

Course-Section: ECAD 210 0101
 Title PRACTICE OF MANAGEMENT
 Instructor: ARMOR, VIVIAN
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 478
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	7	26	4.79	275/1522	4.48	4.42	4.30	4.34	4.79	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	30	4.88	149/1522	4.63	4.47	4.26	4.29	4.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	27	4.76	278/1285	4.67	4.55	4.30	4.36	4.76	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	2	8	21	4.61	367/1476	4.44	4.30	4.22	4.20	4.61	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	1	6	24	4.63	265/1412	4.52	4.35	4.06	4.00	4.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	9	21	4.45	382/1381	4.29	4.12	4.08	3.97	4.45	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	6	26	4.76	211/1500	4.58	4.51	4.18	4.20	4.76	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	1	30	4.97	195/1517	4.92	4.88	4.65	4.63	4.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	1	0	0	6	19	4.62	304/1497	4.48	4.18	4.11	4.11	4.62	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	30	4.97	77/1440	4.79	4.65	4.45	4.42	4.97	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	30	4.97	198/1448	4.89	4.84	4.71	4.78	4.97	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	6	25	4.81	217/1436	4.65	4.56	4.29	4.29	4.81	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	0	6	24	4.80	294/1432	4.56	4.47	4.29	4.31	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	2	3	3	8	9	3.76	781/1221	3.96	4.06	3.93	4.02	3.76	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	3	8	8	4.26	579/1280	4.35	4.38	4.10	4.08	4.26	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	398/1277	4.63	4.65	4.34	4.33	4.74	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	3	1	15	4.63	485/1269	4.59	4.62	4.31	4.33	4.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	3	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	267/ 854	4.28	4.32	4.02	4.00	4.38	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.56	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.58	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	30	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	5.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.11	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	29	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.83	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	30	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	4.58	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.75	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.75	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.17	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	30	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	****	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	****	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	****	****	

Course-Section: ECAD 210 0101
 Title PRACTICE OF MANAGEMENT
 Instructor: ARMOR, VIVIAN
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 478
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	13	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1	B	14						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	6	C	2	General	3	Under-grad	33	Non-major	33
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	27				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECAD 210 0201
 Title PRACTICE OF MANAGEMENT
 Instructor: ARMOR, VIVIAN
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 479
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	0	4	28	4.88	197/1522	4.48	4.42	4.30	4.34	4.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	30	4.91	128/1522	4.63	4.47	4.26	4.29	4.91	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	28	4.88	173/1285	4.67	4.55	4.30	4.36	4.88	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	6	26	4.81	172/1476	4.44	4.30	4.22	4.20	4.81	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	5	25	4.72	191/1412	4.52	4.35	4.06	4.00	4.72	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	6	23	4.59	255/1381	4.29	4.12	4.08	3.97	4.59	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	4	27	4.81	154/1500	4.58	4.51	4.18	4.20	4.81	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	31	4.97	195/1517	4.92	4.88	4.65	4.63	4.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	2	0	0	0	5	20	4.80	147/1497	4.48	4.18	4.11	4.11	4.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	31	5.00	1/1440	4.79	4.65	4.45	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	31	5.00	1/1448	4.89	4.84	4.71	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	2	28	4.87	151/1436	4.65	4.56	4.29	4.29	4.87	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	31	5.00	1/1432	4.56	4.47	4.29	4.31	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	2	2	4	5	14	4.00	606/1221	3.96	4.06	3.93	4.02	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	3	21	4.73	237/1280	4.35	4.38	4.10	4.08	4.73	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	2	3	21	4.73	398/1277	4.63	4.65	4.34	4.33	4.73	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	3	23	4.88	244/1269	4.59	4.62	4.31	4.33	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	1	0	2	7	12	4.32	297/ 854	4.28	4.32	4.02	4.00	4.32	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.62	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.56	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.51	4.57	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.72	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 205	****	****	4.23	4.37	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	30	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.58	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	31	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	5.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 80	****	****	4.11	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.83	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	4.58	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.75	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.75	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.17	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	****	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	****	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	****	****	

