

Rutgers University
Fall 2017 Student Instructional Rating Surveys

Course: 09: 910: 220: 93INTROTOSOCWRK&SER: 2017FA -INTRO TO SOC WRK&SER YR 09: 910: 220: 93

Instructor: F Greenagel *

1 - The instructor was prepared for class and presented the material in an organized manner.											
F Greenagel											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses				Means			
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0%					4.45		4.46	
Disagree	(2)	0	0%					Instructor		Department	
Neutral	(3)	1	9.09%								
Agree	(4)	4	36.36%								
Strongly Agree	(5)	6	54.55%								
N/A	(0)	0	0%								
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Department	Mean	STD	Median				
11/17 (64.71%)	4.45	0.69	5.00	349	4.46	0.94	5.00				

2 - The instructor generated interest in the course material.											
F Greenagel											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses				Means			
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0%					4.45		4.43	
Disagree	(2)	0	0%					Instructor		Department	
Neutral	(3)	1	9.09%								
Agree	(4)	4	36.36%								
Strongly Agree	(5)	6	54.55%								
N/A	(0)	0	0%								
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Department	Mean	STD	Median				
11/17 (64.71%)	4.45	0.69	5.00	348	4.43	0.95	5.00				

3 - The instructor responded effectively to student comments and questions.											
F Greenagel											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses				Means			
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0%					4.36		4.34	
Disagree	(2)	0	0%					Instructor		Department	
Neutral	(3)	2	18.18%								
Agree	(4)	3	27.27%								
Strongly Agree	(5)	6	54.55%								
N/A	(0)	0	0%								
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Department	Mean	STD	Median				
11/17 (64.71%)	4.36	0.81	5.00	345	4.34	1.09	5.00				

Rutgers University
Fall 2017 Student Instructional Rating Surveys

Course: 09: 910: 220: 93INTROTOSOCWRK&SER: 2017FA -INTRO TO SOC WRK&SER YR 09: 910: 220: 93

Instructor: F Greenagel *

4 - The instructor had a positive attitude toward assisting all students in understanding course material.											
F Greenagel											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses				Means			
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0%								
Disagree	(2)	0	0%								
Neutral	(3)	2	18.18%								
Agree	(4)	3	27.27%								
Strongly Agree	(5)	6	54.55%								
N/A	(0)	0	0%								
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Department	Mean	STD	Median				
11/17 (64.71%)	4.36	0.81	5.00	348	4.53	0.93	5.00				

5 - The instructor assigned grades fairly.											
F Greenagel											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses				Means			
Strongly Disagree	(1)	1	9.09%								
Disagree	(2)	0	0%								
Neutral	(3)	0	0%								
Agree	(4)	5	45.45%								
Strongly Agree	(5)	5	45.45%								
N/A	(0)	0	0%								
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Department	Mean	STD	Median				
11/17 (64.71%)	4.18	1.17	4.00	348	4.44	0.98	5.00				

6 - The instructional methods encouraged student learning.											
F Greenagel											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses				Means			
Strongly Disagree	(1)	1	9.09%								
Disagree	(2)	0	0%								
Neutral	(3)	1	9.09%								
Agree	(4)	4	36.36%								
Strongly Agree	(5)	5	45.45%								
N/A	(0)	0	0%								
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Department	Mean	STD	Median				
11/17 (64.71%)	4.09	1.22	4.00	349	4.28	1.08	5.00				

7 - I learned a great deal in this course.											
F Greenagel											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses				Means			
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0%								
Disagree	(2)	0	0%								
Neutral	(3)	1	10%								
Agree	(4)	3	30%								
Strongly Agree	(5)	6	60%								
N/A	(0)	0	0%								
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Department	Mean	STD	Median				
10/17 (58.82%)	4.50	0.71	5.00	310	4.31	1.04	5.00				

Rutgers University
Fall 2017 Student Instructional Rating Surveys

Course: 09: 910: 220: 93INTROTOSOCWRK&SER: 2017FA -INTRO TO SOC WRK&SER YR 09: 910: 220: 93
Instructor: F Greenagel *

8 - I had a strong prior interest in the subject matter and wanted to take this course.

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses			Means						
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0%										
Disagree	(2)	0	0%										
Neutral	(3)	1	9.09%										
Agree	(4)	6	54.55%										
Strongly Agree	(5)	4	36.36%										
N/A	(0)	0	0%										
				0	25	50	75	100	Instructor	Department			
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Department	Mean	STD	Median						
11/17 (64.71%)	4.27	0.65	4.00	310	4.04	1.03	4.00						

9 - I rate the teaching effectiveness of the instructor as:

F Greenagel

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses			Means						
1 = Poor	(1)	0	0%										
2	(2)	0	0%										
3	(3)	3	30%										
4	(4)	2	20%										
5 = Excellent	(5)	5	50%										
N/A	(0)	0	0%										
				0	25	50	75	100	Instructor	Department			
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Department	Mean	STD	Median						
10/17 (58.82%)	4.20	0.92	4.50	346	4.45	0.88	5.00						

10 - I rate the overall quality of the course as:

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses			Means						
1 = Poor	(1)	1	9.09%										
2	(2)	0	0%										
3	(3)	2	18.18%										
4	(4)	4	36.36%										
5 = Excellent	(5)	4	36.36%										
N/A	(0)	0	0%										
				0	25	50	75	100	Instructor	Department			
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Department	Mean	STD	Median						
11/17 (64.71%)	3.91	1.22	4.00	308	4.36	0.94	5.00						

11 - What do you like best about this course?

- The textbook is really good.
- Can do it on my own time.
- I like that it makes us think about social work in a broad range of ways.
- It is online, so very convenient for people who work. Even though it is an introductory course it comprehend a great variety of topics in the field. The interaction with Pearson material makes you feel the different topics much more real.
- The topics were very interesting in what social workers do
- Honestly, this course started off great because we had to get an internship/volunteering experience. However taking this course was a pretty negative experience because of the final online exam which is very difficult.

Rutgers University

Fall 2017 Student Instructional Rating Surveys

Course: 09: 910: 220: 93INTROTOSOCWRK&SER: 2017FA -INTRO TO SOC WRK&SER YR 09: 910: 220: 93

Instructor: F Greenagel *

12 - If you were teaching this course, what would you do differently?

- I'm not sure
- No required internship... it is much too stressful for a 3 credit intro class and 40 hours is not enough to get anything out of an internship. I had to go all the way to Elizabeth 6 times and spend over \$30 each time. The videos did enough.
- N/A
- I will like to offer events to get extra credits during the weekends or late in the afternoon. I understand this is difficult but my schedule is a little complicated.
- N/A
- The final exam is impossible. The questions have barely anything to do with the textbook. They practice quizzes are not helpful in preparing for the final exam. The discussion questions have nothing to do with anything that was presented in the final exam. Overall awful exam, the discussion questions seemed pointless, overly simplistic. There should be a curve for this class because of how poorly the final exam is designed.

13 - In what ways, if any, has this course or the instructor encouraged your intellectual growth and progress?

- Makes us think of our own solutions to problems.
- I know that I do not want to major in social work.
- The discussion videos made me see things in a different light.
- Basically by the discussion assignments because it is not just read and understand the content, it is also retrieve and accommodate the information to answer the weekly questions.
- N/A

14 - Other comments or suggestions:

- I hate that this class is online. I would much prefer that I actually saw my professor, that way I could learn more.
- I just want to finish this semester.
- N/A
- Need to change the final exam.