4.83	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	4.20	4.30	4.58	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.00	4.31	4.75	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.63	****	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	4.50	4.69	****	****	

Course-Section: SOWK 240 0401
 Title INFO TECH IN SOCIAL WO
 Instructor: LAUR, JOHN A.
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1383
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOWK 240 8020
 Title INFO TECH IN SOCIAL WO
 Instructor: LAUR, JOHN A.
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1384
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	681/1522	4.08	4.53	4.30	4.34	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	142/1522	4.51	4.60	4.26	4.29	4.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	366/1285	4.67	4.67	4.30	4.36	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	316/1476	4.43	4.55	4.22	4.20	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	6	1	3.67	1077/1412	3.50	4.19	4.06	4.00	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	392/1381	4.16	4.52	4.08	3.97	4.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	190/1500	4.72	4.66	4.18	4.20	4.78	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	555/1517	4.68	4.72	4.65	4.63	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	5	0	3.83	1089/1497	3.92	4.30	4.11	4.11	3.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	412/1440	4.55	4.65	4.45	4.42	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1448	4.75	4.85	4.71	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	263/1436	4.63	4.67	4.29	4.29	4.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	350/1432	4.45	4.65	4.29	4.31	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	200/1221	4.59	4.17	3.93	4.02	4.63	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	839/1280	4.06	4.54	4.10	4.08	3.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	804/1277	4.21	4.68	4.34	4.33	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	2	0	1	5	4.13	844/1269	4.18	4.73	4.31	4.33	4.13	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	741/ 854	3.13	4.14	4.02	4.00	3.25	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.62	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	61/ 228	4.67	4.67	4.35	4.56	4.67	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	189/ 217	4.00	4.00	4.51	4.57	4.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 216	5.00	5.00	4.42	4.72	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 205	****	****	4.23	4.37	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	50/ 79	4.67	4.67	4.58	4.58	4.67	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 77	5.00	5.00	4.52	5.00	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 65	5.00	5.00	4.49	5.00	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.11	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.00	4.41	4.83	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	4.20	4.30	4.58	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.75	4.40	4.75	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 35	****	4.00	4.31	4.75	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.17	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.63	****	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	4.50	4.69	****	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	****	****	

Course-Section: SOWK 240 8020
 Title INFO TECH IN SOCIAL WO
 Instructor: LAUR, JOHN A.
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1384
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	10	Non-major	4
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOWK 260 0101
 Title INTRO SOCIAL WORK I
 Instructor: BAFFOUR, TIFFAN
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1385
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	19	0	1	0	3	2	6	4.00	1122/1522	4.29	4.53	4.30	4.34	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	19	0	0	1	0	5	6	4.33	787/1522	4.50	4.60	4.26	4.29	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	19	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	135/1285	4.77	4.67	4.30	4.36	4.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	19	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	397/1476	4.56	4.55	4.22	4.20	4.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	316/1412	4.34	4.19	4.06	4.00	4.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	331/1381	4.42	4.52	4.08	3.97	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	19	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	144/1500	4.63	4.66	4.18	4.20	4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	19	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	645/1517	4.81	4.72	4.65	4.63	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	21	0	0	1	2	6	1	3.70	1181/1497	4.17	4.30	4.11	4.11	3.70
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	19	0	1	1	1	3	6	4.00	1186/1440	4.39	4.65	4.45	4.42	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	19	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	1089/1448	4.70	4.85	4.71	4.78	4.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	19	0	1	1	0	4	6	4.08	1013/1436	4.43	4.67	4.29	4.29	4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	2	1	8	4.33	820/1432	4.48	4.65	4.29	4.31	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	19	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	124/1221	4.63	4.17	3.93	4.02	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	3	1	7	4.36	507/1280	4.26	4.54	4.10	4.08	4.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	855/1277	4.31	4.68	4.34	4.33	4.18
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	223/1269	4.67	4.73	4.31	4.33	4.91
4. Were special techniques successful	20	1	1	1	0	3	5	4.00	426/ 854	3.89	4.14	4.02	4.00	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	29	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.62	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 228	****	4.67	4.35	4.56	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	29	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.00	4.51	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	29	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	5.00	4.42	4.72	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	29	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	****	4.23	4.37	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.58	4.58	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	29	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	5.00	4.49	5.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.11	4.00	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.00	4.41	4.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	4.20	4.30	4.58	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.75	4.40	4.75	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.17	****
Self Paced														
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	4.50	4.69	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	****	****