Course-Section: ECAD 210 0201
 Title PRACTICE OF MANAGEMENT
 Instructor: ARMOR, VIVIAN
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 479
 JUN 26, 2007
 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 8	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 14		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 2	C 2	General 3	Under-grad 33 Non-major 33
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 1	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 17	
			? 0		

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	2	7	6	10	3.74	1300/1522	4.48	4.42	4.30	4.34	3.74	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	2	6	15	4.15	986/1522	4.63	4.47	4.26	4.29	4.15	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	2	0	2	5	16	4.32	714/1285	4.67	4.55	4.30	4.36	4.32	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	1	4	7	11	4.08	966/1476	4.44	4.30	4.22	4.20	4.08	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	0	3	6	14	4.20	621/1412	4.52	4.35	4.06	4.00	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	2	2	4	6	10	3.83	992/1381	4.29	4.12	4.08	3.97	3.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	4	2	2	16	4.25	780/1500	4.58	4.51	4.18	4.20	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	1	3	20	4.79	731/1517	4.92	4.88	4.65	4.63	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	0	6	10	4	3.76	1140/1497	4.48	4.18	4.11	4.11	3.76	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	1	1	4	16	4.43	891/1440	4.79	4.65	4.45	4.42	4.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	5	18	4.64	1024/1448	4.89	4.84	4.71	4.78	4.64	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	2	8	14	4.27	865/1436	4.65	4.56	4.29	4.29	4.27	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	2	7	13	4.04	1022/1432	4.56	4.47	4.29	4.31	4.04	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	3	2	6	4	8	3.52	891/1221	3.96	4.06	3.93	4.02	3.52	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	1	5	4	7	3.83	859/1280	4.35	4.38	4.10	4.08	3.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	3	3	11	4.28	789/1277	4.63	4.65	4.34	4.33	4.28	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	1	2	6	8	4.06	864/1269	4.59	4.62	4.31	4.33	4.06	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	11	2	0	0	2	3	3.57	658/ 854	4.28	4.32	4.02	4.00	3.57	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	25	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.62	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.56	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.51	4.57	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.72	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 205	****	****	4.23	4.37	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.58	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	5.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.11	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.83	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	4.58	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.75	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.75	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.17	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	****	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	****	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	****	****	

Course-Section: ECAD 210 0401
 Title PRACTICE OF MANAGEMENT
 Instructor: SKLAMM, STEWART
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 480
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	27	Non-major	27
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	1	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	0						

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	5	19	4.54	571/1522	4.48	4.42	4.30	4.34	4.54	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	7	19	4.57	465/1522	4.63	4.47	4.26	4.29	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	22	4.71	318/1285	4.67	4.55	4.30	4.36	4.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	7	5	14	4.27	781/1476	4.44	4.30	4.22	4.20	4.27	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	9	16	4.52	333/1412	4.52	4.35	4.06	4.00	4.52	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	9	13	4.26	604/1381	4.29	4.12	4.08	3.97	4.26	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	8	16	4.48	512/1500	4.58	4.51	4.18	4.20	4.48	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	25	4.96	195/1517	4.92	4.88	4.65	4.63	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	6	19	4.76	181/1497	4.48	4.18	4.11	4.11	4.76	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	5	21	4.74	472/1440	4.79	4.65	4.45	4.42	4.74	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	26	4.96	198/1448	4.89	4.84	4.71	4.78	4.96	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	3	21	4.67	415/1436	4.65	4.56	4.29	4.29	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	6	17	4.41	758/1432	4.56	4.47	4.29	4.31	4.41	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	1	0	2	1	16	4.55	246/1221	3.96	4.06	3.93	4.02	4.55	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	357/1280	4.35	4.38	4.10	4.08	4.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	351/1277	4.63	4.65	4.34	4.33	4.78	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	361/1269	4.59	4.62	4.31	4.33	4.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	78/ 854	4.28	4.32	4.02	4.00	4.88	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	25	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.62	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.56	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.11	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.83	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	4.58	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.75	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	****	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors					
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A 12	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	2	B 10	General	1	Under-grad	28	Non-major	28
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C 3						
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P 0	Other	21				
				I 0						
				? 0						

