

Course-Section: ECAD 210 0501
 Title PRACTICE OF MANAGEMENT
 Instructor: ARMOR, VIVIAN
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 513
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	4	12	20	4.44	703/1674	4.07	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	13	22	4.58	483/1674	4.23	4.26	4.23	4.26	4.58	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	29	4.72	298/1423	4.33	4.36	4.27	4.36	4.72	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	3	12	19	4.47	536/1609	3.95	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.47	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	3	8	21	4.31	502/1585	4.13	4.04	3.96	3.91	4.31	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	9	13	12	4.03	861/1535	3.81	4.08	4.08	4.03	4.03	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	5	28	4.74	242/1651	4.06	4.20	4.18	4.20	4.74	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	34	5.00	1/1673	4.63	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	1	8	21	4.67	257/1656	4.08	4.06	4.07	4.10	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	31	4.91	192/1586	4.39	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.91	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	34	5.00	1/1585	4.53	4.72	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	5	27	4.74	339/1582	4.28	4.30	4.26	4.35	4.74	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	6	27	4.76	343/1575	4.14	4.32	4.27	4.39	4.76	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	12	1	3	8	5	5	3.45	1065/1380	3.26	3.94	3.94	4.03	3.45	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	6	7	13	4.19	709/1520	3.77	4.14	4.01	4.03	4.19	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	3	7	17	4.52	620/1515	4.29	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.52	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	11	15	4.52	634/1511	4.31	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.52	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	4	1	2	5	9	6	3.74	647/ 994	3.85	3.97	3.94	3.98	3.74	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	32	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.34	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	35	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.42	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.48	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	35	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.07	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.45	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	35	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.63	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	3.97	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	4.20	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.50	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	35	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	35	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.82	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	4.23	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	35	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	4.53	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	4.42	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	35	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	4.63	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	35	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	4.50	****	

Course-Section: ECAD 210 0501
 Title PRACTICE OF MANAGEMENT
 Instructor: ARMOR, VIVIAN
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 513
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	14	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	6	General	8	Under-grad	36	Non-major	2
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	12	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	23				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECAD 210 0601
 Title PRACTICE OF MANAGEMENT
 Instructor: ARMOR, VIVIAN
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 514
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	6	24	4.74	309/1674	4.07	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.74	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	8	23	4.74	281/1674	4.23	4.26	4.23	4.26	4.74	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	7	23	4.71	322/1423	4.33	4.36	4.27	4.36	4.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	13	18	4.58	397/1609	3.95	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.58	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	1	9	18	4.35	462/1585	4.13	4.04	3.96	3.91	4.35	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	11	16	4.35	558/1535	3.81	4.08	4.08	4.03	4.35	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	9	21	4.65	351/1651	4.06	4.20	4.18	4.20	4.65	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	1	0	0	1	28	4.83	832/1673	4.63	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	6	20	4.70	222/1656	4.08	4.06	4.07	4.10	4.70	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	26	4.84	336/1586	4.39	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.84	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	30	4.97	227/1585	4.53	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.97	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	8	23	4.74	326/1582	4.28	4.30	4.26	4.35	4.74	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	6	25	4.81	279/1575	4.14	4.32	4.27	4.39	4.81	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	8	3	3	6	1	9	3.45	1065/1380	3.26	3.94	3.94	4.03	3.45	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	4	9	13	4.22	673/1520	3.77	4.14	4.01	4.03	4.22	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	2	5	19	4.52	620/1515	4.29	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.52	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	0	10	16	4.52	634/1511	4.31	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.52	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	2	2	2	6	11	3.96	521/ 994	3.85	3.97	3.94	3.98	3.96	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	4.23	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	4.53	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	4.42	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A 14	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 12			
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	9	C 4	General 5	Under-grad 32	Non-major 3
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 20		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ECAD 210 0701
 Title PRACTICE OF MANAGEMENT
 Instructor: SKLAMM, STEWART
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 515
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	5	6	13	4.24	979/1674	4.07	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.24	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	20	4.68	365/1674	4.23	4.26	4.23	4.26	4.68	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	1	22	4.72	310/1423	4.33	4.36	4.27	4.36	4.72	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	2	4	5	12	4.17	952/1609	3.95	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	3	4	14	4.17	642/1585	4.13	4.04	3.96	3.91	4.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	8	3	12	3.96	930/1535	3.81	4.08	4.08	4.03	3.96	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	4	19	4.64	351/1651	4.06	4.20	4.18	4.20	4.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	1	23	4.88	742/1673	4.63	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	2	7	9	4.26	706/1656	4.08	4.06	4.07	4.10	4.26	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	23	4.88	249/1586	4.39	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	2	21	4.76	896/1585	4.53	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.76	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	1	22	4.80	246/1582	4.28	4.30	4.26	4.35	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	4	17	4.48	717/1575	4.14	4.32	4.27	4.39	4.48	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	4	4	16	4.40	379/1380	3.26	3.94	3.94	4.03	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	5	3	6	3.93	889/1520	3.77	4.14	4.01	4.03	3.93	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	603/1515	4.29	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.53	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	563/1511	4.31	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	9	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	****/ 994	3.85	3.97	3.94	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.34	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.42	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.48	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.07	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.45	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.63	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	3.97	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	4.20	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.50	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.82	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	4.23	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	4.53	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	4.42	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	4.63	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	4.50	****	

