

Course-Section: SOWK 240 0101  
 Title INFO TECH IN SOCIAL WO  
 Instructor: LAWRENCE-WEBB,  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1382  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	0	0	1	2	2	2	7	3.86	1219/1504	4.18	4.39	4.27	4.26	3.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	8	5	4.21	891/1503	4.11	4.57	4.20	4.18	4.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	937/1290	4.50	4.65	4.28	4.27	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	5	5	3.86	1136/1453	4.18	4.45	4.21	4.20	3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	4	4	2	3.07	1294/1421	4.04	4.24	4.00	3.90	3.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	2	5	3	3.46	1172/1365	4.23	4.41	4.08	4.00	3.46
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	0	2	9	4.31	705/1485	4.40	4.63	4.16	4.15	4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	11	1	4.08	1389/1504	3.79	4.51	4.69	4.68	4.08
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	2	0	0	5	4	2	3.73	1141/1483	4.11	4.13	4.06	4.02	3.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	876/1425	4.71	4.65	4.41	4.40	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	5	8	4.43	1183/1426	4.46	4.80	4.69	4.71	4.43
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	2	4	6	3.93	1081/1418	4.46	4.52	4.25	4.22	3.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	7	5	4.15	953/1416	4.58	4.61	4.26	4.24	4.15
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	253/1199	4.77	4.17	3.97	3.95	4.54
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	2	5	4	3.50	1011/1312	3.25	4.45	4.00	3.98	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	2	0	3	4	5	3.71	1059/1303	3.86	4.60	4.24	4.23	3.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	1	6	6	4.14	869/1299	4.57	4.76	4.25	4.21	4.14
4. Were special techniques successful	0	6	0	2	2	2	2	3.50	580/ 758	3.25	4.02	4.01	3.89	3.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	1	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	4.30	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	145/ 244	4.00	4.00	4.09	4.24	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	219/ 227	3.00	3.00	4.40	4.58	3.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.52	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.22	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.22	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	4.24	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 58	****	4.80	4.43	4.41	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 56	****	4.79	4.23	4.24	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 44	****	4.29	4.65	4.51	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	4.52	4.29	4.65	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.44	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	35/ 40	3.75	3.75	4.53	4.44	3.75

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	1	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	35/	36	3.00	3.00	4.60	4.13	3.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	1	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	1	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: SOWK 240 0101  
 Title INFO TECH IN SOCIAL WO  
 Instructor: LAWRENCE-WEBB,  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1382  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOWK 240 0201  
 Title INFO TECH IN SOCIAL WO  
 Instructor: LAWRENCE-WEBB,  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1383  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	549/1504	4.18	4.39	4.27	4.26	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1052/1503	4.11	4.57	4.20	4.18	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1290	4.50	4.65	4.28	4.27	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	440/1453	4.18	4.45	4.21	4.20	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	4.04	4.24	4.00	3.90	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1365	4.23	4.41	4.08	4.00	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	455/1485	4.40	4.63	4.16	4.15	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1480/1504	3.79	4.51	4.69	4.68	3.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	338/1483	4.11	4.13	4.06	4.02	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1425	4.71	4.65	4.41	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1128/1426	4.46	4.80	4.69	4.71	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1418	4.46	4.52	4.25	4.22	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1416	4.58	4.61	4.26	4.24	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1199	4.77	4.17	3.97	3.95	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1149/1312	3.25	4.45	4.00	3.98	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	910/1303	3.86	4.60	4.24	4.23	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1299	4.57	4.76	4.25	4.21	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	680/ 758	3.25	4.02	4.01	3.89	3.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SOWK 260 0101  
 Title INTRO SOCIAL WORK I  
 Instructor: WALSH, KATHLEEN  
 Enrollment: 35  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1384  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	168/1504	4.61	4.39	4.27	4.26	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	106/1503	4.51	4.57	4.20	4.18	4.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	166/1290	4.39	4.65	4.28	4.27	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	20	4.90	101/1453	4.53	4.45	4.21	4.20	4.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	151/1421	4.48	4.24	4.00	3.90	4.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	100/1365	4.55	4.41	4.08	4.00	4.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	49/1485	4.78	4.63	4.16	4.15	4.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1504	4.38	4.51	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	7	12	4.63	234/1483	4.17	4.13	4.06	4.02	4.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	90/1425	4.76	4.65	4.41	4.40	4.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	251/1426	4.88	4.80	4.69	4.71	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1418	4.60	4.52	4.25	4.22	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	19	4.86	198/1416	4.69	4.61	4.26	4.24	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	165/1199	4.44	4.17	3.97	3.95	4.68
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	111/1312	4.57	4.45	4.00	3.98	4.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	299/1303	4.48	4.60	4.24	4.23	4.81
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1299	4.76	4.76	4.25	4.21	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	7	0	1	3	3	7	4.14	354/ 758	3.71	4.02	4.01	3.89	4.14
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	4.30	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	4.00	4.09	4.24	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 227	****	3.00	4.40	4.58	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.22	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.22	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	4.24	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.80	4.43	4.41	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	4.79	4.23	4.24	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.29	4.65	4.51	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.52	4.29	4.65	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.44	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	3.75	4.53	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.50	****

3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	36	****	3.00	4.60	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: SOWK 260 0101  
 Title INTRO SOCIAL WORK I  
 Instructor: WALSH, KATHLEEN  
 Enrollment: 35  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1384  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	16	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	1						

Course-Section: SOWK 260 0201  
 Title INTRO SOCIAL WORK I  
 Instructor: LAWRENCE-WEBB,  
 Enrollment: 40  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1385  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	1	1	2	5	16	4.36	750/1504	4.61	4.39	4.27	4.26	4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	2	1	0	10	11	4.13	972/1503	4.51	4.57	4.20	4.18	4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	1	2	4	8	9	3.92	1013/1290	4.39	4.65	4.28	4.27	3.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	1	4	6	13	4.16	878/1453	4.53	4.45	4.21	4.20	4.16
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	4	6	13	4.20	596/1421	4.48	4.24	4.00	3.90	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	5	9	11	4.24	603/1365	4.55	4.41	4.08	4.00	4.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	8	16	4.60	349/1485	4.78	4.63	4.16	4.15	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	1	6	15	2	3.75	1467/1504	4.38	4.51	4.69	4.68	3.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	1	6	12	2	3.71	1147/1483	4.17	4.13	4.06	4.02	3.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	4	3	18	4.56	712/1425	4.76	4.65	4.41	4.40	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	1	22	4.80	738/1426	4.88	4.80	4.69	4.71	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	3	8	12	4.20	905/1418	4.60	4.52	4.25	4.22	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	6	16	4.52	603/1416	4.69	4.61	4.26	4.24	4.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	2	3	8	12	4.20	542/1199	4.44	4.17	3.97	3.95	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	2	3	4	12	4.24	605/1312	4.57	4.45	4.00	3.98	4.24
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	2	4	4	11	4.14	863/1303	4.48	4.60	4.24	4.23	4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	2	3	15	4.52	556/1299	4.76	4.76	4.25	4.21	4.52
4. Were special techniques successful	6	14	2	0	1	2	2	3.29	642/ 758	3.71	4.02	4.01	3.89	3.29
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 244	****	****	4.00	4.09	4.24
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.22	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.22	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	4.24	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.80	4.43	4.41
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.79	4.23	4.24
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.29	4.65	4.51
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 40	****	****	3.75	4.53	4.44
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	3.00	4.60	4.13
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: SOWK 260 0201  
 Title INTRO SOCIAL WORK I  
 Instructor: LAWRENCE-WEBB,  
 Enrollment: 40  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1385  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	19
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1	B	16						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	27	Non-major	8
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOWK 260H 0201  
 Title INTRO TO SOCIAL WORK I  
 Instructor: LAWRENCE-WEBB,  
 Enrollment: 2  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1386  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1453/1504	3.00	4.39	4.27	4.26	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.57	4.20	4.18	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.65	4.28	4.27	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1404/1453	3.00	4.45	4.21	4.20	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.24	4.00	3.90	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1359/1365	2.00	4.41	4.08	4.00	2.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1485	5.00	4.63	4.16	4.15	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1493/1504	3.00	4.51	4.69	4.68	3.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1379/1483	3.00	4.13	4.06	4.02	3.00
-----														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1165/1425	4.00	4.65	4.41	4.40	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.80	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1410/1418	2.00	4.52	4.25	4.22	2.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.61	4.26	4.24	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1050/1199	3.00	4.17	3.97	3.95	3.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	1	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	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOWK 360 0101  
 Title SOC WELFARE/POL/WORK I  
 Instructor: TICE, CAROLYN  
 Enrollment: 27  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1387  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	0	0	0	0	2	3	19	4.71	318/1504	4.80	4.39	4.27	4.27	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	151/1503	4.85	4.57	4.20	4.22	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	18	4.75	250/1290	4.72	4.65	4.28	4.31	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	18	4.67	270/1453	4.65	4.45	4.21	4.23	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	139/1421	4.64	4.24	4.00	4.01	4.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	7	16	4.70	169/1365	4.81	4.41	4.08	4.08	4.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	6	17	4.74	220/1485	4.79	4.63	4.16	4.17	4.74
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	591/1504	4.96	4.51	4.69	4.65	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	6	17	4.74	161/1483	4.54	4.13	4.06	4.08	4.74
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	179/1425	4.84	4.65	4.41	4.43	4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	251/1426	4.94	4.80	4.69	4.71	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	152/1418	4.92	4.52	4.25	4.26	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	296/1416	4.89	4.61	4.26	4.27	4.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	1	0	1	8	8	4.22	519/1199	4.28	4.17	3.97	4.02	4.22
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	132/1312	4.88	4.45	4.00	4.09	4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	197/1303	4.91	4.60	4.24	4.27	4.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	333/1299	4.80	4.76	4.25	4.30	4.77
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	125/ 758	4.35	4.02	4.01	4.00	4.68

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	24	Non-major	10
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	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	19				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOWK 360 0201  
 Title SOC WELFARE/POL/WORK I  
 Instructor: TING, LAURA  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1388  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies							Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	228/1504	4.80	4.39	4.27	4.27	4.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	190/1503	4.85	4.57	4.20	4.22	4.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	220/1290	4.72	4.65	4.28	4.31	4.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	146/1453	4.65	4.45	4.21	4.23	4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	18	4.74	170/1421	4.64	4.24	4.00	4.01	4.74
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	19	4.74	149/1365	4.81	4.41	4.08	4.08	4.74
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	17	4.70	260/1485	4.79	4.63	4.16	4.17	4.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	329/1504	4.96	4.51	4.69	4.65	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	2	0	1	0	8	7	4.31	567/1483	4.54	4.13	4.06	4.08	4.31
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	315/1425	4.84	4.65	4.41	4.43	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	596/1426	4.94	4.80	4.69	4.71	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	126/1418	4.92	4.52	4.25	4.26	4.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	142/1416	4.89	4.61	4.26	4.27	4.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	91/1199	4.28	4.17	3.97	4.02	4.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	137/1312	4.88	4.45	4.00	4.09	4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	197/1303	4.91	4.60	4.24	4.27	4.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	344/1299	4.80	4.76	4.25	4.30	4.76
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	1	3	1	4	7	3.81	493/ 758	4.35	4.02	4.01	4.00	3.81

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	23	Non-major	11
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	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	17				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOWK 360 8020  
 Title SOC WELFARE/POL/WORK I  
 Instructor: Planell, Joan  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1389  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	105/1504	4.80	4.39	4.27	4.27	4.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	85/1503	4.85	4.57	4.20	4.22	4.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	2	10	4.62	400/1290	4.72	4.65	4.28	4.31	4.62
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	501/1453	4.65	4.45	4.21	4.23	4.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	429/1421	4.64	4.24	4.00	4.01	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1365	4.81	4.41	4.08	4.08	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	78/1485	4.79	4.63	4.16	4.17	4.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1504	4.96	4.51	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	274/1483	4.54	4.13	4.06	4.08	4.58
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	366/1425	4.84	4.65	4.41	4.43	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1426	4.94	4.80	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1418	4.92	4.52	4.25	4.26	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1416	4.89	4.61	4.26	4.27	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	1	0	3	0	4	3.75	820/1199	4.28	4.17	3.97	4.02	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	89/1312	4.88	4.45	4.00	4.09	4.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	157/1303	4.91	4.60	4.24	4.27	4.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	253/1299	4.80	4.76	4.25	4.30	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	0	5	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	169/ 758	4.35	4.02	4.01	4.00	4.56
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.80	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	4.79	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.29	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.52	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.44	4.47	****

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	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	3
84-150	0	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	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOWK 388 0101  
 Title HUMAN BEHAVIOR  
 Instructor: OKUNDAYE, JOSHU  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1390  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5							
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	5	16	4.57	469/1504	4.52	4.39	4.27	4.27	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	18	4.65	324/1503	4.62	4.57	4.20	4.22	4.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	18	4.74	270/1290	4.81	4.65	4.28	4.31	4.74
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	186/1453	4.66	4.45	4.21	4.23	4.76
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	16	4.61	247/1421	4.51	4.24	4.00	4.01	4.61
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	5	15	4.52	282/1365	4.58	4.41	4.08	4.08	4.52
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	0	1	20	4.77	180/1485	4.78	4.63	4.16	4.17	4.77
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	18	4	4.13	1360/1504	4.55	4.51	4.69	4.65	4.13
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	1	1	5	9	4.38	493/1483	4.38	4.13	4.06	4.08	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	402/1425	4.86	4.65	4.41	4.43	4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	714/1426	4.87	4.80	4.69	4.71	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	7	14	4.67	378/1418	4.79	4.52	4.25	4.26	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	3	16	4.67	446/1416	4.75	4.61	4.26	4.27	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	12	1	1	1	0	6	4.00	636/1199	4.21	4.17	3.97	4.02	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	6	1	13	4.35	512/1312	4.61	4.45	4.00	4.09	4.35
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	321/1303	4.81	4.60	4.24	4.27	4.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	303/1299	4.88	4.76	4.25	4.30	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	1	0	3	5	7	4.06	379/ 758	4.28	4.02	4.01	4.00	4.06
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	4.00	4.09	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	3.00	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.29	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	4.52	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	3.00	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

Course-Section: SOWK 388 0101  
 Title HUMAN BEHAVIOR  
 Instructor: OKUNDAYE, JOSHU  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1390  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	23	Non-major	10
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	1						

Course-Section: SOWK 388 0201  
 Title HUMAN BEHAVIOR  
 Instructor: Mays, Maria  
 Enrollment: 32  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1391  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	1	6	18	4.48	579/1504	4.52	4.39	4.27	4.27	4.48
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	3	20	4.59	391/1503	4.62	4.57	4.20	4.22	4.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	25	4.89	145/1290	4.81	4.65	4.28	4.31	4.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	19	4.56	385/1453	4.66	4.45	4.21	4.23	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	6	17	4.41	410/1421	4.51	4.24	4.00	4.01	4.41
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	20	4.63	211/1365	4.58	4.41	4.08	4.08	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	22	4.78	180/1485	4.78	4.63	4.16	4.17	4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	26	4.96	263/1504	4.55	4.51	4.69	4.65	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	1	9	8	4.39	481/1483	4.38	4.13	4.06	4.08	4.39
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	72/1425	4.86	4.65	4.41	4.43	4.96
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	24	4.92	401/1426	4.87	4.80	4.69	4.71	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	24	4.92	101/1418	4.79	4.52	4.25	4.26	4.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	0	23	4.84	209/1416	4.75	4.61	4.26	4.27	4.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	7	1	18	4.42	349/1199	4.21	4.17	3.97	4.02	4.42
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	0	21	4.86	132/1312	4.61	4.45	4.00	4.09	4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	2	20	4.83	278/1303	4.81	4.60	4.24	4.27	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	102/1299	4.88	4.76	4.25	4.30	4.96
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	1	1	1	2	17	4.50	185/ 758	4.28	4.02	4.01	4.00	4.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 244	****	4.00	4.09	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 227	****	3.00	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	4.25	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	27	Non-major	12
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						

I 0  
? 0

Other

18

Course-Section: SOWK 389 0101  
 Title HUMAN BEHAVIOR II  
 Instructor: OKUNDAYE, JOSHU  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1392  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	0	0	0	2	2	5	8	4.12	1038/1504	4.16	4.39	4.27	4.27	4.12
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	541/1503	4.42	4.57	4.20	4.22	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	671/1290	4.47	4.65	4.28	4.31	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	290/1453	4.48	4.45	4.21	4.23	4.65
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	3	10	4.35	459/1421	4.29	4.24	4.00	4.01	4.35
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	4	9	4.29	536/1365	4.31	4.41	4.08	4.08	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	139/1485	4.62	4.63	4.16	4.17	4.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	7	4.41	1164/1504	4.29	4.51	4.69	4.65	4.41
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	2	1	7	4.27	613/1483	4.09	4.13	4.06	4.08	4.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	0	3	11	4.38	930/1425	4.44	4.65	4.41	4.43	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	1081/1426	4.62	4.80	4.69	4.71	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	2	12	4.56	501/1418	4.51	4.52	4.25	4.26	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	1	12	4.41	740/1416	4.44	4.61	4.26	4.27	4.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	12	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1199	3.73	4.17	3.97	4.02	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	3	0	11	4.40	465/1312	4.26	4.45	4.00	4.09	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	546/1303	4.44	4.60	4.24	4.27	4.53
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	504/1299	4.63	4.76	4.25	4.30	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	2	6	0	2	1	1	5	4.00	387/ 758	3.90	4.02	4.01	4.00	4.00
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.14	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	17	Non-major	2
84-150	2	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	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOWK 389 0201  
 Title HUMAN BEHAVIOR II  
 Instructor: MOSES, JAMAAL  
 Enrollment: 29  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1393  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	1	0	0	0	2	11	10	4.35	775/1504	4.16	4.39	4.27	4.27	4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	3	17	4.61	380/1503	4.42	4.57	4.20	4.22	4.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	19	4.78	220/1290	4.47	4.65	4.28	4.31	4.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	7	14	4.52	418/1453	4.48	4.45	4.21	4.23	4.52
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	6	12	4.36	449/1421	4.29	4.24	4.00	4.01	4.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	6	12	4.36	462/1365	4.31	4.41	4.08	4.08	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	1	3	17	4.64	319/1485	4.62	4.63	4.16	4.17	4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	20	1	4.05	1400/1504	4.29	4.51	4.69	4.65	4.05
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	12	6	4.20	700/1483	4.09	4.13	4.06	4.08	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	6	15	4.64	618/1425	4.44	4.65	4.41	4.43	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	790/1426	4.62	4.80	4.69	4.71	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	354/1418	4.51	4.52	4.25	4.26	4.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	2	17	4.64	485/1416	4.44	4.61	4.26	4.27	4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	5	3	0	4	3	5	3.47	937/1199	3.73	4.17	3.97	4.02	3.47
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	1	7	10	4.32	549/1312	4.26	4.45	4.00	4.09	4.32
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	2	3	13	4.42	652/1303	4.44	4.60	4.24	4.27	4.42
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	323/1299	4.63	4.76	4.25	4.30	4.79
4. Were special techniques successful	5	11	1	0	3	0	4	3.75	508/ 758	3.90	4.02	4.01	4.00	3.75
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 244	****	4.00	4.09	4.20	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.80	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	4.79	4.23	4.13	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.52	4.29	4.14	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	3.75	4.53	4.74	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	3.00	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

Course-Section: SOWK 389 0201  
 Title HUMAN BEHAVIOR II  
 Instructor: MOSES, JAMAAL  
 Enrollment: 29  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1393  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	18	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	18
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	6
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	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	20				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOWK 389 8020  
 Title HUMAN BEHAVIOR II  
 Instructor: SKIBA, DAVID  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1394  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	0	0	1	1	4	4	9	4.00	1092/1504	4.16	4.39	4.27	4.27	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	5	9	4.17	937/1503	4.42	4.57	4.20	4.22	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	6	10	4.26	775/1290	4.47	4.65	4.28	4.31	4.26
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	3	10	4.28	752/1453	4.48	4.45	4.21	4.23	4.28
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	1	5	10	4.16	633/1421	4.29	4.24	4.00	4.01	4.16
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	0	6	10	4.28	558/1365	4.31	4.41	4.08	4.08	4.28
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	3	11	4.39	613/1485	4.62	4.63	4.16	4.17	4.39
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	8	4.42	1155/1504	4.29	4.51	4.69	4.65	4.42
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	4	6	4	3.80	1093/1483	4.09	4.13	4.06	4.08	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	0	6	9	4.29	1008/1425	4.44	4.65	4.41	4.43	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	3	2	12	4.53	1112/1426	4.62	4.80	4.69	4.71	4.53
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	1	4	11	4.28	828/1418	4.51	4.52	4.25	4.26	4.28
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	5	10	4.28	854/1416	4.44	4.61	4.26	4.27	4.28
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	1	4	3	9	4.00	636/1199	3.73	4.17	3.97	4.02	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	1	5	9	4.06	702/1312	4.26	4.45	4.00	4.09	4.06
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	2	0	5	10	4.35	719/1303	4.44	4.60	4.24	4.27	4.35
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	3	3	12	4.50	570/1299	4.63	4.76	4.25	4.30	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	2	4	5	7	3.94	437/ 758	3.90	4.02	4.01	4.00	3.94
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	4.00	4.09	4.20	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	4.80	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 56	****	4.79	4.23	4.13	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	3.75	4.53	4.74	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	3.00	4.60	4.63	****

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
					13

28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	0

General	0
Electives	0
Other	14

Under-grad	19	Non-major	6
------------	----	-----------	---

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: SOWK 390F 0101  
 Title PEER EDUCATORS PROJECT  
 Instructor: GRODACK, ANGELA  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1395  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.39	4.27	4.27	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.57	4.20	4.22	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	507/1290	4.50	4.65	4.28	4.31	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	440/1453	4.50	4.45	4.21	4.23	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	745/1421	4.00	4.24	4.00	4.01	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	297/1365	4.50	4.41	4.08	4.08	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	455/1485	4.50	4.63	4.16	4.17	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	891/1504	4.75	4.51	4.69	4.65	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1302/1483	3.33	4.13	4.06	4.08	3.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	420/1425	4.75	4.65	4.41	4.43	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.80	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	261/1418	4.75	4.52	4.25	4.26	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.61	4.26	4.27	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1199	5.00	4.17	3.97	4.02	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1312	5.00	4.45	4.00	4.09	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.60	4.24	4.27	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.76	4.25	4.30	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	273/ 758	4.33	4.02	4.01	4.00	4.33

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	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	4	Non-major	3
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOWK 390K 0101  
 Title SOWK PRAC RELAT PHYS I  
 Instructor: HARRIS, JESSE  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1396  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	1	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	788/1504	3.39	4.39	4.27	4.27	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	795/1503	3.71	4.57	4.20	4.22	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	6	4.20	832/1290	4.23	4.65	4.28	4.31	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	4	1	4	4.00	1001/1453	3.72	4.45	4.21	4.23	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	3	4	3.80	943/1421	3.32	4.24	4.00	4.01	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	915/1365	3.78	4.41	4.08	4.08	3.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	795/1485	3.67	4.63	4.16	4.17	4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	1	6	2	3.90	1454/1504	4.45	4.51	4.69	4.65	3.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1379/1483	2.89	4.13	4.06	4.08	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	0	7	4.30	1002/1425	4.15	4.65	4.41	4.43	4.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	790/1426	4.39	4.80	4.69	4.71	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	877/1418	3.89	4.52	4.25	4.26	4.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	0	0	6	4.00	1029/1416	3.39	4.61	4.26	4.27	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	2	0	0	2	3.50	919/1199	3.42	4.17	3.97	4.02	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	612/1312	3.94	4.45	4.00	4.09	4.22
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	4	0	5	4.11	881/1303	4.28	4.60	4.24	4.27	4.11
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	3	0	6	4.33	741/1299	4.48	4.76	4.25	4.30	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	2	0	2	1	2	3.14	667/ 758	3.13	4.02	4.01	4.00	3.14
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 244	****	4.00	4.09	4.20	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.84	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	10
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Major 7
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	4
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1	Other	5

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: SOWK 390K 8020  
 Title SOWK PRAC RELAT PHYS I  
 Instructor: KIRKLAND  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1397  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	0	0	2	3	2	2	0	2.44	1495/1504	3.39	4.39	4.27	4.27	2.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	3	0	3.11	1405/1503	3.71	4.57	4.20	4.22	3.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	783/1290	4.23	4.65	4.28	4.31	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	3	1	3.44	1312/1453	3.72	4.45	4.21	4.23	3.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	1	3	0	1	2.83	1353/1421	3.32	4.24	4.00	4.01	2.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	3	3	3.67	1065/1365	3.78	4.41	4.08	4.08	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	3	3	1	3.11	1376/1485	3.67	4.63	4.16	4.17	3.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1504	4.45	4.51	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	1	6	1	0	2.78	1420/1483	2.89	4.13	4.06	4.08	2.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	0	3	4	4.00	1165/1425	4.15	4.65	4.41	4.43	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	1319/1426	4.39	4.80	4.69	4.71	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	4	1	3.56	1237/1418	3.89	4.52	4.25	4.26	3.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	2	2	1	2.78	1352/1416	3.39	4.61	4.26	4.27	2.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	2	0	1	5	1	3.33	987/1199	3.42	4.17	3.97	4.02	3.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	3	2	3.67	947/1312	3.94	4.45	4.00	4.09	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	630/1303	4.28	4.60	4.24	4.27	4.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	484/1299	4.48	4.76	4.25	4.30	4.63
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	1	2	2	1	2	3.13	670/ 758	3.13	4.02	4.01	4.00	3.13

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	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	9	Non-major	1
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	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOWK 397 0201  
 Title SOCIAL WORK METHODS I  
 Instructor: CLEMENTS, JENNI  
 Enrollment: 33  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1398  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	7	21	4.75	262/1504	4.61	4.39	4.27	4.27	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	26	4.93	85/1503	4.78	4.57	4.20	4.22	4.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	20	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1290	4.92	4.65	4.28	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	24	4.86	129/1453	4.72	4.45	4.21	4.23	4.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	5	21	4.70	189/1421	4.36	4.24	4.00	4.01	4.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	22	4.81	114/1365	4.75	4.41	4.08	4.08	4.81
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	1	25	4.96	39/1485	4.75	4.63	4.16	4.17	4.96
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	18	8	4.31	1242/1504	4.65	4.51	4.69	4.65	4.31
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	131/1483	4.43	4.13	4.06	4.08	4.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	25	4.89	194/1425	4.74	4.65	4.41	4.43	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/1426	4.91	4.80	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	25	4.93	101/1418	4.69	4.52	4.25	4.26	4.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	26	4.93	113/1416	4.74	4.61	4.26	4.27	4.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	23	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/1199	4.08	4.17	3.97	4.02	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	2	23	4.70	228/1312	4.69	4.45	4.00	4.09	4.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	0	2	24	4.78	333/1303	4.75	4.60	4.24	4.27	4.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	0	2	23	4.77	344/1299	4.75	4.76	4.25	4.30	4.77
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	1	0	1	7	17	4.50	185/ 758	4.30	4.02	4.01	4.00	4.50
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.44	4.47	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	21	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	25
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	28	Non-major	3
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	7	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 397 0301  
 Title SOCIAL WORK METHODS I  
 Instructor: KNIGHT, CAROLYN  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1399  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	0	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	522/1504	4.61	4.39	4.27	4.27	4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	268/1503	4.78	4.57	4.20	4.22	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1290	4.92	4.65	4.28	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	374/1453	4.72	4.45	4.21	4.23	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	8	4	5	3.82	927/1421	4.36	4.24	4.00	4.01	3.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	237/1365	4.75	4.41	4.08	4.08	4.59
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	270/1485	4.75	4.63	4.16	4.17	4.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	999/1504	4.65	4.51	4.69	4.65	4.65
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	3	6	3	3.85	1051/1483	4.43	4.13	4.06	4.08	3.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	603/1425	4.74	4.65	4.41	4.43	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	549/1426	4.91	4.80	4.69	4.71	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	6	8	4.29	808/1418	4.69	4.52	4.25	4.26	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	603/1416	4.74	4.61	4.26	4.27	4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	13	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	****/1199	4.08	4.17	3.97	4.02	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	5	11	4.53	350/1312	4.69	4.45	4.00	4.09	4.53
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	0	2	14	4.71	413/1303	4.75	4.60	4.24	4.27	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	0	3	13	4.65	464/1299	4.75	4.76	4.25	4.30	4.65
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	1	5	6	2	3.64	542/ 758	4.30	4.02	4.01	4.00	3.64

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	5
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	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	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOWK 397 8020  
 Title SOCIAL WORK METHODS I  
 Instructor: MORRIS, KATHERI  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1400  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	4	8	4.54	509/1504	4.61	4.39	4.27	4.27	4.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	279/1503	4.78	4.57	4.20	4.22	4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	180/1290	4.92	4.65	4.28	4.31	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	194/1453	4.72	4.45	4.21	4.23	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	10	4.54	298/1421	4.36	4.24	4.00	4.01	4.54
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	102/1365	4.75	4.41	4.08	4.08	4.85
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	0	11	4.62	339/1485	4.75	4.63	4.16	4.17	4.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1504	4.65	4.51	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	211/1483	4.43	4.13	4.06	4.08	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	525/1425	4.74	4.65	4.41	4.43	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	643/1426	4.91	4.80	4.69	4.71	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	165/1418	4.69	4.52	4.25	4.26	4.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	310/1416	4.74	4.61	4.26	4.27	4.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	3	3	6	4.08	610/1199	4.08	4.17	3.97	4.02	4.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	142/1312	4.69	4.45	4.00	4.09	4.85
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	344/1303	4.75	4.60	4.24	4.27	4.77
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	263/1299	4.75	4.76	4.25	4.30	4.85
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	101/ 758	4.30	4.02	4.01	4.00	4.75
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 244	****	4.00	4.09	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	3.00	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.80	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	4.79	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.29	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	4.52	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	3.75	4.53	4.74	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****

3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	36	****	3.00	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

Course-Section: SOWK 397 8020  
 Title SOCIAL WORK METHODS I  
 Instructor: MORRIS, KATHERI  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1400  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	4
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						

Course-Section: SOWK 483 0101  
 Title SOCIAL WORK MEHTODS II  
 Instructor: KNIGHT, CAROLYN  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1401  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1504	4.72	4.39	4.27	4.33	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1503	4.80	4.57	4.20	4.18	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1290	4.94	4.65	4.28	4.32	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	112/1453	4.78	4.45	4.21	4.22	4.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	3	9	4.06	712/1421	4.02	4.24	4.00	4.02	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	60/1365	4.79	4.41	4.08	4.09	4.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	144/1485	4.83	4.63	4.16	4.14	4.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1504	4.99	4.51	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	105/1483	4.59	4.13	4.06	4.11	4.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	209/1425	4.81	4.65	4.41	4.38	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1426	4.95	4.80	4.69	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1418	4.85	4.52	4.25	4.25	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1416	4.75	4.61	4.26	4.26	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	13	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1199	4.80	4.17	3.97	4.05	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	0	15	4.59	310/1312	4.68	4.45	4.00	4.07	4.59
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	0	2	13	4.63	488/1303	4.74	4.60	4.24	4.34	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1299	4.95	4.76	4.25	4.38	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	79/ 758	4.45	4.02	4.01	4.17	4.82
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	4.00	4.09	3.56	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	4.29	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	28/ 58	4.80	4.80	4.43	4.83	4.86
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	27/ 56	4.79	4.79	4.23	4.37	4.57
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	37/ 44	4.29	4.29	4.65	4.33	4.29
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	19/ 47	4.52	4.52	4.29	4.12	4.71
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	1	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	22/ 39	4.50	4.50	4.44	4.19	4.50
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	3.75	4.53	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	3.00	4.60	4.83	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.24	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.51	****	****

Course-Section: SOWK 483 0101  
 Title SOCIAL WORK MEHTODS II  
 Instructor: KNIGHT, CAROLYN  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1401  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	17
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	0
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	8	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 MEHTODS II  
 Instructor: BEMBRY, JAMES  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1402  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies						Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1504	4.72	4.39	4.27	4.33	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1503	4.80	4.57	4.20	4.18	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	180/1290	4.94	4.65	4.28	4.32	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	140/1453	4.78	4.45	4.21	4.22	4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	4	1	6	4.18	605/1421	4.02	4.24	4.00	4.02	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	77/1365	4.79	4.41	4.08	4.09	4.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	134/1485	4.83	4.63	4.16	4.14	4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1504	4.99	4.51	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	242/1483	4.59	4.13	4.06	4.11	4.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	179/1425	4.81	4.65	4.41	4.38	4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1426	4.95	4.80	4.69	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1418	4.85	4.52	4.25	4.25	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1416	4.75	4.61	4.26	4.26	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1199	4.80	4.17	3.97	4.05	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	100/1312	4.68	4.45	4.00	4.07	4.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	268/1303	4.74	4.60	4.24	4.34	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1299	4.95	4.76	4.25	4.38	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	1	0	1	1	7	4.30	286/ 758	4.45	4.02	4.01	4.17	4.30
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	4.00	4.09	3.56	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	3.81	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.63	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	34/ 58	4.80	4.80	4.43	4.83	4.75
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 56	4.79	4.79	4.23	4.37	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	4.29	4.29	4.65	4.33	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	27/ 47	4.52	4.52	4.29	4.12	4.33
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	4.50	4.50	4.44	4.19	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	3.75	4.53	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	3.00	4.60	4.83	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.24	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.51	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	1
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOWK 483 0301  
 Title SOCIAL WORK MEHTODS II  
 Instructor: KAPLAN, KENNETH  
 Enrollment: 28  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1403  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	0	0	0	3	6	8	9	3.88	1204/1504	4.72	4.39	4.27	4.33	3.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	7	13	4.27	837/1503	4.80	4.57	4.20	4.18	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	22	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1290	4.94	4.65	4.28	4.32	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	6	16	4.38	618/1453	4.78	4.45	4.21	4.22	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	4	3	5	4	8	3.38	1189/1421	4.02	4.24	4.00	4.02	3.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	1	10	13	4.36	462/1365	4.79	4.41	4.08	4.09	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	20	4.73	220/1485	4.83	4.63	4.16	4.14	4.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	25	4.96	263/1504	4.99	4.51	4.69	4.73	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	7	8	6	3.95	919/1483	4.59	4.13	4.06	4.11	3.95
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	1	7	15	4.46	842/1425	4.81	4.65	4.41	4.38	4.46
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	3	20	4.79	755/1426	4.95	4.80	4.69	4.72	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	5	5	15	4.40	709/1418	4.85	4.52	4.25	4.25	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	4	4	13	4.00	1029/1416	4.75	4.61	4.26	4.26	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	20	0	2	2	0	2	3.33	****/1199	4.80	4.17	3.97	4.05	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	3	3	16	4.20	632/1312	4.68	4.45	4.00	4.07	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	2	2	2	19	4.52	551/1303	4.74	4.60	4.24	4.34	4.52
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	3	21	4.80	303/1299	4.95	4.76	4.25	4.38	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	3	1	1	7	9	3.86	483/ 758	4.45	4.02	4.01	4.17	3.86
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	4.80	4.80	4.43	4.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	4.79	4.79	4.23	4.37	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	4.29	4.29	4.65	4.33	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	4.52	4.52	4.29	4.12	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	4.50	4.50	4.44	4.19	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 19	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 4	C 0	General	0
84-150	15	3.00-3.49 5	D 0	Under-grad	26
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 11	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other	24
			? 0		

Course-Section: SOWK 483 8020  
 Title SOCIAL WORK MEHTODS II  
 Instructor: MCFEATERS, SUSAN  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1404  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies						Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1504	4.72	4.39	4.27	4.33	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	74/1503	4.80	4.57	4.20	4.18	4.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1290	4.94	4.65	4.28	4.32	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1453	4.78	4.45	4.21	4.22	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	2	11	4.47	356/1421	4.02	4.24	4.00	4.02	4.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	60/1365	4.79	4.41	4.08	4.09	4.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	68/1485	4.83	4.63	4.16	4.14	4.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1504	4.99	4.51	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	67/1483	4.59	4.13	4.06	4.11	4.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1425	4.81	4.65	4.41	4.38	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1426	4.95	4.80	4.69	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1418	4.85	4.52	4.25	4.25	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1416	4.75	4.61	4.26	4.26	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	105/1199	4.80	4.17	3.97	4.05	4.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1312	4.68	4.45	4.00	4.07	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1303	4.74	4.60	4.24	4.34	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1299	4.95	4.76	4.25	4.38	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	84/ 758	4.45	4.02	4.01	4.17	4.80
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	4.29	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	4.80	4.80	4.43	4.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	4.79	4.79	4.23	4.37	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	4.29	4.29	4.65	4.33	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	4.52	4.52	4.29	4.12	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	4.50	4.50	4.44	4.19	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 13	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 16	Non-major 3
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	2	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 13		