Course-Section: SOWK 260 0101
 Title INTRO SOCIAL WORK I
 Instructor: BAFFOUR, TIFFAN
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1385
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	31	Non-major	30
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOWK 260 0201
 Title INTRO SOCIAL WORK I
 Instructor: WALSH, KATHLEEN
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1386
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	7	0	0	0	3	4	17	4.58	514/1522	4.29	4.53	4.30	4.34	4.58	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	0	0	1	6	17	4.67	358/1522	4.50	4.60	4.26	4.29	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	0	0	1	2	2	19	4.63	405/1285	4.77	4.67	4.30	4.36	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	0	0	1	2	4	17	4.54	435/1476	4.56	4.55	4.22	4.20	4.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	3	3	5	12	4.13	671/1412	4.34	4.19	4.06	4.00	4.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	2	2	5	14	4.35	507/1381	4.42	4.52	4.08	3.97	4.35	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8	0	0	1	3	4	15	4.43	585/1500	4.63	4.66	4.18	4.20	4.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	0	0	1	0	2	20	4.78	749/1517	4.81	4.72	4.65	4.63	4.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	0	0	0	7	12	4.63	288/1497	4.17	4.30	4.11	4.11	4.63	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	1	1	0	21	4.78	392/1440	4.39	4.65	4.45	4.42	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	1	2	20	4.83	710/1448	4.70	4.85	4.71	4.78	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	263/1436	4.43	4.67	4.29	4.29	4.77	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	2	0	18	4.62	514/1432	4.48	4.65	4.29	4.31	4.62	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	2	1	0	1	4	14	4.50	279/1221	4.63	4.17	3.93	4.02	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	2	3	7	4.15	651/1280	4.26	4.54	4.10	4.08	4.15	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	672/1277	4.31	4.68	4.34	4.33	4.43	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	654/1269	4.67	4.73	4.31	4.33	4.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	18	4	2	0	1	1	5	3.78	580/ 854	3.89	4.14	4.02	4.00	3.78	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.62	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	4.67	4.35	4.56	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.00	4.51	4.57	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	5.00	4.42	4.72	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	****	4.23	4.37	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.58	4.58	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	5.00	4.49	5.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.11	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.00	4.41	4.83	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	4.20	4.30	4.58	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.75	4.40	4.75	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.00	4.31	4.75	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.17	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.63	****	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	4.50	4.69	****	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	****	****	

Course-Section: SOWK 260 0201
 Title INTRO SOCIAL WORK I
 Instructor: WALSH, KATHLEEN
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1386
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	14	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	4	Under-grad	31	Non-major	21
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	1						

Course-Section: SOWK 260H 0201
 Title INTRO TO SOCIAL WORK I
 Instructor: WALSH, KATHLEEN
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1387
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	2	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOWK 360 0101
 Title SOC WELFARE/POL/WORK I
 Instructor: WALSH, KATHLEEN
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 41

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1388
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	10	0	1	0	1	7	22	4.58	514/1522	4.67	4.53	4.30	4.34	4.58	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	11	0	1	0	2	4	23	4.60	432/1522	4.59	4.60	4.26	4.25	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	11	0	0	1	1	3	25	4.73	298/1285	4.60	4.67	4.30	4.30	4.73	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	10	0	0	0	3	5	23	4.65	336/1476	4.53	4.55	4.22	4.26	4.65	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	11	1	1	2	2	3	21	4.41	420/1412	4.31	4.19	4.06	4.03	4.41	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	3	7	20	4.48	351/1381	4.42	4.52	4.08	4.13	4.48	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	10	0	0	0	3	3	25	4.71	263/1500	4.61	4.66	4.18	4.13	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	11	0	0	0	0	18	12	4.40	1161/1517	4.74	4.72	4.65	4.62	4.40	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	1	0	0	3	5	14	4.50	385/1497	4.56	4.30	4.11	4.13	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	1	3	27	4.84	304/1440	4.78	4.65	4.45	4.46	4.84	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	1	0	1	28	4.87	602/1448	4.94	4.85	4.71	4.71	4.87	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	2	4	25	4.74	310/1436	4.72	4.67	4.29	4.30	4.74	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	1	4	25	4.68	442/1432	4.80	4.65	4.29	4.29	4.68	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	0	0	1	2	6	22	4.58	226/1221	3.92	4.17	3.93	3.94	4.58	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	4	21	4.77	214/1280	4.67	4.54	4.10	4.14	4.77	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	2	3	21	4.73	398/1277	4.79	4.68	4.34	4.38	4.73	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	1	0	3	23	4.78	361/1269	4.87	4.73	4.31	4.39	4.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	3	3	0	1	4	15	4.22	352/ 854	4.22	4.14	4.02	4.00	4.22	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	40	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 228	****	4.67	4.35	4.29	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	40	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	4.00	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	40	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 45	****	4.20	4.30	4.39	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	40	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.63	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	2	A	10
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	11
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	3	C	3
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	1
				Required for Majors	0
				General	1
				Electives	1
				Other	22
				#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	

Course-Section: SOWK 360 0201
 Title SOC WELFARE/POL/WORK I
 Instructor: TICE, CAROLYN
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1389
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	9	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	320/1522	4.67	4.53	4.30	4.34	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	9	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	545/1522	4.59	4.60	4.26	4.25	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	9	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	531/1285	4.60	4.67	4.30	4.30	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	9	1	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	597/1476	4.53	4.55	4.22	4.26	4.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	566/1412	4.31	4.19	4.06	4.03	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	604/1381	4.42	4.52	4.08	4.13	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	9	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	362/1500	4.61	4.66	4.18	4.13	4.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	9	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1517	4.74	4.72	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	125/1497	4.56	4.30	4.11	4.13	4.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	240/1440	4.78	4.65	4.45	4.46	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1448	4.94	4.85	4.71	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1436	4.72	4.67	4.29	4.30	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	200/1432	4.80	4.65	4.29	4.29	4.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	2	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	739/1221	3.92	4.17	3.93	3.94	3.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	311/1280	4.67	4.54	4.10	4.14	4.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	375/1277	4.79	4.68	4.34	4.38	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1269	4.87	4.73	4.31	4.39	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	106/ 854	4.22	4.14	4.02	4.00	4.75	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	17	Non-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOWK 360 8020
 Title SOC WELFARE/POL/WORK I
 Instructor: PLANELL, JOAN
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1390
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	414/1522	4.67	4.53	4.30	4.34	4.68	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	358/1522	4.59	4.60	4.26	4.25	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	456/1285	4.60	4.67	4.30	4.30	4.58	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	2	2	14	4.53	454/1476	4.53	4.55	4.22	4.26	4.53	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	1	6	10	4.26	557/1412	4.31	4.19	4.06	4.03	4.26	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	4	13	4.53	314/1381	4.42	4.52	4.08	4.13	4.53	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	1	1	4	12	4.50	483/1500	4.61	4.66	4.18	4.13	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	645/1517	4.74	4.72	4.65	4.62	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	9	6	4.31	592/1497	4.56	4.30	4.11	4.13	4.31	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	643/1440	4.78	4.65	4.45	4.46	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	296/1448	4.94	4.85	4.71	4.71	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	708/1436	4.72	4.67	4.29	4.30	4.41	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	254/1432	4.80	4.65	4.29	4.29	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	2	3	4	3	5	3.35	975/1221	3.92	4.17	3.93	3.94	3.35	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	3	14	4.61	317/1280	4.67	4.54	4.10	4.14	4.61	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	245/1277	4.79	4.68	4.34	4.38	4.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	299/1269	4.87	4.73	4.31	4.39	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	3	0	4	1	8	3.69	616/ 854	4.22	4.14	4.02	4.00	3.69	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 228	****	4.67	4.35	4.29	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.58	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 65	****	5.00	4.49	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.11	3.33	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.00	4.41	4.56	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	10
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOWK 387 0101
 Title POL/PROG/SERV:CHILDREN
 Instructor: CHAKMAKIAN, ELI
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1391
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	7	0	0	0	4	3	16	4.52	582/1522	4.49	4.53	4.30	4.34	4.52	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	0	0	3	3	17	4.61	432/1522	4.44	4.60	4.26	4.25	4.61	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	0	0	1	0	4	18	4.70	337/1285	4.45	4.67	4.30	4.30	4.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	1	0	1	1	5	15	4.55	435/1476	4.54	4.55	4.22	4.26	4.55	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	3	7	11	4.27	547/1412	3.94	4.19	4.06	4.03	4.27	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	7	14	4.59	255/1381	4.56	4.52	4.08	4.13	4.59	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8	0	0	0	3	5	14	4.50	483/1500	4.48	4.66	4.18	4.13	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	1	0	0	3	19	4.70	901/1517	4.71	4.72	4.65	4.62	4.70	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	0	0	5	6	7	4.11	820/1497	4.11	4.30	4.11	4.13	4.11	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	4	4	14	4.45	864/1440	4.33	4.65	4.45	4.46	4.45	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	3	3	16	4.59	1080/1448	4.73	4.85	4.71	4.71	4.59	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	1	2	2	16	4.57	514/1436	4.45	4.67	4.29	4.30	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	2	2	18	4.61	527/1432	4.57	4.65	4.29	4.29	4.61	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	3	3	1	4	5	7	3.60	860/1221	3.51	4.17	3.93	3.94	3.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	2	3	2	11	4.22	605/1280	4.47	4.54	4.10	4.14	4.22	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	3	1	14	4.61	517/1277	4.77	4.68	4.34	4.38	4.61	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	3	2	13	4.56	547/1269	4.67	4.73	4.31	4.39	4.56	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	3	0	1	4	3	7	4.07	418/ 854	4.03	4.14	4.02	4.00	4.07	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	28	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.21	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 228	****	4.67	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 217	****	4.00	4.51	4.45	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	29	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	4.00	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 45	****	4.20	4.30	4.39	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.63	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 13	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 8		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	9
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 30
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	11
			? 0		

Course-Section: SOWK 387 8020
 Title POL/PROG/SERV:CHILDREN
 Instructor: LOVE, YVONNA
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1392
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	656/1522	4.49	4.53	4.30	4.34	4.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	7	4.27	864/1522	4.44	4.60	4.26	4.25	4.27	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	7	6	4.20	809/1285	4.45	4.67	4.30	4.30	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	444/1476	4.54	4.55	4.22	4.26	4.53	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	3	3	6	3.60	1112/1412	3.94	4.19	4.06	4.03	3.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	305/1381	4.56	4.52	4.08	4.13	4.53	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	541/1500	4.48	4.66	4.18	4.13	4.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	837/1517	4.71	4.72	4.65	4.62	4.73	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	820/1497	4.11	4.30	4.11	4.13	4.11	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	4	7	4.20	1094/1440	4.33	4.65	4.45	4.46	4.20	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	602/1448	4.73	4.85	4.71	4.71	4.87	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	793/1436	4.45	4.67	4.29	4.30	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	600/1432	4.57	4.65	4.29	4.29	4.53	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	2	1	2	4	3	3.42	950/1221	3.51	4.17	3.93	3.94	3.42	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	253/1280	4.47	4.54	4.10	4.14	4.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	182/1277	4.77	4.68	4.34	4.38	4.93	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	351/1269	4.67	4.73	4.31	4.39	4.79	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	426/ 854	4.03	4.14	4.02	4.00	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors	1 Graduate 0 Major 8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 0		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	7 Under-grad 15 Non-major 7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	2
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: SOWK 388 0101
 Title HUMAN BEHAVIOR
 Instructor: OKUNDAYE, JOSHU
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1393
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	158/1522	4.66	4.53	4.30	4.34	4.91	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	2	20	4.83	186/1522	4.51	4.60	4.26	4.25	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	181/1285	4.50	4.67	4.30	4.30	4.87	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	167/1476	4.45	4.55	4.22	4.26	4.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	0	3	19	4.70	205/1412	4.61	4.19	4.06	4.03	4.70	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	2	19	4.74	162/1381	4.54	4.52	4.08	4.13	4.74	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	129/1500	4.70	4.66	4.18	4.13	4.87	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	668/1517	4.85	4.72	4.65	4.62	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	0	8	9	4.53	370/1497	4.39	4.30	4.11	4.13	4.53	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	432/1440	4.81	4.65	4.45	4.46	4.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	494/1448	4.81	4.85	4.71	4.71	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	170/1436	4.68	4.67	4.29	4.30	4.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	227/1432	4.64	4.65	4.29	4.29	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	1	0	1	1	3	15	4.60	213/1221	4.20	4.17	3.93	3.94	4.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	156/1280	4.61	4.54	4.10	4.14	4.87	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	159/1277	4.82	4.68	4.34	4.38	4.93	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	266/1269	4.86	4.73	4.31	4.39	4.87	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	129/ 854	3.81	4.14	4.02	4.00	4.69	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	4.67	4.35	4.29	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	5.00	4.49	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	4.00	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	4.20	4.30	4.39	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.75	4.40	4.68	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.00	4.31	4.26	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.12	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.63	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	4.50	4.69	4.75	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	****	****	

Course-Section: SOWK 388 0101
 Title HUMAN BEHAVIOR
 Instructor: OKUNDAYE, JOSHU
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1393
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	27	Non-major	18
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOWK 388 0201
 Title HUMAN BEHAVIOR
 Instructor: CHAKMAKIAN, ELI
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1394
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	5	0	0	2	1	1	11	4.40	733/1522	4.66	4.53	4.30	4.34	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	1	0	2	4	8	4.20	935/1522	4.51	4.60	4.26	4.25	4.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	1	0	4	1	9	4.13	857/1285	4.50	4.67	4.30	4.30	4.13	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	0	1	0	3	4	7	4.07	977/1476	4.45	4.55	4.22	4.26	4.07	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	322/1412	4.61	4.19	4.06	4.03	4.53	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	1	4	9	4.33	519/1381	4.54	4.52	4.08	4.13	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	454/1500	4.70	4.66	4.18	4.13	4.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	577/1517	4.85	4.72	4.65	4.62	4.87	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	1	7	4	4.25	654/1497	4.39	4.30	4.11	4.13	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	272/1440	4.81	4.65	4.45	4.46	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	935/1448	4.81	4.85	4.71	4.71	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	1	0	4	9	4.50	601/1436	4.68	4.67	4.29	4.30	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	4	9	4.43	732/1432	4.64	4.65	4.29	4.29	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	3	3	3	6	3.80	759/1221	4.20	4.17	3.93	3.94	3.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	515/1280	4.61	4.54	4.10	4.14	4.36	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	421/1277	4.82	4.68	4.34	4.38	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	277/1269	4.86	4.73	4.31	4.39	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	2	2	5	3	1	2.92	807/ 854	3.81	4.14	4.02	4.00	2.92	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 228	****	4.67	4.35	4.29	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.58	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	5.00	4.49	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.11	3.33	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	4.00	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 45	****	4.20	4.30	4.39	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.63	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	4.50	4.69	4.75	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	****	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	20	Non-major	8
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						

I	0	Other	10
?	0		

Course-Section: SOWK 389 0101
 Title HUMAN BEHAVIOR II
 Instructor: WIECHELT, SHELL
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1395
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	5	0	0	2	6	8	11	4.04	1101/1522	4.50	4.53	4.30	4.34	4.04	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	2	3	4	18	4.41	702/1522	4.67	4.60	4.26	4.25	4.41	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	2	0	5	20	4.59	435/1285	4.69	4.67	4.30	4.30	4.59	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	1	0	2	3	6	15	4.31	735/1476	4.47	4.55	4.22	4.26	4.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	2	5	6	12	3.89	908/1412	4.19	4.19	4.06	4.03	3.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	2	6	17	4.37	470/1381	4.47	4.52	4.08	4.13	4.37	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	1	2	4	20	4.59	396/1500	4.74	4.66	4.18	4.13	4.59	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	1	26	4.96	195/1517	4.50	4.72	4.65	4.62	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	0	0	0	2	10	7	4.26	643/1497	4.49	4.30	4.11	4.13	4.26	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	4	8	14	4.38	946/1440	4.65	4.65	4.45	4.46	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	2	4	19	4.68	989/1448	4.87	4.85	4.71	4.71	4.68	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	3	8	15	4.46	648/1436	4.75	4.67	4.29	4.30	4.46	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	2	2	3	18	4.48	657/1432	4.73	4.65	4.29	4.29	4.48	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	11	2	1	3	4	5	3.60	860/1221	4.02	4.17	3.93	3.94	3.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	2	3	18	4.54	363/1280	4.72	4.54	4.10	4.14	4.54	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	2	1	20	4.67	470/1277	4.75	4.68	4.34	4.38	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	2	0	4	18	4.58	524/1269	4.79	4.73	4.31	4.39	4.58	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	4	0	1	3	4	12	4.35	277/ 854	4.45	4.14	4.02	4.00	4.35	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 16	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 19
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	8	2.00-2.99 3	C 4	General 2	Under-grad 32 Non-major 13
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 14	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 20	
			? 0		

Course-Section: SOWK 389 0201
 Title HUMAN BEHAVIOR II
 Instructor: MOSES, JAMAAL
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1396
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	433/1522	4.50	4.53	4.30	4.34	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	142/1522	4.67	4.60	4.26	4.25	4.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	165/1285	4.69	4.67	4.30	4.30	4.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	425/1476	4.47	4.55	4.22	4.26	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	393/1412	4.19	4.19	4.06	4.03	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	136/1381	4.47	4.52	4.08	4.13	4.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	119/1500	4.74	4.66	4.18	4.13	4.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	1217/1517	4.50	4.72	4.65	4.62	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	264/1497	4.49	4.30	4.11	4.13	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	412/1440	4.65	4.65	4.45	4.46	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1448	4.87	4.85	4.71	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	141/1436	4.75	4.67	4.29	4.30	4.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	327/1432	4.73	4.65	4.29	4.29	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	759/1221	4.02	4.17	3.93	3.94	3.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	151/1280	4.72	4.54	4.10	4.14	4.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1277	4.75	4.68	4.34	4.38	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1269	4.79	4.73	4.31	4.39	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 854	4.45	4.14	4.02	4.00	5.00
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 228	****	4.67	4.35	4.29	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 12
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	8
			? 0		

Course-Section: SOWK 389 8020
 Title HUMAN BEHAVIOR II
 Instructor: THIEL, MINDY
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1397
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	246/1522	4.50	4.53	4.30	4.34	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	322/1522	4.67	4.60	4.26	4.25	4.70	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	15	4.60	425/1285	4.69	4.67	4.30	4.30	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	14	4.55	425/1476	4.47	4.55	4.22	4.26	4.55	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	5	11	4.25	566/1412	4.19	4.19	4.06	4.03	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	9	8	4.25	604/1381	4.47	4.52	4.08	4.13	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	211/1500	4.74	4.66	4.18	4.13	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	16	4	4.20	1301/1517	4.50	4.72	4.65	4.62	4.20	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	363/1497	4.49	4.30	4.11	4.13	4.53	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	412/1440	4.65	4.65	4.45	4.46	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	296/1448	4.87	4.85	4.71	4.71	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	132/1436	4.75	4.67	4.29	4.30	4.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	97/1432	4.73	4.65	4.29	4.29	4.94	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	1	1	1	14	4.65	187/1221	4.02	4.17	3.93	3.94	4.65	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	237/1280	4.72	4.54	4.10	4.14	4.74	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	547/1277	4.75	4.68	4.34	4.38	4.58	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	351/1269	4.79	4.73	4.31	4.39	4.79	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	1	4	6	6	4.00	426/ 854	4.45	4.14	4.02	4.00	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.21	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 228	****	4.67	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 217	****	4.00	4.51	4.45	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.58	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 65	****	5.00	4.49	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.11	3.33	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOWK 390F 0101
 Title PEER EDUCATORS PROJECT
 Instructor: ROHRBACH, ALISO
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1398
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.53	4.30	4.34	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.60	4.26	4.25	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.67	4.30	4.30	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	316/1476	4.67	4.55	4.22	4.26	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1412	5.00	4.19	4.06	4.03	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1381	5.00	4.52	4.08	4.13	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1500	5.00	4.66	4.18	4.13	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.72	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	2	0	0	1	2	3.20	1386/1497	3.20	4.30	4.11	4.13	3.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.65	4.45	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.85	4.71	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.67	4.29	4.30	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.65	4.29	4.29	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1221	5.00	4.17	3.93	3.94	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 37	5.00	5.00	4.63	5.00	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	3	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	26/ 33	4.50	4.50	4.69	4.75	4.50	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	3	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	****	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 0		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0	Under-grad	6
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	0

Course-Section: SOWK 397 0201
 Title SOCIAL WORK METHODS I
 Instructor: WALSH, KATHLEEN
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1399
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	5	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	106/1522	4.77	4.53	4.30	4.34	4.95	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	77/1522	4.77	4.60	4.26	4.25	4.95	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	11	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	173/1285	4.69	4.67	4.30	4.30	4.88	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	75/1476	4.75	4.55	4.22	4.26	4.95	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	257/1412	4.15	4.19	4.06	4.03	4.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	52/1381	4.72	4.52	4.08	4.13	4.95	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	65/1500	4.70	4.66	4.18	4.13	4.95	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	292/1517	4.56	4.72	4.65	4.62	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	206/1497	4.50	4.30	4.11	4.13	4.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	224/1440	4.76	4.65	4.45	4.46	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	296/1448	4.88	4.85	4.71	4.71	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	188/1436	4.77	4.67	4.29	4.30	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	187/1432	4.74	4.65	4.29	4.29	4.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	2	0	0	4	4	8	4.25	461/1221	4.24	4.17	3.93	3.94	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1280	4.78	4.54	4.10	4.14	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1277	4.88	4.68	4.34	4.38	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1269	4.89	4.73	4.31	4.39	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	177/ 854	4.64	4.14	4.02	4.00	4.56	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.21	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 228	****	4.67	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 217	****	4.00	4.51	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 216	****	5.00	4.42	4.35	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 205	****	****	4.23	4.26	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.58	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 65	****	5.00	4.49	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 80	****	****	4.11	3.33	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 47	****	4.00	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	4.20	4.30	4.39	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.75	4.40	4.68	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	4.00	4.31	4.26	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.12	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.63	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	4.50	4.69	4.75	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	****	****	

Course-Section: SOWK 397 0201
 Title SOCIAL WORK METHODS I
 Instructor: WALSH, KATHLEEN
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1399
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	9
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOWK 397 0301
 Title SOCIAL WORK METHODS I
 Instructor: KNIGHT, CAROLYN
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1400
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	305/1522	4.77	4.53	4.30	4.34	4.76	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	244/1522	4.77	4.60	4.26	4.25	4.76	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	16	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/1285	4.69	4.67	4.30	4.30	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	255/1476	4.75	4.55	4.22	4.26	4.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	7	8	4	3.55	1143/1412	4.15	4.19	4.06	4.03	3.55	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	8	13	4.55	297/1381	4.72	4.52	4.08	4.13	4.55	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	3	1	18	4.68	287/1500	4.70	4.66	4.18	4.13	4.68	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	6	16	4.73	855/1517	4.56	4.72	4.65	4.62	4.73	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	248/1497	4.50	4.30	4.11	4.13	4.68	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	1	5	13	4.50	798/1440	4.76	4.65	4.45	4.46	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	1	18	4.85	629/1448	4.88	4.85	4.71	4.71	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	3	4	13	4.50	601/1436	4.77	4.67	4.29	4.30	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	2	16	4.65	466/1432	4.74	4.65	4.29	4.29	4.65	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	16	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1221	4.24	4.17	3.93	3.94	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	184/1280	4.78	4.54	4.10	4.14	4.81	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	2	1	18	4.76	363/1277	4.88	4.68	4.34	4.38	4.76	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	1	18	4.76	371/1269	4.89	4.73	4.31	4.39	4.76	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	0	0	3	2	11	4.50	194/ 854	4.64	4.14	4.02	4.00	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 17	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 21
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	6	2.00-2.99 1	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 24 Non-major 3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 22	
			? 0		