Course-Section: ECAD 210 0701
 Title PRACTICE OF MANAGEMENT
 Instructor: SKLAMM, STEWART
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 515
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	25	Non-major	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECAD 210 8020
 Title PRACTICE OF MANAGEMENT
 Instructor: Shady Grove
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 516
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	5	3	4	4	3	2.84	1645/1674	4.07	4.23	4.27	4.32	2.84	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	3	7	3	3	2.90	1633/1674	4.23	4.26	4.23	4.26	2.90	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	5	1	3	8	3	3.15	1348/1423	4.33	4.36	4.27	4.36	3.15	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	7	2	0	5	2	2.56	1600/1609	3.95	4.23	4.22	4.23	2.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	1	3	3	8	3.67	1121/1585	4.13	4.04	3.96	3.91	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	6	2	4	2	5	2.89	1471/1535	3.81	4.08	4.08	4.03	2.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	10	1	3	1	3	2.22	1629/1651	4.06	4.20	4.18	4.20	2.22	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	5	13	1	3.79	1637/1673	4.63	4.65	4.69	4.67	3.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	4	3	5	2	2	2.69	1608/1656	4.08	4.06	4.07	4.10	2.69	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	4	4	4	3	4	2.95	1549/1586	4.39	4.43	4.43	4.48	2.95	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	4	2	3	4	7	3.40	1559/1585	4.53	4.72	4.69	4.76	3.40	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	5	4	3	3	4	2.84	1537/1582	4.28	4.30	4.26	4.35	2.84	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	8	2	3	3	3	2.53	1546/1575	4.14	4.32	4.27	4.39	2.53	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	12	5	1	0	0	1	1.71	1371/1380	3.26	3.94	3.94	4.03	1.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	3	2	6	4	0	2.73	1438/1520	3.77	4.14	4.01	4.03	2.73	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	2	2	2	3	6	3.60	1274/1515	4.29	4.37	4.24	4.28	3.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	2	0	4	5	4	3.60	1291/1511	4.31	4.37	4.27	4.28	3.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	11	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/ 994	3.85	3.97	3.94	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.34	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	2	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.42	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	2	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.48	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.07	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.45	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.63	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	3.97	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	4.20	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.50	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.82	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	4.23	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	4.53	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	4.42	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	4.63	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	4.50	****	

Course-Section: ECAD 210 8020
 Title PRACTICE OF MANAGEMENT
 Instructor: Shady Grove
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 516
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	12	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	20	Non-major	7
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECAD 310 0101
 Title HUMAN RESOURCE MGT
 Instructor: Sadler, Patrici
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 517
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	3	5	4	4.08	1131/1674	4.08	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	830/1674	4.33	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	771/1423	4.33	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	3	5	3.92	1211/1609	3.92	4.23	4.22	4.27	3.92	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	642/1585	4.17	4.04	3.96	3.95	4.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	4	5	4.00	870/1535	4.00	4.08	4.08	4.15	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	2	1	5	3.42	1480/1651	3.42	4.20	4.18	4.16	3.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	1300/1673	4.42	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.42	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	5	3	3	3.67	1297/1656	3.67	4.06	4.07	4.07	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	1260/1586	4.08	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.08	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	1	9	4.50	1225/1585	4.50	4.72	4.69	4.66	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	4	3	3.91	1217/1582	3.91	4.30	4.26	4.26	3.91	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	2	2	5	3.75	1289/1575	3.75	4.32	4.27	4.25	3.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	1	2	0	1	1	2.80	1280/1380	2.80	3.94	3.94	4.01	2.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	700/1520	4.20	4.14	4.01	4.09	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	944/1515	4.20	4.37	4.24	4.32	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	955/1511	4.20	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	360/ 994	4.25	3.97	3.94	3.96	4.25	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.24	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	5
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 12
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	6
			? 1		

Course-Section: ECAD 360 0101
 Title BUSINESS LAW
 Instructor: COHEN, HYMAN K.
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 518
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	3	7	9	4.32	878/1674	4.32	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.32	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	9	8	4.32	856/1674	4.32	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.32	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	6	9	4.16	922/1423	4.16	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.16	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	2	1	3	3	5	3.57	1423/1609	3.57	4.23	4.22	4.27	3.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	244/1585	4.63	4.04	3.96	3.95	4.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	2	0	4	4	4	3.57	1256/1535	3.57	4.08	4.08	4.15	3.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	4	11	4.37	727/1651	4.37	4.20	4.18	4.16	4.37	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	10	8	4.44	1267/1673	4.44	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.44	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	4	8	2	3.86	1162/1656	3.86	4.06	4.07	4.07	3.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	784/1586	4.58	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.58	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	591/1585	4.89	4.72	4.69	4.66	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	8	8	4.26	924/1582	4.26	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.26	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	6	8	4.05	1119/1575	4.05	4.32	4.27	4.25	4.05	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	17	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1380	****	3.94	3.94	4.01	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	2	1	3	6	3.85	961/1520	3.85	4.14	4.01	4.09	3.85	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	0	2	10	4.62	533/1515	4.62	4.37	4.24	4.32	4.62	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	479/1511	4.69	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.69	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	12	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 994	****	3.97	3.94	3.96	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 10		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General 4	Under-grad 19 Non-major 4
84-150	7	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 13	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ECAD 385 0101
 Title BUSINESS ETHICS & SOC
 Instructor: BRENNER, THOMAS
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 519
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	7	11	4.33	854/1674	4.33	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	14	4.52	554/1674	4.52	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.52	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	16	4.62	445/1423	4.62	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.62	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	12	4.48	536/1609	4.48	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.48	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	5	11	4.30	512/1585	4.30	4.04	3.96	3.95	4.30	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	4	4	9	4.00	870/1535	4.00	4.08	4.08	4.15	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	116/1651	4.90	4.20	4.18	4.16	4.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	1040/1673	4.70	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.70	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	1	13	6	4.25	719/1656	4.25	4.06	4.07	4.07	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	560/1586	4.72	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.72	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	853/1585	4.79	4.72	4.69	4.66	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	481/1582	4.63	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	537/1575	4.63	4.32	4.27	4.25	4.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	10	1	1	2	2	3	3.56	1017/1380	3.56	3.94	3.94	4.01	3.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	572/1520	4.33	4.14	4.01	4.09	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	681/1515	4.47	4.37	4.24	4.32	4.47	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	289/1511	4.87	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.87	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	237/ 994	4.46	3.97	3.94	3.96	4.46	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 13	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	5
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 21
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	12
			? 0		

Course-Section: ECAD 425 0101
 Title: MARKETING
 Instructor: HOFHERR, WILLIA
 Enrollment: 44
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 520
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	2	0	2	9	15	4.25	954/1674	4.25	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	19	4.54	542/1674	4.54	4.26	4.23	4.31	4.54	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	22	4.68	363/1423	4.68	4.36	4.27	4.34	4.68	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	5	7	13	4.00	1094/1609	4.00	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	0	3	9	11	4.08	715/1585	4.08	4.04	3.96	4.01	4.08	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	1	3	11	8	3.77	1140/1535	3.77	4.08	4.08	4.18	3.77	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	4	21	4.54	484/1651	4.54	4.20	4.18	4.23	4.54	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	1	13	6	4.25	719/1656	4.25	4.06	4.07	4.19	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	25	4.89	231/1586	4.89	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	24	4.89	615/1585	4.89	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	22	4.78	286/1582	4.78	4.30	4.26	4.31	4.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	5	20	4.54	658/1575	4.54	4.32	4.27	4.35	4.54	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	3	0	2	5	16	4.19	540/1380	4.19	3.94	3.94	4.04	4.19	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	537/1520	4.38	4.14	4.01	4.18	4.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	629/1515	4.50	4.37	4.24	4.40	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	751/1511	4.40	4.37	4.27	4.45	4.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	11	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	****/ 994	****	3.97	3.94	4.19	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.21	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.65	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.57	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.46	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	4.86	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	4.24	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 14	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 8		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	1
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	D 0	Under-grad	28
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	21

Course-Section: ECAD 489 0301
 Title MGMT & ADMIN SEMINAR
 Instructor: Boulay, William (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 521
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	3	1	1	7	4.00	1196/1674	4.00	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	419/1674	4.64	4.26	4.23	4.31	4.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	181/1423	4.83	4.36	4.27	4.34	4.83		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	743/1609	4.33	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	131/1585	4.82	4.04	3.96	4.01	4.82	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	440/1535	4.45	4.08	4.08	4.18	4.45	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	361/1651	4.64	4.20	4.18	4.23	4.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	655/1656	4.35	4.06	4.07	4.19	4.35	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	0	0	11	4.67	663/1586	4.79	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	737/1585	4.92	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	1	1	9	4.42	762/1582	4.53	4.30	4.26	4.31	4.53	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	958/1575	4.26	4.32	4.27	4.35	4.26	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	1	1	7	4.30	447/1380	4.45	3.94	3.94	4.04	4.45	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.14	4.01	4.18	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	230/1515	4.89	4.37	4.24	4.40	4.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.45	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	160/ 994	4.63	3.97	3.94	4.19	4.63	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.42	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.65	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.57	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.46	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	2
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 12
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	7
			? 1		

Course-Section: ECAD 489 0301
 Title MGMT & ADMIN SEMINAR
 Instructor: RAUDENBUSH, LIN (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 522
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	3	1	1	7	4.00	1196/1674	4.00	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	419/1674	4.64	4.26	4.23	4.31	4.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	181/1423	4.83	4.36	4.27	4.34	4.83		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	743/1609	4.33	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	131/1585	4.82	4.04	3.96	4.01	4.82	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	440/1535	4.45	4.08	4.08	4.18	4.45	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	361/1651	4.64	4.20	4.18	4.23	4.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	522/1656	4.35	4.06	4.07	4.19	4.35	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	214/1586	4.79	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1585	4.92	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	481/1582	4.53	4.30	4.26	4.31	4.53	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	940/1575	4.26	4.32	4.27	4.35	4.26	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	241/1380	4.45	3.94	3.94	4.04	4.45	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.14	4.01	4.18	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	230/1515	4.89	4.37	4.24	4.40	4.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.45	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	160/ 994	4.63	3.97	3.94	4.19	4.63	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.42	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.65	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.57	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.46	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	2
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 12
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	7
			? 1		