Course: 09: 910: 475: 02: Integration Seminar

Instructor: F Greenagel \*

F Greenagel													
Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent		Perce	nt Re	esponses			Means	
Strongly Disagree			(1)	0	0%						4.91	4.34	
Disagree			(2)	0	0%								
Neutral			(3)	0	0%								
Agree			(4)	1	9.09%								
Strongly Agree			(5)	10	90.91%								
N/A			(0)	0	0%								
						0	25	50	75	100	Instructor	Department	
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Depart	ment	Mean	ST	D	Median				
11/34 (32.35%)	4.91	0.30	5.00	20	8	4.34	1.0	9	5.00				

2 - The instructor ge	nerated inter	est in the	course m	aterial.								
F Greenagel												
Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent		Percent F	Responses			Means	
Strongly Disagree			(1)	0	0%					4.90	4.33	
Disagree			(2)	0	0%							
Neutral			(3)	0	0%							
Agree			(4)	1	10%							
Strongly Agree			(5)	9	90%							
N/A			(0)	0	0%							
						0	25 50	) 75	100	Instructor	Department	
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Depart	ment	Mean	STD	Median				
10/34 (29.41%)	4.90	0.32	5.00	20	7	4.33	1.11	5.00				

3 - The instructor res	ponded effe	ctively to	student c	omments and	questions								
F Greenagel													
Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent		Per	cent R	esponses			Means	
Strongly Disagree			(1)	0	0%						4.91	4.26	
Disagree			(2)	0	0%								
Neutral			(3)	0	0%								
Agree			(4)	1	9.09%								
Strongly Agree			(5)	10	90.91%								
N/A			(0)	0	0%								
			•			0	25	50	75	100	Instructor	Department	
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Depart	ment	Mean		STD	Median				
11/34 (32.35%)	4.91	0.30	5.00	20	7	4.26		1.23	5.00				

Course: 09: 910: 475: 02: Integration Seminar

Instructor: F Greenagel \*

F Greenagel													
Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent		Percent F	Responses		Means			
Strongly Disagree			(1)	0	0%					4.91	4.43		
Disagree			(2)	0	0%								
Neutral			(3)	0	0%								
Agree			(4)	1	9.09%								
Strongly Agree			(5)	10	90.91%								
N/A			(0)	0	0%								
						0	25 5	) 75	100	Instructor	Department		
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Depart	ment	Mean	STD	Median					
11/34 (32.35%)	4.91	0.30	5.00	20	7	4.43	1.11	5.00					

## 5 - The instructor assigned grades fairly.

F Greenagel														
Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent		Percent R	esponses		Means				
Strongly Disagree			(1)	0	0%					4.64	4.43			
Disagree			(2)	1	9.09%									
Neutral			(3)	0	0%									
Agree			(4)	1	9.09%									
Strongly Agree			(5)	9	81.82%				l .					
N/A			(0)	0	0%									
						0	25 50	75	100	Instructor	Department			
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Depart	ment	Mean	STD	Median						
11/34 (32.35%)	4.64	0.92	5.00	20	8	4.43	0.91	5.00						

6 - The instructional i	methods end	couraged	student le	arning.									
F Greenagel													
Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent		Ре	rcent R	esponses			Means	
Strongly Disagree			(1)	0	0%						4.91	4.22	
Disagree			(2)	0	0%								
Neutral			(3)	0	0%								
Agree			(4)	1	9.09%								
Strongly Agree			(5)	10	90.91%								
N/A			(0)	0	0%								
						0	25	50	75	100	Instructor	Department	
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Depart	ment	Mean		STD	Median				
11/34 (32.35%)	4.91	0.30	5.00	20	7	4.22		1.13	5.00				

## 7 - I learned a great deal in this course.

-												
Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent		Percent R	lesponses			Means	
Strongly Disagree			(1)	0	0%					4.55	4.13	
Disagree			(2)	1	9.09%						4.15	
Neutral			(3)	0	0%							
Agree			(4)	2	18.18%							
Strongly Agree			(5)	8	72.73%							
N/A			(0)	0	0%							
						0	25 50	75	100	Instructor	Department	
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Depart	tment	Mean	STD	Median				
11/34 (32.35%)	4.55	0.93	5.00	20	8	4.13	1.15	5.00				

**Course:** 09: 910: 4

09: 910: 475: 02: Integration Seminar

Instructor: F Greenagel \*

8 - I had a strong prio	r interest in	the subje	ect matter	and wanted t	o take this	course.							
Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent		P	ercent R	esponses			Means	
Strongly Disagree			(1)	0	0%						4.10		
Disagree			(2)	1	9.09%						4.10	3.78	
Neutral			(3)	2	18.18%								
Agree			(4)	2	18.18%								
Strongly Agree			(5)	5	45.45%								
N/A			(0)	1	9.09%								
						0	25	50	75	100	Instructor	Department	
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Depart	ment	Mean		STD	Median				
11/34 (32.35%)	4.10	1.10	4.50	20	8	3.78		1.17	4.00				

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

F Greenagel												
Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent		Percent F	Responses			Means	
1 = Poor			(1)	0	0%					4.91	4.34	
2			(2)	0	0%							
3			(3)	0	0%	1						
4			(4)	1	9.09%							
5 = Excellent			(5)	10	90.91%							
N/A			(0)	0	0%							
						0	25 50	) 75	100	Instructor	Department	
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Depart	ment	Mean	STD	Median				
11/34 (32.35%)	4.91	0.30	5.00	20	9	4.34	1.10	5.00				

#### 10 - I rate the overall quality of the course as: **Response Option** Weight Frequency Percent Percent Responses Means 1 = Poor (1) 0 0% 4.91 4.18 2 0 0% (2) 3 (3) 0 0% 9.09% 4 (4) 1 10 90.91% 5 = Excellent (5) N/A (0) 0 0% 0 25 50 75 100 Instructor Department Return Rate Mean STD Median Department Mean STD Median 11/34 (32.35%) 4.91 0.30 5.00 208 4.18 1.11 5.00

## 11 - What do you like best about this course?

• The professor taught very interesting material that related to the field. Highly recommend the professor again!

• The instructor created their own syllabus and cirriculum. The instructor taught tangible skills that will be used in everyday life as a social work professional The instructor made special effort to marry the interests of macro and micro social workers

• I like that the professor was passionate, energetic, and knowledgeable. He generated lots of interest in the subjects and it was very refreshing to actually, for once, have a challenging professor in the social work program. My experience with the entire program has been so disappointing, but I'm glad I got to end it on a good note with professor GreenageI. The school of social work needs more professors like this! I actually enjoyed getting grades back, as not everyone was handed an 'A', as is the case in every other social work class. He was also very likable, humorous, and connected well with the students.

Professor Greenagel's teaching style, very very unique. You cannot be bored in this class.

· He taught us things we could use and forced us to be better writers.

The information was really helpful for students transitioning into the workforce.

• The instructor prepared us for our future by informing us about supervision and tests that we will need to take along our journey. Best course I have taken at RU!

• This was the best class I ever took in my college career.

Course: 09: 910: 475: 02: Integration Seminar

Instructor:

F Greenagel \*

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

Nothing

• Get rid of TA and provide more critiques of papers. Remove second reflection paper assignment.

• The course was taught perfectly! I wish the course was longer and that this professor was able to teach other courses within the program! The only thing I would have liked is if he were able to grade all of our assignments because I feel like getting an 'A' from him would have made me feel more like I earned it.

• maybe less work....I understand this is college, but too many readings, journals, book reviews, letter to the editor, presentations etc, its stressful because I am not just taking this course. I couldnt really keep up with all the readings and assignments. One thing I didnt like was the way you graded us on our midterm. That was unfair in my opinion, at least give credit for having half or almost the whole answer. Other than that, you were great!

Add more time to talk about Icsw process rather than Rostock subjects

• I would make the presentations 3-4 minutes. There were WAY too many people and took up more time than ideal.

Absolutely nothing...Professor Greenagel is the best professor I had at Rutgers.

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

Taught great information, the professor was knowledgable about information that directly applies to the field. He made it interesting and was very informative.

• This course was THE ONLY course at Rutgers School of Social Work that challeneged me, not because of the cirriculum but because of the instructor. I- someone who refused to believe that micro work could be my passion- have developed a deep interest in micro work and have changed the concentration of my graduate studies due to the tangible clinical skills this professor taught. I learned various ways of building rapport with my clients- through office decorations, and fine tuning personal interests as well as the importance of seeking help for myself when needed as well as the importance of a supervisor. I learned ways to guage how good a supervisor or potential place of employement is at teaching new social workers. I have increased my writing ability and have learned more about drug abuse and the criminal justice system than I have in any other classes. The journals were not only useful in self-exploration but also in answering questions that will be asked in job interviews. From this class alone, i feel more prepared to enter the workforce than ever before. EVERY CLASS NEEDS TO PROVIDE THIS FEELING FOR ITS STUDENTS. This instructor MUST BE the lead instructor for this course.

• Unfortunately the entire social work program at Rutgers has discouraged me to get my master's degree and pursue work in the social work field, as I feel I have learned nothing and had a terrible overall experience. Professor Greenagel's class has been my only positive experience here at Rutgers and I was able to learn more general work-related things to help me when I apply for jobs. He was also able to give great advice to his class about life, which I will take with me.

• Success is measurable. Professor greenagel can measure his successes in numerous ways, that is what makes him an incredible professor

In every way. I love the course and I learned so much. More than any other class

· He inspired us to strive to be better students, professionals, and well rounded people.

• The instructor genuinely enjoyed his time with us. I could see by day 1 that teaching is his passion. The courses in the SW program needs some serious saving and Greenagel did his best at teaching us the most he could in one semester. I believe every student should take a class as Greenagel's.

### 14 - Other comments or suggestions:

• N/A

• EVERY social work class needs to be run as this one; challenege the students more. Pushing students to do more allows them to find themselves and learn their place in the world. The whole SSW must adopt this ideology is they wish to create the best social workers in the world.

• Professor Greenagel should have a higher position within the school of social work. He needs to work with others to help improve this program before it gets any worse. It's been such a waste of time and money and I feel like this professor gets it and has been real with us about this from day one. He should be involved in updating the curriculum and the hiring process of other professors who give this program a bad name. At the very least, he deserves a raise! Thank you for an unforgettable semester!

• Professor Greenagel, you have a unique teaching style. You are extremely funny. You are really the best professor from the School of Social Work!

· Use his syllabus . It's a lot of work, but I feel more prepared as a social worker and what to do in the dield

· He was a great professor. He introduces books that made an impact and will influence the work I do in the future.

• Thank you Professor Greenagel for teaching me all I know. I hope that you can teach in the masters level.