Course-Section: ECAD 310 0201
 Title HUMAN RESOURCE MGT
 Instructor: SADLER, PATRICI
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 482
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	1	0	3	5	9	4.17	991/1522	4.17	4.42	4.30	4.34	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	5	9	4.17	965/1522	4.17	4.47	4.26	4.25	4.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	4	10	4.28	752/1285	4.28	4.55	4.30	4.30	4.28	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	4	4	7	3.94	1079/1476	3.94	4.30	4.22	4.26	3.94	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	5	10	4.22	594/1412	4.22	4.35	4.06	4.03	4.22	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	3	1	10	3.89	953/1381	3.89	4.12	4.08	4.13	3.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	4	3	10	4.17	871/1500	4.17	4.51	4.18	4.13	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	2	15	4.72	855/1517	4.72	4.88	4.65	4.62	4.72	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	1	4	4	5	3.73	1160/1497	3.73	4.18	4.11	4.13	3.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	4	7	4	3.71	1322/1440	3.71	4.65	4.45	4.46	3.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	840/1448	4.76	4.84	4.71	4.71	4.76	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	5	4	7	3.94	1117/1436	3.94	4.56	4.29	4.30	3.94	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	4	3	8	4.00	1036/1432	4.00	4.47	4.29	4.29	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	2	5	8	4.19	508/1221	4.19	4.06	3.93	3.94	4.19	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	442/1280	4.44	4.38	4.10	4.14	4.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	560/1277	4.56	4.65	4.34	4.38	4.56	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	3	0	6	4.33	721/1269	4.33	4.62	4.31	4.39	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	228/ 854	4.44	4.32	4.02	4.00	4.44	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 9		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	6
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	8
			? 1		

Course-Section: ECAD 360 0101
 Title BUSINESS LAW
 Instructor: COHEN, HYMAN K.
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 483
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	2	7	5	4.21	939/1522	4.11	4.42	4.30	4.34	4.21	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	8	3	3.93	1168/1522	3.83	4.47	4.26	4.25	3.93	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	2	4	3.64	1129/1285	3.87	4.55	4.30	4.30	3.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	0	3	3	4	3.82	1169/1476	3.64	4.30	4.22	4.26	3.82	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	448/1412	4.22	4.35	4.06	4.03	4.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	2	2	4	1	3.00	1286/1381	3.34	4.12	4.08	4.13	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	3	7	4.14	892/1500	4.05	4.51	4.18	4.13	4.14	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	1019/1517	4.79	4.88	4.65	4.62	4.57	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	5	4	2	3.58	1246/1497	3.54	4.18	4.11	4.13	3.58	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	4	9	4.50	798/1440	4.43	4.65	4.45	4.46	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	1097/1448	4.59	4.84	4.71	4.71	4.57	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	2	7	3	3.71	1224/1436	3.86	4.56	4.29	4.30	3.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	5	4	4	3.71	1207/1432	3.91	4.47	4.29	4.29	3.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	9	2	0	1	1	1	2.80	1121/1221	3.22	4.06	3.93	3.94	2.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	2	2	3	2	3.56	1009/1280	3.35	4.38	4.10	4.14	3.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	743/1277	4.03	4.65	4.34	4.38	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	848/1269	4.02	4.62	4.31	4.39	4.11	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 7		Graduate 1
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	3
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 13
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	10
			? 1		

Course-Section: ECAD 360 0201
 Title BUSINESS LAW
 Instructor: HALL, WILLIAM
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 484
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	2	3	11	7	4.00	1122/1522	4.11	4.42	4.30	4.34	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	5	11	4	3.73	1280/1522	3.83	4.47	4.26	4.25	3.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	4	8	9	4.09	887/1285	3.87	4.55	4.30	4.30	4.09	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	1	4	11	3	3.45	1336/1476	3.64	4.30	4.22	4.26	3.45	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	7	7	8	4.05	734/1412	4.22	4.35	4.06	4.03	4.05	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	6	6	7	3.68	1086/1381	3.34	4.12	4.08	4.13	3.68	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	3	11	6	3.95	1038/1500	4.05	4.51	4.18	4.13	3.95	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1517	4.79	4.88	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	2	8	8	2	3.50	1277/1497	3.54	4.18	4.11	4.13	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	4	5	11	4.35	969/1440	4.43	4.65	4.45	4.46	4.35	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	1072/1448	4.59	4.84	4.71	4.71	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	2	3	8	7	4.00	1056/1436	3.86	4.56	4.29	4.30	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	2	8	8	4.10	991/1432	3.91	4.47	4.29	4.29	4.10	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	2	1	4	4	6	3.65	841/1221	3.22	4.06	3.93	3.94	3.65	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	3	2	2	4	3	3.14	1166/1280	3.35	4.38	4.10	4.14	3.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	2	3	3	6	3.73	1072/1277	4.03	4.65	4.34	4.38	3.73	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	5	2	6	3.93	943/1269	4.02	4.62	4.31	4.39	3.93	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	5	3	1	3	1	1	2.56	830/ 854	2.56	4.32	4.02	4.00	2.56	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.29	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.11	3.33	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	4.39	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.75	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	11
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	2
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	5	D	1
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
			Required for Majors		1
			General		2
			Electives		0
			Other		15
				Graduate	0
				Under-grad	23
				Major	0
				Non-major	23
				#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	

Course-Section: ECAD 385 0101
 Title BUSINESS ETHICS & SOC
 Instructor: BRENNER, THOMAS
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 485
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	2	2	17	4.71	380/1522	4.71	4.42	4.30	4.34	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	419/1522	4.62	4.47	4.26	4.25	4.62	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	415/1285	4.62	4.55	4.30	4.30	4.62	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	316/1476	4.67	4.30	4.22	4.26	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	18	4.71	191/1412	4.71	4.35	4.06	4.03	4.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	17	4.71	174/1381	4.71	4.12	4.08	4.13	4.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	201/1500	4.76	4.51	4.18	4.13	4.76	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	244/1517	4.95	4.88	4.65	4.62	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	1	0	1	8	9	4.26	643/1497	4.26	4.18	4.11	4.13	4.26	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	353/1440	4.80	4.65	4.45	4.46	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	19	4.86	629/1448	4.86	4.84	4.71	4.71	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	132/1436	4.89	4.56	4.29	4.30	4.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	97/1432	4.95	4.47	4.29	4.29	4.95	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	0	1	2	3	8	4.29	442/1221	4.29	4.06	3.93	3.94	4.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1280	5.00	4.38	4.10	4.14	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.65	4.34	4.38	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	223/1269	4.90	4.62	4.31	4.39	4.90	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	272/ 854	4.36	4.32	4.02	4.00	4.36	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 10	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 8		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	8
84-150	12	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 410 0101
 Title PRODUCTION MANAGEMENT
 Instructor: WAGNER, ALLEN A
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 486
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	3	6	16	4.42	707/1522	4.42	4.42	4.30	4.42	4.42	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	22	4.81	201/1522	4.81	4.47	4.26	4.34	4.81	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	2	21	4.76	268/1285	4.76	4.55	4.30	4.42	4.76	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	4	1	7	4.25	792/1476	4.25	4.30	4.22	4.31	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	4	7	11	4.00	760/1412	4.00	4.35	4.06	4.11	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	18	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	470/1381	4.38	4.12	4.08	4.21	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	3	20	4.65	325/1500	4.65	4.51	4.18	4.25	4.65	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.88	4.65	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	1	0	0	1	7	4	4.25	654/1497	4.25	4.18	4.11	4.21	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	24	4.92	153/1440	4.92	4.65	4.45	4.52	4.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	23	4.88	548/1448	4.88	4.84	4.71	4.75	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	141/1436	4.88	4.56	4.29	4.32	4.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	24	4.92	129/1432	4.92	4.47	4.29	4.34	4.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	10	2	0	6	3	4	3.47	921/1221	3.47	4.06	3.93	4.04	3.47	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	1	7	7	4.19	631/1280	4.19	4.38	4.10	4.28	4.19	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	4	2	10	4.38	714/1277	4.38	4.65	4.34	4.50	4.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	4	2	9	4.19	820/1269	4.19	4.62	4.31	4.49	4.19	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	11	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	****/ 854	****	4.32	4.02	4.31	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 1	A 14	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 1	B 8		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 4	C 2	General	2
84-150	15	3.00-3.49 11	D 0		Under-grad 26
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	23
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ECAD 425 0101
 Title: MARKETING
 Instructor: COAKLEY, PAUL E
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 487
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	2	1	19	4.77	290/1522	4.77	4.42	4.30	4.42	4.77	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	20	4.86	157/1522	4.86	4.47	4.26	4.34	4.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	150/1285	4.91	4.55	4.30	4.42	4.91	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	265/1476	4.71	4.30	4.22	4.31	4.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	1	1	16	4.68	214/1412	4.68	4.35	4.06	4.11	4.68	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	214/1381	4.65	4.12	4.08	4.21	4.65	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1500	5.00	4.51	4.18	4.25	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.88	4.65	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	385/1497	4.50	4.18	4.11	4.21	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.65	4.45	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.84	4.71	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	123/1436	4.91	4.56	4.29	4.32	4.91	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.47	4.29	4.34	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	0	1	0	2	12	4.67	175/1221	4.67	4.06	3.93	4.04	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	96/1280	4.93	4.38	4.10	4.28	4.93	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.65	4.34	4.50	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.62	4.31	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	5	1	0	1	0	8	4.40	252/ 854	4.40	4.32	4.02	4.31	4.40	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.47	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.51	4.55	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	****	4.23	3.85	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	4.65	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	4.58	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.11	4.14	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.51	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	4.22	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.03	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.13	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.33	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.92	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	4.25	****	

Course-Section: ECAD 425 0101
 Title: MARKETING
 Instructor: COAKLEY, PAUL E
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 487
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	17	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	5	C	0	General	7	Under-grad	21	Non-major	22
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECAD 489 0101
 Title MGMT & ADMIN SEMINAR
 Instructor: FROCK, SUZANNE
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 488
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	1	3	16	4.75	320/1522	4.36	4.42	4.30	4.42	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	8	9	4.30	824/1522	4.47	4.47	4.26	4.34	4.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	228/1285	4.67	4.55	4.30	4.42	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	1	0	2	1	8	4.25	792/1476	4.38	4.30	4.22	4.31	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	2	1	4	6	4.08	715/1412	4.28	4.35	4.06	4.11	4.08	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	6	1	0	2	3	6	4.08	763/1381	4.03	4.12	4.08	4.21	4.08	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	6	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	945/1500	4.47	4.51	4.18	4.25	4.08	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	9	10	4.53	1062/1517	4.84	4.88	4.65	4.71	4.53	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	1	0	2	6	4	3.92	1006/1497	4.10	4.18	4.11	4.21	3.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	492/1440	4.67	4.65	4.45	4.52	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	602/1448	4.89	4.84	4.71	4.75	4.87	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	326/1436	4.71	4.56	4.29	4.32	4.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	454/1432	4.36	4.47	4.29	4.34	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	4	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	139/1221	4.53	4.06	3.93	4.04	4.73	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	147/1280	4.63	4.38	4.10	4.28	4.89	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	245/1277	4.90	4.65	4.34	4.50	4.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	244/1269	4.96	4.62	4.31	4.49	4.89	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	106/ 854	4.78	4.32	4.02	4.31	4.75	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	4.65	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	4.58	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 80	****	****	4.11	4.14	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 12	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	3
84-150	14	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 20
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	15
			? 2		

Course-Section: ECAD 489 0201
 Title MGMT & ADMIN SEMINAR
 Instructor: BOULAY, WILLIA (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 489
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	6	3	9	4.17	991/1522	4.36	4.42	4.30	4.42	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	488/1522	4.47	4.47	4.26	4.34	4.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	415/1285	4.67	4.55	4.30	4.42	4.61	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	566/1476	4.38	4.30	4.22	4.31	4.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	1	1	14	4.39	448/1412	4.28	4.35	4.06	4.11	4.39	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	3	4	8	4.00	806/1381	4.03	4.12	4.08	4.21	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	312/1500	4.47	4.51	4.18	4.25	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1517	4.84	4.88	4.65	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	0	7	6	4.29	622/1497	4.10	4.18	4.11	4.21	4.18	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	740/1440	4.67	4.65	4.45	4.52	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	296/1448	4.89	4.84	4.71	4.75	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	341/1436	4.71	4.56	4.29	4.32	4.69	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	2	12	4.28	869/1432	4.36	4.47	4.29	4.34	4.21	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	3	3	11	4.47	303/1221	4.53	4.06	3.93	4.04	4.44	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	390/1280	4.63	4.38	4.10	4.28	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	228/1277	4.90	4.65	4.34	4.50	4.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1269	4.96	4.62	4.31	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	88/ 854	4.78	4.32	4.02	4.31	4.80	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	4.65	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	4.58	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 80	****	****	4.11	4.14	****	

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
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 5	Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	Major 0
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	4	D 0	Non-major 18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	1
				P 0	Electives 1
				I 0	Other 15
				? 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ECAD 489 0201
 Title MGMT & ADMIN SEMINAR
 Instructor: RAUDENBUSH, LIN (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 490
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	6	3	9	4.17	991/1522	4.36	4.42	4.30	4.42	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	488/1522	4.47	4.47	4.26	4.34	4.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	415/1285	4.67	4.55	4.30	4.42	4.61	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	566/1476	4.38	4.30	4.22	4.31	4.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	1	1	14	4.39	448/1412	4.28	4.35	4.06	4.11	4.39	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	3	4	8	4.00	806/1381	4.03	4.12	4.08	4.21	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	312/1500	4.47	4.51	4.18	4.25	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1517	4.84	4.88	4.65	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	2	0	5	5	4.08	846/1497	4.10	4.18	4.11	4.21	4.18	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	492/1440	4.67	4.65	4.45	4.52	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	602/1448	4.89	4.84	4.71	4.75	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	0	2	12	4.67	415/1436	4.71	4.56	4.29	4.32	4.69	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	2	1	1	10	4.13	970/1432	4.36	4.47	4.29	4.34	4.21	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	1	2	2	10	4.40	359/1221	4.53	4.06	3.93	4.04	4.44	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	390/1280	4.63	4.38	4.10	4.28	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	228/1277	4.90	4.65	4.34	4.50	4.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1269	4.96	4.62	4.31	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	88/ 854	4.78	4.32	4.02	4.31	4.80	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	4.65	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	4.58	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 80	****	****	4.11	4.14	****	

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
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 5	Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General 1
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	4	D 0	Under-grad 18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Non-major 18
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	
					Electives 1
					Other 15

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant