

Course-Section: SOWK 240 0101  
 Title INFO TECH IN SOCIAL WO  
 Instructor: LAUR, JOHN A.  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1531  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	4	0	4	0	9	4	4	3.19	1603/1670	3.73	4.41	4.31	4.32	3.19
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	1	1	1	6	12	4.29	931/1666	4.59	4.58	4.27	4.27	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	18	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1406	4.67	4.61	4.32	4.39	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	3	0	2	1	2	13	4.44	633/1615	4.26	4.46	4.24	4.29	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	10	1	0	2	3	3	3.78	1129/1566	3.81	4.38	4.07	4.00	3.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	1	1	4	11	4.11	842/1528	4.29	4.43	4.12	4.11	4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	229/1650	4.89	4.65	4.22	4.20	4.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	18	3	4.14	1444/1667	4.45	4.63	4.67	4.64	4.14
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	2	1	4	3	3	3.31	1473/1626	3.77	4.22	4.11	4.06	3.31
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	2	3	14	4.50	896/1559	4.57	4.68	4.46	4.40	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	1102/1560	4.88	4.81	4.72	4.73	4.65
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	2	2	15	4.68	463/1549	4.74	4.64	4.31	4.25	4.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	4	3	11	4.10	1103/1546	4.43	4.63	4.32	4.30	4.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	1	0	4	5	10	4.15	619/1323	4.48	4.03	4.00	4.08	4.15
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	5	1	1	6	5	3.28	1194/1384	3.93	4.48	4.10	4.07	3.28
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	2	2	4	10	4.22	878/1378	4.60	4.65	4.29	4.25	4.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	2	1	3	11	4.17	915/1378	4.66	4.65	4.31	4.26	4.17
4. Were special techniques successful	7	8	1	1	1	4	3	3.70	653/ 904	3.96	4.27	4.03	4.01	3.70
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.33	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.75	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	4.30	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.50	2.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.19	2.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 18	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 15
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	2	B 0			
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 25	Non-major 10
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 18		
				? 0			

Course-Section: SOWK 240 0201  
 Title INFO TECH IN SOCIAL WO  
 Instructor: LAUR, JOHN A.  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1532  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	4	0	1	1	4	7	6	3.84	1386/1670	3.73	4.41	4.31	4.32	3.84
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	452/1666	4.59	4.58	4.27	4.27	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	14	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/1406	4.67	4.61	4.32	4.39	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	1	0	0	3	6	9	4.33	775/1615	4.26	4.46	4.24	4.29	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	5	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	664/1566	3.81	4.38	4.07	4.00	4.23
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	0	3	6	9	4.33	631/1528	4.29	4.43	4.12	4.11	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1650	4.89	4.65	4.22	4.20	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	15	4	4.21	1395/1667	4.45	4.63	4.67	4.64	4.21
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	2	1	0	3	7	4	3.87	1162/1626	3.77	4.22	4.11	4.06	3.87
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	4	6	8	4.22	1178/1559	4.57	4.68	4.46	4.40	4.22
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1560	4.88	4.81	4.72	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	488/1549	4.74	4.64	4.31	4.25	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	557/1546	4.43	4.63	4.32	4.30	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	211/1323	4.48	4.03	4.00	4.08	4.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	4	5	8	4.24	683/1384	3.93	4.48	4.10	4.07	4.24
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	452/1378	4.60	4.65	4.29	4.25	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	365/1378	4.66	4.65	4.31	4.26	4.82
4. Were special techniques successful	7	5	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	570/ 904	3.96	4.27	4.03	4.01	3.91
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.33	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.61	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	4.25	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.75	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	4.30	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.50	2.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.19	2.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.62	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.27	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.47	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: SOWK 240 0201  
 Title INFO TECH IN SOCIAL WO  
 Instructor: LAUR, JOHN A.  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1532  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	2	A	15	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	10
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	0						

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	1	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	1094/1670	3.73	4.41	4.31	4.32	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	216/1666	4.59	4.58	4.27	4.27	4.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	423/1406	4.67	4.61	4.32	4.39	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	1083/1615	4.26	4.46	4.24	4.29	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	4	1	3.43	1335/1566	3.81	4.38	4.07	4.00	3.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	532/1528	4.29	4.43	4.12	4.11	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	194/1650	4.89	4.65	4.22	4.20	4.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1667	4.45	4.63	4.67	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	854/1626	3.77	4.22	4.11	4.06	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1559	4.57	4.68	4.46	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1560	4.88	4.81	4.72	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	248/1549	4.74	4.64	4.31	4.25	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	631/1546	4.43	4.63	4.32	4.30	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	288/1323	4.48	4.03	4.00	4.08	4.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	651/1384	3.93	4.48	4.10	4.07	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	295/1378	4.60	4.65	4.29	4.25	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1378	4.66	4.65	4.31	4.26	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	356/ 904	3.96	4.27	4.03	4.01	4.29
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.75	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	4.30	****
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.47	4.00	****
Self Paced														
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	7	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	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	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOWK 260 0101  
 Title INTRO SOCIAL WORK I  
 Instructor: BAFFOUR, TIFFAN  
 Enrollment: 28  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1534  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	12	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	849/1670	4.35	4.41	4.31	4.32	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	13	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	686/1666	4.26	4.58	4.27	4.27	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	12	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	254/1406	4.46	4.61	4.32	4.39	4.81
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	12	2	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	552/1615	4.17	4.46	4.24	4.29	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	280/1566	4.46	4.38	4.07	4.00	4.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	518/1528	4.25	4.43	4.12	4.11	4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	12	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	406/1650	4.37	4.65	4.22	4.20	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	12	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1667	4.39	4.63	4.67	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	1	0	2	4	3	3	3.58	1354/1626	3.70	4.22	4.11	4.06	3.58
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	1185/1559	4.27	4.68	4.46	4.40	4.21
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	892/1560	4.48	4.81	4.72	4.73	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	952/1549	4.28	4.64	4.31	4.25	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	3	4	7	4.13	1079/1546	4.32	4.63	4.32	4.30	4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	0	2	0	1	3	9	4.13	634/1323	4.04	4.03	4.00	4.08	4.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	1	3	2	6	3.85	957/1384	4.05	4.48	4.10	4.07	3.85
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	1	0	1	11	4.69	459/1378	4.50	4.65	4.29	4.25	4.69
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	2	0	11	4.69	501/1378	4.56	4.65	4.31	4.26	4.69
4. Were special techniques successful	15	4	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	138/ 904	3.97	4.27	4.03	4.01	4.78

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SOWK 260 0201  
 Title INTRO SOCIAL WORK I  
 Instructor: CHAKMAKIAN, ELI  
 Enrollment: 29  
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1535  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	11	0	0	0	3	6	9	4.33	902/1670	4.35	4.41	4.31	4.32	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	11	0	0	0	5	7	6	4.06	1167/1666	4.26	4.58	4.27	4.27	4.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	11	0	0	3	2	3	10	4.11	988/1406	4.46	4.61	4.32	4.39	4.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	11	0	0	2	4	7	5	3.83	1276/1615	4.17	4.46	4.24	4.29	3.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	3	4	9	4.24	664/1566	4.46	4.38	4.07	4.00	4.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	3	7	6	4.06	870/1528	4.25	4.43	4.12	4.11	4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	11	0	0	1	2	9	6	4.11	1067/1650	4.37	4.65	4.22	4.20	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	11	0	1	1	4	7	5	3.78	1629/1667	4.39	4.63	4.67	4.64	3.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	0	0	6	8	3	3.82	1200/1626	3.70	4.22	4.11	4.06	3.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	4	4	10	4.33	1092/1559	4.27	4.68	4.46	4.40	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	1	5	2	10	4.17	1438/1560	4.48	4.81	4.72	4.73	4.17
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	0	3	7	8	4.28	960/1549	4.28	4.64	4.31	4.25	4.28
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	715/1546	4.32	4.63	4.32	4.30	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	1	0	2	2	8	5	3.94	768/1323	4.04	4.03	4.00	4.08	3.94
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	670/1384	4.05	4.48	4.10	4.07	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	3	5	8	4.31	819/1378	4.50	4.65	4.29	4.25	4.31
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	721/1378	4.56	4.65	4.31	4.26	4.44
4. Were special techniques successful	13	4	2	1	3	5	1	3.17	808/ 904	3.97	4.27	4.03	4.01	3.17
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.75	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	4.30	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.50	2.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.19	2.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.62	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.27	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.47	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	27	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	2	A 9	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 7
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B 6			
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	1	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 29	Non-major 22
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough	

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	15	
?	0			

Course-Section: SOWK 260H 0201  
 Title INTRO TO SOCIAL WORK I  
 Instructor: CHAKMAKIAN, ELI  
 Enrollment: 1  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1536  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	1	Non-major	1
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						



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	7	0	0	3	6	6	4	3.58	1518/1670	4.25	4.41	4.31	4.24	3.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	1	2	1	10	5	3.84	1357/1666	4.31	4.58	4.27	4.18	3.84
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	0	1	2	3	9	4	3.68	1230/1406	4.21	4.61	4.32	4.22	3.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	8	1	0	3	7	4	3	3.41	1491/1615	4.09	4.46	4.24	4.18	3.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	11	6	4.28	621/1566	4.23	4.38	4.07	4.04	4.28
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	4	8	5	3.94	983/1528	4.28	4.43	4.12	4.07	3.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8	0	0	4	4	6	4	3.56	1445/1650	4.16	4.65	4.22	4.12	3.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	9	0	1	3	1	10	2	3.53	1647/1667	4.16	4.63	4.67	4.67	3.53
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	1	0	0	6	4	2	3.67	1312/1626	4.33	4.22	4.11	4.06	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	3	7	6	4.19	1205/1559	4.48	4.68	4.46	4.40	4.19
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	3	3	3	9	4.00	1467/1560	4.46	4.81	4.72	4.67	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	1	5	6	6	3.94	1200/1549	4.33	4.64	4.31	4.25	3.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	2	2	7	7	4.06	1121/1546	4.30	4.63	4.32	4.24	4.06
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	2	2	1	5	5	2	3.27	1121/1323	3.55	4.03	4.00	3.99	3.27
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	0	6	10	4.47	466/1384	4.63	4.48	4.10	4.12	4.47
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	3	7	7	4.24	872/1378	4.47	4.65	4.29	4.30	4.24
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	721/1378	4.61	4.65	4.31	4.33	4.44
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	1	1	3	7	3	3.67	671/ 904	3.76	4.27	4.03	4.03	3.67
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	3.99	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.62	4.68	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	2.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 9	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 1	Major 15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 25	Non-major 11
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D 0			
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	8	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough	

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	15	
?	1			

Course-Section: SOWK 360 0201  
 Title SOC WELFARE/POL/WORK I  
 Instructor: TICE, CAROLYN  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1538  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	2	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	1017/1670	4.25	4.41	4.31	4.24	4.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	991/1666	4.31	4.58	4.27	4.18	4.23
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	0	1	2	9	4.38	739/1406	4.21	4.61	4.32	4.22	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	0	1	3	8	4.31	813/1615	4.09	4.46	4.24	4.18	4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	559/1566	4.23	4.38	4.07	4.04	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	3	7	4.25	706/1528	4.28	4.43	4.12	4.07	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	0	1	1	9	4.42	705/1650	4.16	4.65	4.22	4.12	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	1	0	0	7	4	4.08	1482/1667	4.16	4.63	4.67	4.67	4.08
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	499/1626	4.33	4.22	4.11	4.06	4.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	755/1559	4.48	4.68	4.46	4.40	4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	1279/1560	4.46	4.81	4.72	4.67	4.46
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	1	10	4.54	646/1549	4.33	4.64	4.31	4.25	4.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	2	8	4.23	1002/1546	4.30	4.63	4.32	4.24	4.23
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	3	0	9	4.23	560/1323	3.55	4.03	4.00	3.99	4.23
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	348/1384	4.63	4.48	4.10	4.12	4.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	0	1	9	4.55	571/1378	4.47	4.65	4.29	4.30	4.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	2	0	9	4.64	560/1378	4.61	4.65	4.31	4.33	4.64
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	3	0	8	4.45	266/ 904	3.76	4.27	4.03	4.03	4.45
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.04	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	3.99	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	9
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	11				
				?	1						

Course-Section: SOWK 360 8620  
 Title SOC WELFARE/POL/WORK I  
 Instructor: PLANELL, JOAN  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1539  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	4	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	165/1670	4.25	4.41	4.31	4.24	4.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	216/1666	4.31	4.58	4.27	4.18	4.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	1	0	3	10	4.57	525/1406	4.21	4.61	4.32	4.22	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	1	1	0	0	2	10	4.54	520/1615	4.09	4.46	4.24	4.18	4.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	4	2	7	4.07	808/1566	4.23	4.38	4.07	4.04	4.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	315/1528	4.28	4.43	4.12	4.07	4.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	570/1650	4.16	4.65	4.22	4.12	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	768/1667	4.16	4.63	4.67	4.67	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	131/1626	4.33	4.22	4.11	4.06	4.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	0	2	11	4.64	706/1559	4.48	4.68	4.46	4.40	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	477/1560	4.46	4.81	4.72	4.67	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	0	1	1	11	4.50	683/1549	4.33	4.64	4.31	4.25	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	1	11	4.62	582/1546	4.30	4.63	4.32	4.24	4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	4	3	0	0	1	3	3.14	1161/1323	3.55	4.03	4.00	3.99	3.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	249/1384	4.63	4.48	4.10	4.12	4.77
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	517/1378	4.47	4.65	4.29	4.30	4.62
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	428/1378	4.61	4.65	4.31	4.33	4.77
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	3	1	3	1	4	3.17	808/ 904	3.76	4.27	4.03	4.03	3.17
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.04	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	3.99	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.25	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	3.93	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.19	3.96	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	2.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: SOWK 360 8620  
 Title SOC WELFARE/POL/WORK I  
 Instructor: PLANELL, JOAN  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1539  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	10
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	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	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOWK 371 8620  
 Title AGING:ISSUES, THRY, PR  
 Instructor: LOVE, YVONNA  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1540  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies							Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	224/1670	4.89	4.41	4.31	4.24	4.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	415/1666	4.67	4.58	4.27	4.18	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	667/1406	4.44	4.61	4.32	4.22	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	775/1615	4.33	4.46	4.24	4.18	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	295/1566	4.67	4.38	4.07	4.04	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	532/1528	4.43	4.43	4.12	4.07	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	499/1650	4.56	4.65	4.22	4.12	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.63	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	693/1626	4.29	4.22	4.11	4.06	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	971/1559	4.44	4.68	4.46	4.40	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	647/1560	4.89	4.81	4.72	4.67	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	622/1549	4.56	4.64	4.31	4.25	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	520/1546	4.67	4.63	4.32	4.24	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	842/1323	3.88	4.03	4.00	3.99	3.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	324/1384	4.67	4.48	4.10	4.12	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	379/1378	4.78	4.65	4.29	4.30	4.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	302/1378	4.89	4.65	4.31	4.33	4.89
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	279/ 904	4.43	4.27	4.03	4.03	4.43

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 6	Under-grad 9	Non-major 2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	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 1		
				? 0			

Course-Section: SOWK 372 0101  
 Title SOCIAL WORK & HLTH CAR  
 Instructor: HARRIS, JESSE  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1541  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	7	0	1	0	0	1	9	4.55	621/1670	4.59	4.41	4.31	4.24	4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	0	0	4	2	5	4.09	1142/1666	4.50	4.58	4.27	4.18	4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	352/1406	4.77	4.61	4.32	4.22	4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	509/1615	4.68	4.46	4.24	4.18	4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	2	1	7	4.18	715/1566	4.24	4.38	4.07	4.04	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	5	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	421/1528	4.61	4.43	4.12	4.07	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	879/1650	4.54	4.65	4.22	4.12	4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	1	0	0	0	9	1	4.10	1472/1667	4.55	4.63	4.67	4.67	4.10
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	728/1626	4.48	4.22	4.11	4.06	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	276/1559	4.86	4.68	4.46	4.40	4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	596/1560	4.91	4.81	4.72	4.67	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	525/1549	4.73	4.64	4.31	4.25	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	231/1546	4.91	4.63	4.32	4.24	4.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	7	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/1323	4.91	4.03	4.00	3.99	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	608/1384	4.58	4.48	4.10	4.12	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	481/1378	4.83	4.65	4.29	4.30	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	302/1378	4.94	4.65	4.31	4.33	4.89
4. Were special techniques successful	10	4	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/ 904	4.64	4.27	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	3.99	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.76	****

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	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General	5	Under-grad	18	Non-major	9
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	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	6				
				? 0						

Course-Section: SOWK 372 8620  
 Title SOCIAL WORK & HLTH CAR  
 Instructor: MCFEATERS, SUSAN  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1542  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	518/1670	4.59	4.41	4.31	4.24	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	173/1666	4.50	4.58	4.27	4.18	4.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	254/1406	4.77	4.61	4.32	4.22	4.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	238/1615	4.68	4.46	4.24	4.18	4.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	589/1566	4.24	4.38	4.07	4.04	4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	260/1528	4.61	4.43	4.12	4.07	4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	229/1650	4.54	4.65	4.22	4.12	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1667	4.55	4.63	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	255/1626	4.48	4.22	4.11	4.06	4.70
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	419/1559	4.86	4.68	4.46	4.40	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	596/1560	4.91	4.81	4.72	4.67	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	284/1549	4.73	4.64	4.31	4.25	4.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	231/1546	4.91	4.63	4.32	4.24	4.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	119/1323	4.91	4.03	4.00	3.99	4.91
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	215/1384	4.58	4.48	4.10	4.12	4.82
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1378	4.83	4.65	4.29	4.30	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1378	4.94	4.65	4.31	4.33	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	190/ 904	4.64	4.27	4.03	4.03	4.64

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 9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 9	Under-grad 11	Non-major 2
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	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 2		
				? 0			



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

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1543  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	4	0	0	0	0	3	23	4.88	224/1670	4.88	4.41	4.31	4.24	4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	5	21	4.81	259/1666	4.81	4.58	4.27	4.18	4.81
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	4	21	4.77	306/1406	4.77	4.61	4.32	4.22	4.77
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	1	0	0	2	5	18	4.64	401/1615	4.64	4.46	4.24	4.18	4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	2	1	5	17	4.48	409/1566	4.48	4.38	4.07	4.04	4.48
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	5	21	4.81	173/1528	4.81	4.43	4.12	4.07	4.81
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	0	4	22	4.85	201/1650	4.85	4.65	4.22	4.12	4.85
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	16	10	4.38	1271/1667	4.38	4.63	4.67	4.67	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	2	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	515/1626	4.44	4.22	4.11	4.06	4.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	2	24	4.92	221/1559	4.92	4.68	4.46	4.40	4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.81	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	3	23	4.88	220/1549	4.88	4.64	4.31	4.25	4.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	3	22	4.81	345/1546	4.81	4.63	4.32	4.24	4.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	0	0	2	5	16	4.61	273/1323	4.61	4.03	4.00	3.99	4.61
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	1	5	17	4.58	384/1384	4.58	4.48	4.10	4.12	4.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	3	21	4.88	274/1378	4.88	4.65	4.29	4.30	4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	5	19	4.79	396/1378	4.79	4.65	4.31	4.33	4.79
4. Were special techniques successful	6	5	4	0	2	4	9	3.74	638/ 904	3.74	4.27	4.03	4.03	3.74
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	29	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.19	3.96	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0	Major 18
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 11			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C 0	General 4	Under-grad 30	Non-major 12
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	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 14		
				? 0			

Course-Section: SOWK 388 0101  
 Title HUMAN BEHAVIOR  
 Instructor: OKUNDAYE, JOSHU  
 Enrollment: 40  
 Questionnaires: 38

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1544  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	6	0	0	0	1	2	29	4.88	234/1670	4.88	4.41	4.31	4.24	4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	0	1	2	4	25	4.66	428/1666	4.66	4.58	4.27	4.18	4.66
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	0	1	0	7	5	18	4.26	876/1406	4.26	4.61	4.32	4.22	4.26
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	0	0	0	2	6	23	4.68	368/1615	4.68	4.46	4.24	4.18	4.68
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	6	25	4.75	226/1566	4.75	4.38	4.07	4.04	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	5	27	4.84	152/1528	4.84	4.43	4.12	4.07	4.84
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	0	1	4	4	23	4.53	527/1650	4.53	4.65	4.22	4.12	4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	0	0	31	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.63	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	2	0	0	0	6	18	4.75	207/1626	4.75	4.22	4.11	4.06	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	3	27	4.90	276/1559	4.90	4.68	4.46	4.40	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	0	30	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.81	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	1	3	26	4.83	266/1549	4.83	4.64	4.31	4.25	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	29	4.97	93/1546	4.97	4.63	4.32	4.24	4.97
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	7	4	2	6	2	9	3.43	1069/1323	3.43	4.03	4.00	3.99	3.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	3	23	4.81	215/1384	4.81	4.48	4.10	4.12	4.81
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	6	21	4.78	379/1378	4.78	4.65	4.29	4.30	4.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	0	1	25	4.85	333/1378	4.85	4.65	4.31	4.33	4.85
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	1	1	2	6	16	4.35	322/ 904	4.35	4.27	4.03	4.03	4.35
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.62	4.68	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.47	4.51	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors					
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 19	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	22
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 10						
56-83	11	2.00-2.99	3	C 1	General	4	Under-grad	38	Non-major	16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P 0						
				I 0	Other	23				
				? 0						

Course-Section: SOWK 389 0101  
 Title HUMAN BEHAVIOR II  
 Instructor: WIECHELT, SHELL  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1545  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	4	0	0	1	4	6	10	4.19	1060/1670	4.52	4.41	4.31	4.24	4.19
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	7	13	4.57	529/1666	4.78	4.58	4.27	4.18	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	483/1406	4.75	4.61	4.32	4.22	4.62
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	2	8	11	4.43	660/1615	4.53	4.46	4.24	4.18	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	2	4	12	4.25	643/1566	4.45	4.38	4.07	4.04	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	6	13	4.52	406/1528	4.61	4.43	4.12	4.07	4.52
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	2	5	14	4.57	471/1650	4.76	4.65	4.22	4.12	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	338/1667	4.78	4.63	4.67	4.67	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	3	10	4	4.06	926/1626	4.26	4.22	4.11	4.06	4.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	2	3	16	4.67	673/1559	4.77	4.68	4.46	4.40	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	2	2	17	4.71	1023/1560	4.83	4.81	4.72	4.67	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	683/1549	4.71	4.64	4.31	4.25	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	6	13	4.52	691/1546	4.63	4.63	4.32	4.24	4.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	11	5	0	2	1	2	2.50	1269/1323	3.62	4.03	4.00	3.99	2.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	403/1384	4.61	4.48	4.10	4.12	4.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	488/1378	4.79	4.65	4.29	4.30	4.65
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	386/1378	4.79	4.65	4.31	4.33	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	5	15	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	****/ 904	4.42	4.27	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	3.99	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	3	0	0	0	1	2.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.27	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.47	4.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	2.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: SOWK 389 0101  
 Title HUMAN BEHAVIOR II  
 Instructor: WIECHELT, SHELL  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1545  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	25	Non-major	9
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	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	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOWK 389 0201  
 Title HUMAN BEHAVIOR II  
 Instructor: MOSES, JAMAAL  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1546  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	2	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	388/1670	4.52	4.41	4.31	4.24	4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	121/1666	4.78	4.58	4.27	4.18	4.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	153/1406	4.75	4.61	4.32	4.22	4.93
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	308/1615	4.53	4.46	4.24	4.18	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	1	13	4.73	242/1566	4.45	4.38	4.07	4.04	4.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	346/1528	4.61	4.43	4.12	4.07	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	201/1650	4.76	4.65	4.22	4.12	4.85
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	9	6	4.40	1256/1667	4.78	4.63	4.67	4.67	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	670/1626	4.26	4.22	4.11	4.06	4.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	706/1559	4.77	4.68	4.46	4.40	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	477/1560	4.83	4.81	4.72	4.67	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	323/1549	4.71	4.64	4.31	4.25	4.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	2	11	4.57	631/1546	4.63	4.63	4.32	4.24	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	3	0	0	0	5	3.50	1040/1323	3.62	4.03	4.00	3.99	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	0	0	12	4.43	519/1384	4.61	4.48	4.10	4.12	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	368/1378	4.79	4.65	4.29	4.30	4.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	608/1378	4.79	4.65	4.31	4.33	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	3	8	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	243/ 904	4.42	4.27	4.03	4.03	4.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.04	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	3.99	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.25	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	3.93	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.27	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.47	4.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	2.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: SOWK 389 0201  
 Title HUMAN BEHAVIOR II  
 Instructor: MOSES, JAMAAL  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1546  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	5
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	0	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	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOWK 389 8620  
 Title HUMAN BEHAVIOR II  
 Instructor: THIEL, MINDY  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1547  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	7	0	0	1	1	0	12	4.64	505/1670	4.52	4.41	4.31	4.24	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	8	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	224/1666	4.78	4.58	4.27	4.18	4.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	8	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	387/1406	4.75	4.61	4.32	4.22	4.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	0	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	660/1615	4.53	4.46	4.24	4.18	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	2	0	3	9	4.36	540/1566	4.45	4.38	4.07	4.04	4.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	277/1528	4.61	4.43	4.12	4.07	4.69
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	194/1650	4.76	4.65	4.22	4.12	4.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1667	4.78	4.63	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	547/1626	4.26	4.22	4.11	4.06	4.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1559	4.77	4.68	4.46	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	725/1560	4.83	4.81	4.72	4.67	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	248/1549	4.71	4.64	4.31	4.25	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	370/1546	4.63	4.63	4.32	4.24	4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	141/1323	3.62	4.03	4.00	3.99	4.85
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	200/1384	4.61	4.48	4.10	4.12	4.85
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	194/1378	4.79	4.65	4.29	4.30	4.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1378	4.79	4.65	4.31	4.33	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	328/ 904	4.42	4.27	4.03	4.03	4.33

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 7	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 4				
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General	0	Under-grad 21	Non-major 14
84-150	2	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	10		
				? 0				

Course-Section: SOWK 390F 0101  
 Title PEER EDUCATORS PROJECT  
 Instructor: ROHRBACH, ALISO (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1548  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies							Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	1216/1670	4.00	4.41	4.31	4.24	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	870/1666	4.33	4.58	4.27	4.18	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.61	4.32	4.22	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	775/1615	4.33	4.46	4.24	4.18	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.38	4.07	4.04	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1447/1528	3.00	4.43	4.12	4.07	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.65	4.22	4.12	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.63	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1312/1626	3.67	4.22	4.11	4.06	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.68	4.46	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.81	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.64	4.31	4.25	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.63	4.32	4.24	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	692/1323	4.00	4.03	4.00	3.99	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	820/1384	4.00	4.48	4.10	4.12	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	970/1378	4.00	4.65	4.29	4.30	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1189/1378	3.50	4.65	4.31	4.33	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	4.27	4.03	4.03	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 41	5.00	5.00	4.50	4.44	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 38	5.00	5.00	4.19	3.96	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 38	5.00	5.00	4.62	4.68	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	5.00	4.27	4.38	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.51	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
-----											
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	3	Non-major	2
84-150	1	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 390F 0101  
 Title PEER EDUCATORS PROJECT  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1549  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies							Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	1216/1670	4.00	4.41	4.31	4.24	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	870/1666	4.33	4.58	4.27	4.18	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.61	4.32	4.22	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	775/1615	4.33	4.46	4.24	4.18	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.38	4.07	4.04	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1447/1528	3.00	4.43	4.12	4.07	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.65	4.22	4.12	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.63	4.67	4.67	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.68	4.46	4.40	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	820/1384	4.00	4.48	4.10	4.12	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	970/1378	4.00	4.65	4.29	4.30	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1189/1378	3.50	4.65	4.31	4.33	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	4.27	4.03	4.03	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 41	5.00	5.00	4.50	4.44	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 38	5.00	5.00	4.19	3.96	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 38	5.00	5.00	4.62	4.68	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	5.00	4.27	4.38	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.51	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	3	Non-major	2
84-150	1	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 397 0201  
 Title SOCIAL WORK METHODS I  
 Instructor: KNIGHT, CAROLYN  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1550  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	1	1	5	13	4.50	665/1670	4.52	4.41	4.31	4.24	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	216/1666	4.74	4.58	4.27	4.18	4.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	18	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1406	4.56	4.61	4.32	4.22	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	2	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	499/1615	4.56	4.46	4.24	4.18	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	1	8	9	4.20	706/1566	4.36	4.38	4.07	4.04	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	346/1528	4.65	4.43	4.12	4.07	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	0	1	4	14	4.50	570/1650	4.52	4.65	4.22	4.12	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	675/1667	4.41	4.63	4.67	4.67	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	693/1626	4.09	4.22	4.11	4.06	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	7	11	4.53	871/1559	4.53	4.68	4.46	4.40	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1560	4.79	4.81	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	323/1549	4.61	4.64	4.31	4.25	4.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	370/1546	4.66	4.63	4.32	4.24	4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	16	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1323	3.97	4.03	4.00	3.99	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	340/1384	4.73	4.48	4.10	4.12	4.65
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	0	6	10	4.47	637/1378	4.72	4.65	4.29	4.30	4.47
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	0	5	11	4.53	640/1378	4.72	4.65	4.31	4.33	4.53
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	1	0	5	6	4	3.75	629/ 904	4.24	4.27	4.03	4.03	3.75

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 18
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 7			
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 23	Non-major 5
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 16		
				? 0			

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	3	0	1	2	1	3	13	4.25	996/1670	4.52	4.41	4.31	4.24	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	1	5	13	4.50	622/1666	4.74	4.58	4.27	4.18	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	12	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	751/1406	4.56	4.61	4.32	4.22	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	1	2	5	12	4.40	687/1615	4.56	4.46	4.24	4.18	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	2	2	14	4.40	491/1566	4.36	4.38	4.07	4.04	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	4	14	4.55	383/1528	4.65	4.43	4.12	4.07	4.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	2	0	0	7	11	4.25	903/1650	4.52	4.65	4.22	4.12	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	1	0	9	9	1	3.45	1652/1667	4.41	4.63	4.67	4.67	3.45
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	2	1	0	2	6	3	3.83	1191/1626	4.09	4.22	4.11	4.06	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	2	7	10	4.25	1157/1559	4.53	4.68	4.46	4.40	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	0	2	3	14	4.45	1294/1560	4.79	4.81	4.72	4.67	4.45
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	3	5	11	4.25	977/1549	4.61	4.64	4.31	4.25	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	1	7	10	4.32	939/1546	4.66	4.63	4.32	4.24	4.32
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	2	2	5	3	3	3.20	1143/1323	3.97	4.03	4.00	3.99	3.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	308/1384	4.73	4.48	4.10	4.12	4.69
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	400/1378	4.72	4.65	4.29	4.30	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	511/1378	4.72	4.65	4.31	4.33	4.69
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	1	0	0	2	13	4.63	194/ 904	4.24	4.27	4.03	4.03	4.63
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	3.99	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.27	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.47	4.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	2.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	9
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	15	
?	1			

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	0	3	12	4.80	300/1670	4.52	4.41	4.31	4.24	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	207/1666	4.74	4.58	4.27	4.18	4.87	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	318/1406	4.56	4.61	4.32	4.22	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	308/1615	4.56	4.46	4.24	4.18	4.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	429/1566	4.36	4.38	4.07	4.04	4.47	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	173/1528	4.65	4.43	4.12	4.07	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	229/1650	4.52	4.65	4.22	4.12	4.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	749/1667	4.41	4.63	4.67	4.67	4.87	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	7	4	4.15	843/1626	4.09	4.22	4.11	4.06	4.15	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	435/1559	4.53	4.68	4.46	4.40	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	417/1560	4.79	4.81	4.72	4.67	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	294/1549	4.61	4.64	4.31	4.25	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	276/1546	4.66	4.63	4.32	4.24	4.87	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	194/1323	3.97	4.03	4.00	3.99	4.73	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	195/1384	4.73	4.48	4.10	4.12	4.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	194/1378	4.72	4.65	4.29	4.30	4.93	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	225/1378	4.72	4.65	4.31	4.33	4.93	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	1	0	1	3	9	4.36	317/ 904	4.24	4.27	4.03	4.03	4.36	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	3.99	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.30	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.53	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.50	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.76	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	3.33	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	2.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****	

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	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	8
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	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	11				
				?	0						

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					
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	1	0	3	6	9	4.16	1105/1670	4.16	4.41	4.31	4.45	4.16
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	3	4	11	4.32	895/1666	4.32	4.58	4.27	4.35	4.32
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	5	11	4.42	691/1406	4.42	4.61	4.32	4.48	4.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	1	0	1	3	4	9	4.24	898/1615	4.24	4.46	4.24	4.37	4.24
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	2	5	10	4.28	621/1566	4.28	4.38	4.07	4.17	4.28
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	0	5	0	11	4.38	590/1528	4.38	4.43	4.12	4.26	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	361/1650	4.67	4.65	4.22	4.28	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	405/1667	4.94	4.63	4.67	4.73	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	0	3	8	2	3.71	1282/1626	3.71	4.22	4.11	4.28	3.71
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	555/1559	4.74	4.68	4.46	4.58	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	1126/1560	4.63	4.81	4.72	4.80	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	4	1	3	11	4.11	1104/1549	4.11	4.64	4.31	4.43	4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	0	7	9	4.05	1121/1546	4.05	4.63	4.32	4.43	4.05
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	1	2	4	10	4.17	612/1323	4.17	4.03	4.00	4.10	4.17
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	2	3	11	4.22	690/1384	4.22	4.48	4.10	4.32	4.22
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	1	7	9	4.33	797/1378	4.33	4.65	4.29	4.55	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	3	7	7	4.11	942/1378	4.11	4.65	4.31	4.60	4.11
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	2	0	4	2	6	3.71	648/ 904	3.71	4.27	4.03	4.22	3.71
<b>Laboratory</b>														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.26	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.60	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.56	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.67	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.50	4.98	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.19	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.27	4.02	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.47	4.49	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 9			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 21	Non-major 6
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	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 15		
				? 0			

Course-Section: SOWK 483 0101  
 Title SOCIAL WORK METHODS II  
 Instructor: KNIGHT, CAROLYN  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1554  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	7	0	0	1	0	2	11	4.64	505/1670	4.73	4.41	4.31	4.45	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	216/1666	4.82	4.58	4.27	4.35	4.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	9	9	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1406	4.93	4.61	4.32	4.48	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	210/1615	4.85	4.46	4.24	4.37	4.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	1	2	3	7	4.00	851/1566	4.41	4.38	4.07	4.17	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	1	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	152/1528	4.89	4.43	4.12	4.26	4.85
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	194/1650	4.88	4.65	4.22	4.28	4.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	540/1667	4.92	4.63	4.67	4.73	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	151/1626	4.75	4.22	4.11	4.28	4.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	623/1559	4.83	4.68	4.46	4.58	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1560	4.98	4.81	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	352/1549	4.86	4.64	4.31	4.43	4.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	185/1546	4.92	4.63	4.32	4.43	4.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	8	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	****/1323	4.25	4.03	4.00	4.10	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	169/1384	4.80	4.48	4.10	4.32	4.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1378	4.95	4.65	4.29	4.55	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1378	4.95	4.65	4.31	4.60	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	138/ 904	4.71	4.27	4.03	4.22	4.78

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 5			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 2	General 0	Under-grad 21	Non-major 9
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	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 12		
				? 0			

Course-Section: SOWK 483 0201  
 Title SOCIAL WORK METHODS II  
 Instructor: BEMBRY, JAMES  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1555  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	5	0	0	1	1	2	14	4.61	544/1670	4.73	4.41	4.31	4.45	4.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	1	0	1	16	4.78	291/1666	4.82	4.58	4.27	4.35	4.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	11	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	226/1406	4.93	4.61	4.32	4.48	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	3	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	308/1615	4.85	4.46	4.24	4.37	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	1	1	1	0	2	13	4.47	419/1566	4.41	4.38	4.07	4.17	4.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	131/1528	4.89	4.43	4.12	4.26	4.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	95/1650	4.88	4.65	4.22	4.28	4.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1667	4.92	4.63	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	199/1626	4.75	4.22	4.11	4.28	4.77
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	435/1559	4.83	4.68	4.46	4.58	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	417/1560	4.98	4.81	4.72	4.80	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	248/1549	4.86	4.64	4.31	4.43	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	162/1546	4.92	4.63	4.32	4.43	4.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	1	2	1	1	3	7	3.86	857/1323	4.25	4.03	4.00	4.10	3.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	1	1	13	4.63	356/1384	4.80	4.48	4.10	4.32	4.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	337/1378	4.95	4.65	4.29	4.55	4.81
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	375/1378	4.95	4.65	4.31	4.60	4.81
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	230/ 904	4.71	4.27	4.03	4.22	4.53
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.26	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.30	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.80	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.60	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.56	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.67	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	5.00	5.00	4.50	4.98	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 38	5.00	5.00	4.19	4.36	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	5.00	5.00	4.62	4.58	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	5.00	5.00	4.27	4.02	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.49	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	5.00	****



Course-Section: SOWK 483 0201  
 Title SOCIAL WORK METHODS II  
 Instructor: BEMBRY, JAMES  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1555  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	15	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	17
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	6
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOWK 483 0301  
 Title SOCIAL WORK METHODS II  
 Instructor: TING, LAURA  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1556  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	505/1670	4.73	4.41	4.31	4.45	4.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	250/1666	4.82	4.58	4.27	4.35	4.81
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	15	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1406	4.93	4.61	4.32	4.48	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	238/1615	4.85	4.46	4.24	4.37	4.81
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	4	10	4.35	540/1566	4.41	4.38	4.07	4.17	4.35
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	162/1528	4.89	4.43	4.12	4.26	4.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	1	14	4.71	316/1650	4.88	4.65	4.22	4.28	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1667	4.92	4.63	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	403/1626	4.75	4.22	4.11	4.28	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	403/1559	4.83	4.68	4.46	4.58	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1560	4.98	4.81	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	275/1549	4.86	4.64	4.31	4.43	4.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	322/1546	4.92	4.63	4.32	4.43	4.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	1	3	4	7	4.13	634/1323	4.25	4.03	4.00	4.10	4.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	324/1384	4.80	4.48	4.10	4.32	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1378	4.95	4.65	4.29	4.55	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1378	4.95	4.65	4.31	4.60	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	230/ 904	4.71	4.27	4.03	4.22	4.53
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 41	5.00	5.00	4.50	4.98	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 38	5.00	5.00	4.19	4.36	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 38	5.00	5.00	4.62	4.58	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 39	5.00	5.00	4.27	4.02	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.49	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	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 1	General	0
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	16
			? 0		

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	4	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1670	4.73	4.41	4.31	4.45	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	233/1666	4.82	4.58	4.27	4.35	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	7	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1406	4.93	4.61	4.32	4.48	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1615	4.85	4.46	4.24	4.37	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	170/1566	4.41	4.38	4.07	4.17	4.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1528	4.89	4.43	4.12	4.26	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1650	4.88	4.65	4.22	4.28	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	922/1667	4.92	4.63	4.67	4.73	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	126/1626	4.75	4.22	4.11	4.28	4.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1559	4.83	4.68	4.46	4.58	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1560	4.98	4.81	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1549	4.86	4.64	4.31	4.43	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1546	4.92	4.63	4.32	4.43	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	1	0	0	11	4.75	183/1323	4.25	4.03	4.00	4.10	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1384	4.80	4.48	4.10	4.32	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1378	4.95	4.65	4.29	4.55	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1378	4.95	4.65	4.31	4.60	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/ 904	4.71	4.27	4.03	4.22	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.80	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.60	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.67	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 41	5.00	5.00	4.50	4.98	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 38	5.00	5.00	4.19	4.36	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 38	5.00	5.00	4.62	4.58	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	5.00	4.27	4.02	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.49	5.00

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	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	6
84-150	4	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						