Course-Section: SOWK 397 0401
 Title SOCIAL WORK METHODS I
 Instructor: CHAKMAKIAN, ELI
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1401
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	246/1522	4.77	4.53	4.30	4.34	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	277/1522	4.77	4.60	4.26	4.25	4.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	8	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	456/1285	4.69	4.67	4.30	4.30	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	245/1476	4.75	4.55	4.22	4.26	4.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	493/1412	4.15	4.19	4.06	4.03	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	162/1381	4.72	4.52	4.08	4.13	4.73	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	232/1500	4.70	4.66	4.18	4.13	4.73	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	3	10	2	3.93	1431/1517	4.56	4.72	4.65	4.62	3.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	718/1497	4.50	4.30	4.11	4.13	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	353/1440	4.76	4.65	4.45	4.46	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	602/1448	4.88	4.85	4.71	4.71	4.87	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	86/1436	4.77	4.67	4.29	4.30	4.93	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	294/1432	4.74	4.65	4.29	4.29	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	0	2	3	9	4.27	455/1221	4.24	4.17	3.93	3.94	4.27	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	370/1280	4.78	4.54	4.10	4.14	4.54	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	363/1277	4.88	4.68	4.34	4.38	4.77	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	288/1269	4.89	4.73	4.31	4.39	4.85	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	67/ 854	4.64	4.14	4.02	4.00	4.92	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 18 Non-major 10
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 10	
			? 0		

Course-Section: SOWK 397 8020
 Title SOCIAL WORK METHODS I
 Instructor: MORRIS, KATHERI
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1402
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	2	5	14	4.57	525/1522	4.77	4.53	4.30	4.34	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	419/1522	4.77	4.60	4.26	4.25	4.62	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	13	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	405/1285	4.69	4.67	4.30	4.30	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	1	0	0	3	2	14	4.58	406/1476	4.75	4.55	4.22	4.26	4.58	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	4	4	11	4.10	703/1412	4.15	4.19	4.06	4.03	4.10	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	2	17	4.67	207/1381	4.72	4.52	4.08	4.13	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	3	0	3	15	4.43	600/1500	4.70	4.66	4.18	4.13	4.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	1	0	0	3	16	4.65	942/1517	4.56	4.72	4.65	4.62	4.65	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	1	8	7	4.38	534/1497	4.50	4.30	4.11	4.13	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	272/1440	4.76	4.65	4.45	4.46	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	629/1448	4.88	4.85	4.71	4.71	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	217/1436	4.77	4.67	4.29	4.30	4.81	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	514/1432	4.74	4.65	4.29	4.29	4.62	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	2	0	3	2	13	4.20	500/1221	4.24	4.17	3.93	3.94	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	199/1280	4.78	4.54	4.10	4.14	4.79	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1277	4.88	4.68	4.34	4.38	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	134/1269	4.89	4.73	4.31	4.39	4.95	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	1	2	1	15	4.58	174/ 854	4.64	4.14	4.02	4.00	4.58	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		Under-grad 23
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	13
			? 0		

Course-Section: SOWK 483 0101
 Title SOCIAL WORK MEHTODS II
 Instructor: KNIGHT, CAROLYN
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1403
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	6	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	365/1522	4.48	4.53	4.30	4.42	4.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	193/1522	4.54	4.60	4.26	4.34	4.82	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1285	5.00	4.67	4.30	4.42	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	172/1476	4.56	4.55	4.22	4.31	4.82	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	760/1412	4.12	4.19	4.06	4.11	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	114/1381	4.62	4.52	4.08	4.21	4.82	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	242/1500	4.56	4.66	4.18	4.25	4.73	
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	901/1517	4.85	4.72	4.65	4.71	4.70	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	116/1497	4.45	4.30	4.11	4.21	4.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	353/1440	4.65	4.65	4.45	4.52	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1448	4.91	4.85	4.71	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	263/1436	4.65	4.67	4.29	4.32	4.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	161/1432	4.61	4.65	4.29	4.34	4.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	8	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1221	3.96	4.17	3.93	4.04	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	138/1280	4.59	4.54	4.10	4.28	4.90	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1277	4.80	4.68	4.34	4.50	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1269	4.81	4.73	4.31	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	75/ 854	4.18	4.14	4.02	4.31	4.90	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 17
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	11
			? 0		

Course-Section: SOWK 483 0201
 Title SOCIAL WORK MEHTODS II
 Instructor: BEMBRY, JAMES
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1404
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	6	5	3.94	1190/1522	4.48	4.53	4.30	4.42	3.94	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	7	5	3.94	1157/1522	4.54	4.60	4.26	4.34	3.94	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1285	5.00	4.67	4.30	4.42	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	5	6	3.94	1091/1476	4.56	4.55	4.22	4.31	3.94	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	4	4	5	3.63	1100/1412	4.12	4.19	4.06	4.11	3.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	5	8	4.19	673/1381	4.62	4.52	4.08	4.21	4.19	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	1	3	6	4	3.73	1197/1500	4.56	4.66	4.18	4.25	3.73	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	802/1517	4.85	4.72	4.65	4.71	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	2	6	5	4.07	852/1497	4.45	4.30	4.11	4.21	4.07	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	1	4	9	4.25	1047/1440	4.65	4.65	4.45	4.52	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	575/1448	4.91	4.85	4.71	4.75	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	2	11	4.44	684/1436	4.65	4.67	4.29	4.32	4.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	3	10	4.25	884/1432	4.61	4.65	4.29	4.34	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	11	1	0	2	2	0	3.00	1064/1221	3.96	4.17	3.93	4.04	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	0	5	7	4.07	697/1280	4.59	4.54	4.10	4.28	4.07	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	398/1277	4.80	4.68	4.34	4.50	4.73	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	461/1269	4.81	4.73	4.31	4.49	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	4	2	2	1	3	2.75	819/ 854	4.18	4.14	4.02	4.31	2.75	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	34/ 47	4.00	4.00	4.41	4.51	4.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	29/ 45	4.20	4.20	4.30	4.22	4.20	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	18/ 39	4.75	4.75	4.40	4.03	4.75	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	23/ 35	4.00	4.00	4.31	4.13	4.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.11	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 13	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	15

Questionnaires: 22

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	7	13	4.65	443/1522	4.48	4.53	4.30	4.42	4.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	322/1522	4.54	4.60	4.26	4.34	4.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	13	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.67	4.30	4.42	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	326/1476	4.56	4.55	4.22	4.31	4.65
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	2	8	8	4.16	655/1412	4.12	4.19	4.06	4.11	4.16
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	272/1381	4.62	4.52	4.08	4.21	4.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	139/1500	4.56	4.66	4.18	4.25	4.84
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	292/1517	4.85	4.72	4.65	4.71	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	280/1497	4.45	4.30	4.11	4.21	4.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	288/1440	4.65	4.65	4.45	4.52	4.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	656/1448	4.91	4.85	4.71	4.75	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	248/1436	4.65	4.67	4.29	4.32	4.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	430/1432	4.61	4.65	4.29	4.34	4.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	1	2	6	9	4.28	448/1221	3.96	4.17	3.93	4.04	4.28
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	214/1280	4.59	4.54	4.10	4.28	4.76
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	363/1277	4.80	4.68	4.34	4.50	4.76
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	244/1269	4.81	4.73	4.31	4.49	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	5	3	8	4.19	369/ 854	4.18	4.14	4.02	4.31	4.19
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.47	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	4.67	4.35	4.32	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.00	4.51	4.55	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	5.00	4.42	4.20	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	****	4.23	3.85	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.58	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	4.60	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	5.00	4.49	4.65	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	4.58	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.11	4.14	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 47	4.00	4.00	4.41	4.51	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 45	4.20	4.20	4.30	4.22	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 39	4.75	4.75	4.40	4.03	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 35	4.00	4.00	4.31	4.13	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.11	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.63	4.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	4.50	4.69	4.92	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	4.25	****

Course-Section: SOWK 483 0301
 Title SOCIAL WORK MEHTODS II
 Instructor: TING, LAURA
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1405
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	19
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	3
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	1	0	4	12	4.59	514/1522	4.48	4.53	4.30	4.42	4.59	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	0	2	14	4.71	310/1522	4.54	4.60	4.26	4.34	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	13	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1285	5.00	4.67	4.30	4.42	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	167/1476	4.56	4.55	4.22	4.31	4.82	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	1	14	4.71	197/1412	4.12	4.19	4.06	4.11	4.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	92/1381	4.62	4.52	4.08	4.21	4.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	76/1500	4.56	4.66	4.18	4.25	4.94	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1517	4.85	4.72	4.65	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	1	6	7	4.20	718/1497	4.45	4.30	4.11	4.21	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	552/1440	4.65	4.65	4.45	4.52	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	296/1448	4.91	4.85	4.71	4.75	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	502/1436	4.65	4.67	4.29	4.32	4.59	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	548/1432	4.61	4.65	4.29	4.34	4.59	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	226/1221	3.96	4.17	3.93	4.04	4.59	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	311/1280	4.59	4.54	4.10	4.28	4.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	451/1277	4.80	4.68	4.34	4.50	4.69	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	445/1269	4.81	4.73	4.31	4.49	4.69	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	78/ 854	4.18	4.14	4.02	4.31	4.88	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.58	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	5.00	4.49	4.65	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	4.58	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.11	4.14	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 47	4.00	4.00	4.41	4.51	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 45	4.20	4.20	4.30	4.22	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 39	4.75	4.75	4.40	4.03	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 35	4.00	4.00	4.31	4.13	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.11	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 3	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D 0	Under-grad 20
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Non-major 11
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	Other 13

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant