Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

Instructor: CARROLL, KATHLE

Enrollment:

79 Questionnaires: 32 Fall 2008

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Page 509 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

		Questions	5		NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	5 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	ou gain new	insights, ski	lls from	this course	0	0	0	3	4	9	16	4.19	1037/1649	4.05	4.23	4.28	4.11	4.19
_	_	or make clear			0	0	2	1	4	12	13	4.03	1106/1648	4.00	4.24	4.23	4.16	4.03
		stions reflect	_	-	0	0	2	3	3	6	18	4.09	918/1375	4.10	4.32	4.27	4.10	4.09
	_	cions reflect	_	-	0	13	0	0	4	6	9	4.26	806/1595	3.75	4.06	4.20	4.03	4.26
			_	at you learned	1	2	2	1	4	10	12	4.00	815/1533	3.89	4.04	4.04	3.87	4.00
				what you learned	0	20	4	0	0	5	3		1375/1512	3.50	3.93	4.10	3.86	3.25
	-	system clearly		-	0	0	0	2	-	13	16	4.34	708/1623	4.12	4.29	4.16	4.08	4.34
		as class cance			0	0	0	0	0	12	20		1081/1646	4.44	4.57	4.69	4.67	4.63
	-			ng effectiveness	4	0	1	1		10	8		1132/1621	3.75	4.05	4.06		3.82
		Lecture	<u>a</u>															
1. Were t	he instruct	tor's lecture		epared	1	0	0	0	3	9	19	4.52	839/1568	4.43	4.53	4.43	4.39	4.52
		or seem inter	_	-	2	0	0	0	0	6	24	4.80	840/1572	4.65	4.73	4.70	4.64	4.80
				lained clearly	3	0	0	4	2	6	17	4.24	950/1564	4.15	4.28	4.28	4.20	4.24
		_	_	_	3	0	1	1	4	4	19	4.34	891/1559	4.31	4.34	4.29	4.20	4.34
	d the lectures contribute to what you learned d audiovisual techniques enhance your understand					12	2	0	3	7	5	3.76	907/1352	3.40	3.57	3.98		3.76
o. Did au	idiovisual (	r understanding	3	12	2	U	3	,	5	3.70	907/1352	3.40	3.37	3.90	3.00	3.70		
ו הגל ו	44	laad	10	0	1	2	6	2	11	2 01	006/1204	2 70	2 70	4 00	2 06	3.91		
	d class discussions contribute to what you lear					0	2	2 0	8	2 4	8	3.91	886/1384	3.70 3.52	3.79 3.91	4.08	3.86	
	re all students actively encouraged to particip the instructor encourage fair and open discus							-	-	_	-		1116/1382			4.29	4.03	3.73
				open discussion	10	0	1 2	3	5	5	8		1110/1368	3.81	4.08	4.30	4.01	3.73
4. were s	special tecr	nniques succes	SSIUI		11	11	2	1	1	3	3	3.40	746/ 948	3.93	3.94	3.95	3.75	3.40
		Labora	_															
		ease understa	_		28	1	1	0	1	0	1		****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.05	****
				ound information	29	0	0	1	1	1	0		****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.08	****
	_			lab activities	29	0	1	0	0	1	1		****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.43	****
		ructor provide			30	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were r	requirements	s for lab repo	orts clea	rly specified	28	0	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	****/ 555	4.38	4.38	4.29	4.14	****
		Semina	r															
5. Were c	riteria for	r grading made	e clear		30	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	3.29	3.29	3.68	3.54	****
		Self 1	Paced															
1. Did se	elf-paced sy	ystem contrib	ute to wh	at you learned	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	***	3.86	4.30	4.17	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	ı									
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	;
00-27												9	Graduat		0			0
00-27 28-55						Kec	4ulre	ed fo	JT IMS	JOP	Ð	J	Graduat	=	U	Majo	)T	U
28-55 56-83						Oc.	nera	1				6	IIndox	~~d ?	2	More	ma i a	32
	-			Ger	nera.	т				U	Under-g	rau 3	2	MOII-	major	3∠		
84-150	0									2	шшліп -	Maar - '	bar -			.la		
Grad.	U	3.50-4.00	4			EIG	ectiv	ves				2	#### - 1				_	111
				- *		O+1	h o				1	1	respons	es to D	e sign	ıııcar	I L	
				I 0		Uti	her				1	1						
				; I														

PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

Title

Instructor: MITCH, DAVID F

Enrollment: 48 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 510

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncie	g		Tngi	ructor	Course	Dent	UMBC	T.evel	Sect
Ouestions	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	1	1	2	16	12	4.16	1067/1649	4.05	4.23	4.28	4.11	4.16
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	5	14	11	4.03	1106/1648	4.00	4.24	4.23	4.16	4.03
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	3	11	16	4.25	806/1375	4.10	4.32	4.27	4.10	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	1	1	4	12	11	4.07	1032/1595	3.75	4.06	4.20	4.03	4.07
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	1	2	9	15	4.29	594/1533	3.89	4.04	4.04	3.87	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	2	3	11	11	4.04	868/1512	3.50	3.93	4.10	3.86	4.04
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	9	11	11	4.00	1029/1623	4.12	4.29	4.16	4.08	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	2	0	0	0	2	28	4.93	465/1646	4.44	4.57	4.69	4.67	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	1	1	5	14	2	3.65	1268/1621	3.75	4.05	4.06	3.96	3.65
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	9	8	14	4.16	1191/1568	4.43	4.53	4.43	4.39	4.16
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	10	20	4.61	1133/1572	4.65	4.73	4.70	4.64	4.61
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	2	6	13	9	3.97	1163/1564	4.15	4.28	4.28	4.20	3.97
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	4	11	14	4.19	1009/1559	4.31	4.34	4.29	4.20	4.19
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	12	3	1	5	3	7	3.53	1039/1352	3.40	3.57	3.98	3.86	3.53
Discussion	_		_											
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	4	10	9	4.08	767/1384	3.70	3.79	4.08	3.86	4.08
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	2	2	5	10	6		1156/1382	3.52	3.91	4.29	4.03	3.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	1	4	10	8	3.96	990/1368	3.81	4.08	4.30	4.01	3.96
4. Were special techniques successful	8	4	0	3	3	8	7	3.90	533/ 948	3.93	3.94	3.95	3.75	3.90
Tabanahann														
Laboratory	2.1	1	0	0	^	0	1	F 00	**** / OO1	****	****	1 10	4 05	****
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	31	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****		4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31 31	1 1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209 ****/ 555	4.38	**** 4.38	4.35 4.29	4.38 4.14	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	1	U	U	U	U	Т	5.00	****/ 555	4.38	4.38	4.29	4.14	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	3.29	3.29	3.68	3.54	****
or here directed for grading made drear	-	_	Ū	ŭ	ŭ	Ū	_	3.00	, 200	3.27	3.27	3.00	3.31	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 312	3.20	3.73	3.68	3.51	****
-														
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	3.86	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****

Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

Instructor: MITCH, DAVID F

Enrollment: 48
Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 510 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	2	 А	11	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	33	Non-major	32
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	10	-		_	
				?	0						

PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

Title Instructor: CARPENTER, ROBE

Enrollment: 80 Questionnaires: 38 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 511 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Over the law of	<b>.</b>	373		_	ncie	s 4	-		tructor	Course	_	UMBC		Sect
Questions	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	2	14	7	14	3.82	1343/1649	4.05	4.23	4.28	4.11	3.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	11	14	9	3.68	1395/1648	4.00	4.24	4.23	4.16	3.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	9	11	15	3.97	975/1375	4.10	4.32	4.27	4.10	3.97
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	24	2	3	3	3	3	3.14	1516/1595	3.75	4.06	4.20	4.03	3.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	5	10	8	11	3.74	1084/1533	3.89	4.04	4.04	3.87	3.74
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	28	0	3	2	4	1		1356/1512		3.93	4.10	3.86	3.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	4	6	7	17		1222/1623	4.12	4.29	4.16	4.08	3.84
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	16	21		1193/1646		4.57	4.69	4.67	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	1	1	1	9	9	4	3.58	1310/1621	3.75	4.05	4.06	3.96	3.58
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	4	12	20	4.35	1031/1568	4.43	4.53	4.43	4.39	4.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	4	5	27	4.64	1108/1572	4.65	4.73	4.70	4.64	4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	9		14		1127/1564		4.28	4.28	4.20	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	2	6		15		1098/1559			4.29	4.20	4.06
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	3	6	10	13	4.03	672/1352	3.40	3.57	3.98	3.86	4.03
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	2	7	11	5	3 65	1016/1384	3.70	3.79	4.08	3.86	3.65
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	3	8	8	7		1110/1384		3.79	4.29	4.03	3.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	2	7	7	10	3.73	-,		4.08	4.30	4.03	3.73
4. Were special techniques successful	13	18	3	1	2	1	0		****/ 948				3.75	****
1. Here special committees successful			5	_	_	_	ŭ		, , , , ,	3.75	3.71	3.75	3.73	
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	33	0	2	0	2	1	0	2.40	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.08	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	3	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 555	4.38	4.38	4.29	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	31	6	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 88	***	****	4.54	4.31	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	33	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	4	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 288	3.29	3.29	3.68	3.54	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	36	0	2	0	0	0	0	1 00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	36	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	,	****	****	4.00	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	35	2	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****
5. Was the instructor available for consultation	55	2	Ü	O	Ü	_	O	1.00	, 35			1.17	1.50	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	36	0	1	0	1	0	0		****/ 53	****	3.86	4.30	4.17	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	35	2	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	34	2	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****
The same		- D	1											

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	 А	8	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	14						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	5	General	4	Under-grad	38	Non-major	37
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sid	nificant	
				I	0	Other	22	-	-	-	

? 2

University of Maryland PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS Baltimore County

Title Instructor: KAIKAI, ALPHA

Enrollment: 40 Questionnaires: 29 Fall 2008

Page 512 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncie	S		Tnst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	_	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	5	13	8	3.90	1279/1649	4.05	4.23	4.28	4.11	3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	9	13	5	3.72	1368/1648	4.00	4.24	4.23	4.16	3.72
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	4	6	12	5	3.48	1215/1375	4.10	4.32	4.27	4.10	3.48
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	17	2	2	4	4	0	2.83	1562/1595	3.75	4.06	4.20	4.03	2.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	1	3	14	6	3.92	895/1533	3.89	4.04	4.04	3.87	3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	18	1	2	3	2	2	3.20	1395/1512	3.50	3.93	4.10	3.86	3.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	3	12	10	3.93	1134/1623	4.12	4.29	4.16	4.08	3.93
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	26	2	4.00	1544/1646	4.44	4.57	4.69	4.67	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	1	5	12	1	3.68	1247/1621	3.75	4.05	4.06	3.96	3.68
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	2	7	17	4.48	878/1568	4.43	4.53	4.43	4.39	4.48
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	1	5	20	4.63	1121/1572	4.65	4.73	4.70	4.64	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	3	4	13	8	3.93	1200/1564	4.15	4.28	4.28	4.20	3.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	1	0	1	8	14	4.42	818/1559	4.31	4.34	4.29	4.20	4.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	17	1	1	6	0	3	3.27	1153/1352	3.40	3.57	3.98	3.86	3.27
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	4	3	4	6	6	3.30	1175/1384	3.70	3.79	4.08	3.86	3.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	3	1	4	6	9		1110/1382	3.52	3.91	4.29	4.03	3.74
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	2	8	12	4.30	816/1368	3.81	4.08	4.30	4.01	4.30
4. Were special techniques successful	6	20	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/ 948	3.93	3.94	3.95	3.75	***
Laboratory		_	•	•	_	_		4 00					4 0=	
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	6	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	2	0	0	2	0	2.50	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 212			4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	2	0	1	0	1 1	0		****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	3	U	U	U	Т	2	4.67	****/ 555	4.38	4.38	4.29	4.14	^^^
Seminar		_			_									
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 92	****	****	4.35	4.01	***
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 288	3.29	3.29	3.68	3.54	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	1	0	1	0	0		****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	1	0	0	1	0	0		,	****	****	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 312	3.20	3.73	3.68	3.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 53	****	3.86	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67		****	****	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****

Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

Instructor: KAIKAI, ALPHA

Enrollment: 40
Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 512 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	4	 А	 7	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	6	General	4	Under-grad	29	Non-major	29
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13	-		_	
				?	0						

Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

Instructor: KAIKAI, ALPHA

Enrollment: 50 Questionnaires: 33

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 513 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eane	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	3	12	6	10	3.58	1479/1649	4.05	4.23	4.28	4.11	3.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	6	9	10	6	3.36	1538/1648	4.00	4.24	4.23	4.16	3.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	13	9	7	3.52	1204/1375	4.10	4.32	4.27	4.10	3.52
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	17	2	2	7	3	2	3.06	1531/1595	3.75	4.06	4.20	4.03	3.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	2	9	8	9		1065/1533	3.89	4.04	4.04	3.87	3.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	20	5	4	1	1	2	2.31	1503/1512	3.50	3.93	4.10	3.86	2.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	3	9	8	12	3.91	1180/1623	4.12	4.29	4.16	4.08	3.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	4	25	3	3.88	1608/1646	4.44	4.57	4.69	4.67	3.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	2	3	15	6	3	3.17	1470/1621	3.75	4.05	4.06	3.96	3.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	10	9	11	3 88	1358/1568	4.43	4.53	4.43	4.39	3.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	4	10	18		1297/1572	4.65	4.73	4.70	4.64	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	6	9	10	6		1415/1564		4.28	4.28	4.20	3.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	3	6	8	-		1301/1559		4.34	4.29	4.20	3.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	24	1	2	2	2	1		****/1352		3.57	3.98	3.86	****
5. Dia addiovibadi ecciniques ciniance your anderseanding	_	2.	-	_	_	_	_	3.00	71332	3.10	3.37	3.70	3.00	
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	4	0	6	5	0	2.80	1314/1384	3.70	3.79	4.08	3.86	2.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	1	3	4	4	3	3.33	1251/1382	3.52	3.91	4.29	4.03	3.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	7	2	6	3.93	1006/1368	3.81	4.08	4.30	4.01	3.93
4. Were special techniques successful	18	12	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/ 948	3.93	3.94	3.95	3.75	****
- 1														
Laboratory	0.17	_	•	0	-	0	•	2 00	****	****	****	4 16	4 05	****
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	5	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	0	1	2	0	0		****/ 243	****		4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	29	2	0	0	1	0 2	1		****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	29	2 2	0	0	0	3	0		****/ 209 ****/ 555			4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	2	U	U	U	3	U	4.00	****/ 555	4.38	4.38	4.29	4.14	
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	3.29	3.29	3.68	3.54	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	30	0	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	29	1	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	30	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	29	3	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 312	3.20	3.73	3.68	3.51	****
									,					
Self Paced						_								
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 53	****	3.86	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	1	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	29	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	29	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 110	***	****	3.99	3.83	****

Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

Instructor: KAIKAI, ALPHA

Enrollment: 50
Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 513 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	15	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	5	General	3	Under-grad	33	Non-major	33
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	16	_			
				?	1						

Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

Instructor: DICKSON, LISA

Enrollment: 80
Questionnaires: 46

Fall 2008

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 514 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	8	16	20	4 17	1047/1649	4.05	4.23	4.28	4.11	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	17	22	4.30	839/1648	4.00	4.24	4.23	4.16	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	8	19	17	4.09	922/1375	4.10	4.32	4.27	4.10	4.09
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	1	1	7	15	12		1067/1595	3.75	4.06	4.20	4.03	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	2	4	9	13	12		1093/1533	3.89	4.04	4.04	3.87	3.72
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	6	2	12	7	9		1356/1512	3.50	3.93	4.10	3.86	3.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	7	14	21	4.09	989/1623	4.12	4.29	4.16	4.08	4.09
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	40			1484/1646		4.57	4.69		4.13
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	0	0	8	21	6	3.94	1001/1621	3.75	4.05	4.06	3.96	3.94
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	2	6	33	4.69	588/1568	4.43	4.53	4.43	4.39	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	0	7	34	4.76	912/1572	4.65	4.73	4.70	4.64	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	5	12	25	4.48	689/1564	4.15	4.28	4.28	4.20	4.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	4	9	27	4.45	763/1559	4.31	4.34	4.29	4.20	4.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	22	2	3	5	2	6	3.39	1109/1352	3.40	3.57	3.98	3.86	3.39
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	4	4	7	2	7	3.17	1224/1384	3.70	3.79	4.08	3.86	3.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	3	3	10	3	5	3.17	1298/1382	3.52	3.91	4.29	4.03	3.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	1	5	7	3	8		1181/1368	3.81	4.08	4.30	4.01	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	22	14	3	0	5	1	1	2.70	****/ 948	3.93	3.94	3.95	3.75	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	43	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	44	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	44	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	***	****	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	44	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	41	1	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	****/ 555	4.38	4.38	4.29	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	44	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	***	****	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	44	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	44	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	44	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	42	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 288	3.29	3.29	3.68	3.54	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	44	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	44	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	44	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	44	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	42	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 312	3.20	3.73	3.68	3.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	44	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 53	****	3.86	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	44	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	44	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	44	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	44	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****

Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

Instructor: DICKSON, LISA

Enrollment: 80
Questionnaires: 46

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 514 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	2	A	13	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	В	14						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	9	General	6	Under-grad	46	Non-major	44
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	1	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	19	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 101 1401 University of Maryland Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009

Instructor: THOMAS, MARK S

Enrollment: 42 Questionnaires: 23

# Fall 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 515

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	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	4	7	10	4.09	1129/1649	4.05	4.23	4.28	4.11	4.09
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	4	14	4.35	784/1648	4.00	4.24	4.23	4.16	4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	8	12	4.35	723/1375	4.10	4.32	4.27	4.10	4.35
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	16	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	1435/1595	3.75	4.06	4.20	4.03	3.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	12	3	1	1	2	4	3.27	1358/1533	3.89	4.04	4.04	3.87	3.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	1	0	2	3	3	3.78	1107/1512	3.50	3.93	4.10	3.86	3.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	3	15	4.39	647/1623	4.12	4.29	4.16	4.08	4.39
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	12	4.52	1175/1646	4.44	4.57	4.69	4.67	4.52
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	5	10	4	3.85	1105/1621	3.75	4.05	4.06	3.96	3.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	1	3	17	4.59	743/1568	4.43	4.53	4.43	4.39	4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	4	16	4.59	1155/1572	4.65	4.73	4.70	4.64	4.59
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	5	14	4.50	651/1564	4.15	4.28	4.28	4.20	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	2	17	4.57	629/1559	4.31	4.34	4.29	4.20	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	14	1	1	3	1	1	3.00	1219/1352	3.40	3.57	3.98	3.86	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	1	3	3	3	3.55	1064/1384	3.70	3.79	4.08	3.86	3.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	2	3	4	2		1199/1382	3.52	3.91	4.29	4.03	3.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	3	3	2	3		1193/1368	3.81	4.08	4.30	4.01	3.45
4. Were special techniques successful	12	6	1	1	1	1	1		****/ 948		3.94	3.95	3.75	****
Freq	iency	Dis	trib	utior	ı									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	А	10	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	5	Under-grad	23	Non-major	23
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	10	-			
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

Instructor: MUTTER, RYAN L

Enrollment: 42 Questionnaires: 29

Fall 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 516 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eauer	ncies	\$		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
a														
General  1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	2	22	4.59	536/1649	4.05	4.23	4.28	4.11	4.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	2	23	4.62	414/1648	4.00	4.24	4.23	4.11	4.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	20	4.62	443/1375	4.10	4.32	4.23	4.10	4.62
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	5	0	2	1	4	15	4.45	566/1595	3.75	4.06	4.20	4.10	4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	5	0	0	3	7	12	4.41	476/1533	3.89	4.04	4.20	3.87	4.41
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	13	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	436/1512	3.50	3.93	4.10	3.86	4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	13	0	0	2	3	23	4.75	220/1623	4.12	4.29	4.16	4.08	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	5	22	4.81	816/1646	4.44	4.57	4.69	4.67	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	7	14	4.67	234/1621		4.05	4.06		4.67
5. Now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	U	U	U	U	,	14	4.07	234/1021	3.73	4.05	4.00	3.90	4.07
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	28	4.93	171/1568	4.43	4.53	4.43	4.39	4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	28	4.97	237/1572	4.65	4.73	4.70	4.64	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	23	4.76	342/1564	4.15	4.28	4.28	4.20	4.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	26	4.86	250/1559	4.31	4.34	4.29	4.20	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	1	2	3	3	13	4.14	607/1352	3.40	3.57	3.98	3.86	4.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	3	5	14	4.50	437/1384	3.70	3.79	4.08	3.86	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	1	5	15	4.55	585/1382	3.52	3.91	4.29	4.03	4.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	0	5	16	4.64	550/1368	3.81	4.08	4.30	4.01	4.64
4. Were special techniques successful	7	14	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	203/ 948		3.94			4.50
1. Wele special techniques successful	,		O	O	_	2	5	1.50	203/ 310	3.73	3.71	3.75	3.73	1.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.43	***
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	3	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/ 555	4.38	4.38	4.29	4.14	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	3	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	3	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 288	3.29	3.29	3.68	3.54	****
J. More driveria for grading made drear	23	3	J	Ü	Ü	Ü	_	3.00	, 200	3.27	3.23	3.00	3.31	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 39	***	****	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/ 312	3.20	3.73	3.68	3.51	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 53	****	3.86	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.17	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	0	0	0	0	0	4		****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****
J. WELE CHELE EHOUGH PLOCEOUS FOR ALL CHE SCUCENCS	25	U	U	U	U	U	7	5.00	/ 110			3.23	3.03	

Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

Instructor: MUTTER, RYAN L

Enrollment: 42
Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 516 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	 5	0.00-0.99	1	 А	7	Required for Majors	5 5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	7	General	4	Under-grad	29	Non-major	29
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14	-			
				?	2						

University of Maryland PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS Baltimore County

Title Instructor: THOMAS, MARK S

Enrollment: 40

Questionnaires: 20

# Fall 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 517 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	_		Level Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	1	2	2	6	6	3.82	1335/1649	4.05	4.23	4.28	4.11	3.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	2	2	3	5	5		1474/1648	4.00	4.24	4.23	4.16	3.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	1	1	0	1	7	7	4.19	862/1375	4.10	4.32	4.27	4.10	4.19
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	9	0	0	4	3	1	3.63	1359/1595	3.75	4.06	4.20	4.03	3.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	11	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	986/1533	3.89	4.04	4.04	3.87	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	12	0	1	0	4	1		1068/1512	3.50	3.93	4.10	3.86	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	2	2	2	7	4		1379/1623	4.12	4.29	4.16	4.08	3.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	9	9		1193/1646	4.44	4.57	4.69	4.67	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	2	1	3	7	1	3.29	1444/1621	3.75	4.05	4.06	3.96	3.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	2	1	5	7		1326/1568	4.43	4.53	4.43	4.39	3.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	2	1	-	10		1377/1572	4.65	4.73	4.70	4.64	4.31
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	2	0	1	7	6		1191/1564	4.15	4.28	4.28	4.20	3.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	1	1	4	8		1174/1559	4.31	4.34	4.29	4.20	3.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	5	4	1	1	1	4	3.00	1219/1352	3.40	3.57	3.98	3.86	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	1	4	3	3.89	896/1384	3.70	3.79	4.08	3.86	3.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	3	3	2	0	1		1372/1382	3.52	3.91	4.29	4.03	2.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	3	1	2	2	1		1339/1368		4.08	4.30	4.01	2.67
4. Were special techniques successful	11	8	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 948	3.93	3.94	3.95	3.75	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	2	0		****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	1	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	329/ 555	4.38	4.38	4.29	4.14	4.38
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	1	0	0	0	1	0			****	****	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	1	0	0	0	1	0	1.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18 11	0 2	0	0 2	0 1	2 4	0	3.29	****/ 92			4.35	4.01 3.54	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	ΤΤ	۷	U	2	Т	4	U	3.29	212/ 288	3.29	3.29	3.08	3.54	3.29
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	1	0	2	0	3	0	3.20	251/ 312	3.20	3.73	3.68	3.51	3.20
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	3.86	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	1	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****

Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

Instructor: THOMAS, MARK S

Enrollment: 40
Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 517 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	 А	3	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	3	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	6	_			
				?	1						

Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

Instructor: THOMAS, MARK S

Enrollment: 40
Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 518 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

							Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructo	c	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rai	nk	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 L																
1. Did you	ı gain new	insights, ski	lls from t	his course	0	0	2	0	0	8	11	4.24	986/3	1649	4.05	4.23	4.28	4.11	4.24
2. Did the	e instruct	or make clear	the expec	ted goals	0	0	0	1	1	8	11	4.38	729/	1648	4.00	4.24	4.23	4.16	4.38
3. Did the	e exam que	stions reflect	the expe	cted goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	12	4.48	581/1	1375	4.10	4.32	4.27	4.10	4.48
		tions reflect			0	12	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	321/	1595	3.75	4.06	4.20	4.03	4.67
	_	-		t you learned	0	12	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	815/		3.89	4.04	4.04	3.87	4.00
				hat you learned	0	18	0	0	0	1	2		****/		3.50	3.93	4.10	3.86	****
		system clearly	-	d	0	0	0	0	5	3			,		4.12	4.29	4.16	4.08	4.38
		as class cance			2	0	0	0	0	10			1221/		4.44	4.57	4.69	4.67	4.47
9. How wou	ıld you gra	ade the overa	ll teachin	g effectiveness	4	0	0	0	6	7	4	3.88	1078/	1621	3.75	4.05	4.06	3.96	3.88
		Lecture	9																
1. Were th	ne instruc	tor's lecture:	s well pre	pared	1	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	480/3	1568	4.43	4.53	4.43	4.39	4.75
2. Did the	e instruct	or seem inter	ested in t	he subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	840/1	1572	4.65	4.73	4.70	4.64	4.80
				ained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	9	9	4.30	887/3	1564	4.15	4.28	4.28	4.20	4.30
		contribute to	_		1	0	0	1	0			4.60	586/		4.31	4.34	4.29		4.60
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques enl	nance your	understanding	1	10	3	2	3	1	1	2.50	1301/	1352	3.40	3.57	3.98	3.86	2.50
		Discus	sion																
1. Did cla	ass discus			t you learned	9	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	726/3	1384	3.70	3.79	4.08	3.86	4.17
				o participate	9	0	1	1	4	2			1183/		3.52	3.91	4.29	4.03	3.58
		_	_	pen discussion	10	0	1	0	2	4	4	3.91	1032/	1368	3.81	4.08	4.30	4.01	3.91
4. Were sp	pecial tecl	nniques succes	ssful	-	9	10	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/	948	3.93	3.94	3.95	3.75	****
		Labora	ory																
2 Were w	ni provide		-	und information	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3 00	****/	243	****	****	4.12	4.08	****
				lab activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	1				****	****	4.40	4.43	****
	_	ructor provide			20	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/		****	****	4.35	4.38	****
		s for lab repo			19	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/		4.38	4.38	4.29	4.14	****
	-																		
		Field N																	
		ence contribut			20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00		52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you	ı clearly	understand you	ır evaluat	ion criteria	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****
		Self 1	Paced																
1. Did sel	lf-paced s	ystem contrib	ite to wha	t you learned	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	53	***	3.86	4.30	4.17	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ution	1										
Credits Ea	arned 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	sons	5 				Ту <u>г</u>	pe 			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 9		Rec	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	8	Grad	duate	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В 7		_	_									_			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 1		Ger	neral	_				2	Unde	er-gi	rad 2	1	Non-	major	21
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D 0								•	** ** **		_	,			,
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0		Ele	ectiv	res				0			Means t			_	h
				P 0 I 0		Oth						6	res	ponse	es to b	e sign	ııııcar	IT	
				3 0 I 0		ULL	IGT.					U							
				; U															

Course-Section: ECON 101H 0101 Title

PRIN OF MICROECON-HONO

Instructor: MCCONNELL, VIRG

Enrollment: 9 Questionnaires: 7

Page 519 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

	2410		00011	-1
	F	all	2008	
Student	Course	Evalua	ıtion	Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

								_	ncies	3	_		ructor		_	UMBC		
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1 Did vo	on gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.23	4.28	4.11	5.00
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	182/1648	4.86	4.24	4.23	4.16	4.86
		estions reflec			0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	199/1375	4.86	4.32	4.27	4.10	4.86
		ations reflect			0	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	321/1595	4.67	4.06	4.20	4.03	4.67
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7		1/1533	5.00	4.04	4.04	3.87	5.00
				o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	331/1512	4.57	3.93	4.10	3.86	4.57
		system clearl			0	0	0	0	0	0	7		1/1623	5.00	4.29	4.16	4.08	5.00
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.57	4.69	4.67	5.00
	-			hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	313/1621	4.57	4.05	4.06	3.96	4.57
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lecture	s well	prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.53	4.43	4.39	5.00
		ctor seem inter			1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.73	4.70	4.64	5.00
3. Was le	ecture mat	erial presente	d and e	explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.28	4.28	4.20	5.00
4. Did th	ne lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.34	4.29	4.20	5.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	lass discu	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	326/1384	4.67	3.79	4.08	3.86	4.67
2. Were a	all studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1382	5.00	3.91	4.29	4.03	5.00
3. Did th	ne instruc	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	654/1368	4.50	4.08	4.30	4.01	4.50
4. Were s	special te	echniques succe	ssful		5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	****	3.94	3.95	3.75	****
		Labora	tory															
1. Did th	ne lab inc	crease understa	nding c	of the material	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.05	****
				ground information	6	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were n	necessary	materials avai	lable f	or lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	***	****	4.40	4.43	****
				Frequ	ency	/ Dist	rib	ution	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	5
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Red	mire	ed fo	or Ma	iors	- – – –	2	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 4					10	- ,	-	_	or adda c	-	-			-
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	1				1	Under-g	rad	7	Non-	major	6
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0													5	-
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enou	ah
	-		-	P 0								-	respons				_	,
				I O		Oth	ner					4					-	
						- 01												

?

Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS

Instructor: PAPADANTONAKIS,

Enrollment: 38
Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2008

Page 520 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	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	6	4	10		1122/1649		4.23	4.28	4.11	4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	9	9	4.19	966/1648	4.11	4.24	4.23	4.16	4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	8	9	4.19	855/1375	4.21	4.32	4.27	4.10	4.19
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	2	6	10	4.20	890/1595	4.12	4.06	4.20	4.03	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	5	13	4.38	495/1533	4.20	4.04	4.04	3.87	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	7	9	4.19	755/1512	3.99	3.93	4.10	3.86	4.19
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3	5	11	4.14	936/1623	4.18	4.29	4.16	4.08	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	10	10	4.38	1302/1646	4.30	4.57	4.69	4.67	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	1	2	9	4	3.82	1132/1621	3.94	4.05	4.06	3.96	3.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	3	5	11	4.19	1169/1568	4.35	4.53	4.43	4.39	4.19
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	840/1572	4.74	4.73	4.70	4.64	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	0	5	6	8	3.86	1246/1564	4.22	4.28	4.28	4.20	3.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	5	2	5	2	7	3.19	1450/1559	4.15	4.34	4.29	4.20	3.19
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	4	3	0	3	2	2.67	1287/1352	3.63	3.57	3.98	3.86	2.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	5	3	0	3	2 77	1320/1384	3.72	3.79	4.08	3.86	2.77
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	4	4	2	2		1316/1382		3.91	4.29	4.03	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	948/1368	4.06	4.08	4.30	4.01	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	8	11	0	1	0	0	1		****/ 948			3.95	3.75	****
i. Wele special ecciniques successful	O		O	_	O	O	_	3.30	, 510	3.03	3.71	3.75	3.73	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 555	****	4.38	4.29	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 288	***	3.29	3.68	3.54	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00		****	****	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	, -	****	****	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	1	1	0	0		****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	2	0	0		****/ 312	***	3.73	3.68	3.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	3.86	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	1	0	0	1	0	0		,	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	,	****	****	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****
J. Here there enough proceds for all the students	エク	Τ.	U	U	т	U	U	5.00	/ 110			3.22	٥. ر	

Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS

Instructor: PAPADANTONAKIS,

Enrollment: 38
Questionnaires: 21

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 520 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	1	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	 6	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	11						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	21	Non-major	20
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 102 0201 Title

PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS

Instructor: DASGUPTA, NANDI

Enrollment: 41 Questionnaires: 15

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 521

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

		0			<b>.</b>	373		_	ncie		-		ructor	Course	_			
		Question	S 		NR	NA	1		3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did you	u gain ne	ew insights,ski		m this course	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	230/1649	4.14	4.23	4.28	4.11	4.86
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	234/1648		4.24	4.23	4.16	4.79
		uestions reflec			1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	133/1375	4.21	4.32	4.27	4.10	4.93
4. Did oth	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	6	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	362/1595	4.12	4.06	4.20	4.03	4.63
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	280/1533	4.20	4.04	4.04	3.87	4.62
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	1	7	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	651/1512	3.99	3.93	4.10	3.86	4.29
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearly	y expla	ined	1	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	261/1623	4.18	4.29	4.16	4.08	4.71
8. How man	ny times	was class cand	elled		1	0	0	0	1	10	3	4.14	1476/1646	4.30	4.57	4.69	4.67	4.14
9. How wor	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	159/1621	3.94	4.05	4.06	3.96	4.77
		Lectur	е															
1. Were th	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	424/1568	4.35	4.53	4.43	4.39	4.79
2. Did the	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	473/1572	4.74	4.73	4.70	4.64	4.93
3. Was led	cture mat	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1564	4.22	4.28	4.28	4.20	5.00
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	164/1559	4.15	4.34	4.29	4.20	4.93
5. Did aud	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	5	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	534/1352	3.63	3.57	3.98	3.86	4.22
		Discus																
				what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	201/1384	3.72	3.79	4.08	3.86	4.80
				d to participate	10	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	946/1382	3.69	3.91	4.29	4.03	4.00
				d open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	579/1368	4.06	4.08	4.30	4.01	
4. Were sp	pecial to	echniques succe	ssful		10	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 948	3.63	3.94	3.95	3.75	****
		Field																
5. Did com	nference	s help you carr	y out f	ield activities	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.73	3.68	3.51	****
				Frequ	iency	/ Dist	tribu	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	5			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 10		Red	 quire	ed fo	or Ma	 ajor		3	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В 2			-			,						, ,		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	1				1	Under-g	rad 1	.5	Non-	-major	15
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D 0									3				-	
Grad.	0 3.50-4.00 5 F 0					Ele	ectiv	ves				1	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ŗh
		P 0									respons							
				I O		Oth	ner					6	_		_			
				? 0														

PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS

Title Instructor: COOMBER, WILLIA

Enrollment: 42 Questionnaires: 23

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 522 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncie	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	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	1	1	6	5	9	3.91	1272/1649	4.14	4.23	4.28	4.11	3.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	6	5	10		1176/1648	4.11	4.24	4.23	4.16	3.96
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	3	4	3	11		1034/1375	4.21	4.32	4.27	4.10	3.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	6	4	10	3.95	1134/1595	4.12	4.06	4.20	4.03	3.95
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	4	1	6	11	4.09	754/1533	4.20	4.04	4.04	3.87	4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	1	6	4	7	3.79	1101/1512	3.99	3.93	4.10	3.86	3.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	2	3	3	12	3.95	1104/1623	4.18	4.29	4.16	4.08	3.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	1	16	4	4.05	1528/1646	4.30	4.57	4.69	4.67	4.05
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	1	7	7	4	3.60	1302/1621	3.94	4.05	4.06	3.96	3.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	2	6	11	4.35	1031/1568	4.35	4.53	4.43	4.39	4.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	5	15	4.59	1155/1572	4.74	4.73	4.70	4.64	4.59
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	6	3	11	4.00	1127/1564	4.22	4.28	4.28	4.20	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	2	3	13	4.05	1102/1559	4.15	4.34	4.29	4.20	4.05
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	4	1	2	5	8	3.60	1002/1352	3.63	3.57	3.98	3.86	3.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	4	2	7	4.07	771/1384	3.72	3.79	4.08	3.86	4.07
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	2	0	2	3	7	3.93	1014/1382	3.69	3.91	4.29	4.03	3.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	2	1	10	4.43	732/1368	4.06	4.08	4.30	4.01	4.43
4. Were special techniques successful	9	5	0	2	1	1	5	4.00	431/ 948	3.63	3.94	3.95	3.75	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 221	***	****	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 209	***	****	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 555	***	4.38	4.29	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 288	****	3.29	3.68	3.54	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	1	0	5.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/ 312	****	3.73	3.68	3.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 53	****	3.86	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****

Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS

Instructor: COOMBER, WILLIA

Enrollment: 42
Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 522 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	В	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	23	Non-major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	9	-		_	
				?	0						

PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS

Title COOMBER, WILLIA

Instructor: Enrollment:

39 Questionnaires: 24 Fall 2008

Page 523 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

	Fre			eanei	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	2	8	8	3		1560/1649		4.23	4.28	4.11	3.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	4	7	6	4		1577/1648	4.11	4.24	4.23	4.16	3.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	1	5	10	5		1192/1375	4.21	4.32	4.27	4.10	3.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	3	5	2	11	2		1507/1595	4.12	4.06	4.20	4.03	3.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	3	2	7	7		1296/1533	4.20	4.04	4.04	3.87	3.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	6	0	6	4	5		1418/1512		3.93	4.10	3.86	3.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	5	2	7	4	5		1525/1623	4.18	4.29	4.16	4.08	3.09
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	4	20	0		1613/1646	4.30	4.57	4.69		3.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	2	3	3	7	2	3.24	1456/1621	3.94	4.05	4.06	3.96	3.24
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	2	1	6	5	7	3.67	1426/1568	4.35	4.53	4.43	4.39	3.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	1	5	5	9		1477/1572	4.74	4.73	4.70	4.64	3.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	2	0	7	7	4		1374/1564		4.28	4.28	4.20	3.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	3	6	4	4		1458/1559		4.34	4.29	4.20	3.15
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	4	2	4	3	4	3.06	1213/1352	3.63	3.57	3.98		3.06
Discussion	_		_		_									
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	5	0	5	4	3		1254/1384		3.79	4.08	3.86	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	2	4	2	9	0		1313/1382	3.69	3.91	4.29	4.03	3.06
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7 7	0 11	4 0	3 2	2 2	5 0	3		1286/1368	4.06	4.08	4.30	4.01	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	/	11	U	2	2	U	2	3.33	776/ 948	3.63	3.94	3.95	3.75	3.33
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	2	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	****/ 555	****	4.38	4.29	4.14	****
Combras														
Seminar	21	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	1 21	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.31	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	1	2	0		****/ 288	****	3.29	3.68	3.54	****
									,					
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 312	****	3.73	3.68	3.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 53	****	3.86	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****
The second secon		_	-	-	Ū	-	_		, 110				05	

Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS

Instructor: COOMBER, WILLIA

Enrollment: 39
Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 523 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	2	 А	5	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	1	Under-grad	24	Non-major	19
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0	Electives		responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14	=			
				?	2						

Course-Section: ECON 102 0601 University of Maryland Baltimore County

Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS

Instructor: FALCON, HAROLD

Enrollment: 38 Ouestionnaires: 23

Fall 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 524

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 4 9 10 4.26 954/1649 4.14 4.23 4.28 4.11 4.26 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 4 5 14 4.43 658/1648 4.11 4.24 4.23 4.16 4.43 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 1 0 5 3 14 4.26 797/1375 4.21 4.32 4.27 4.10 4.26 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 9 0 0 2 4 8 4.43 608/1595 4.12 4.06 4.20 4.03 4.43 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 3 0 1 3 8 7 4.11 748/1533 4.20 4.04 4.04 3.87 4.11 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 8 0 1 2 6 6 4.13 808/1512 3.99 3.93 4.10 3.86 4.137. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 1 0 3 5 14 4.35 708/1623 4.18 4.29 4.16 4.08 4.35 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 1 0 0 0 7 15 4.68 1015/1646 4.30 4.57 4.69 4.67 4.68 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 0 0 0 3 8 6 4.18 777/1621 3.94 4.05 4.06 3.96 4.18 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 3 0 0 1 2 5 12 4.40 983/1568 4.35 4.53 4.43 4.39 4.40 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3 0 0 0 1 3 16 4.75 931/1572 4.74 4.73 4.70 4.64 4.75 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3 0 1 0 1 6 12 4.40 780/1564 4.22 4.28 4.28 4.20 4.40 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 3 1 1 1 0 2 15 4.53 673/1559 4.15 4.34 4.29 4.20 4.53 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 9 2 1 1 2 4 3.50 1049/1352 3.63 3.57 3.98 3.86 3.50 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 3 2 5 4.20 708/1384 3.72 3.79 4.08 3.86 4.20 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13 0 0 0 3 3 4 4.10 923/1382 3.69 3.91 4.29 4.03 4.10 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0 0 0 2 3 5 4.30 816/1368 4.06 4.08 4.30 4.01 4.30 4. Were special techniques successful 13 6 0 1 1 2 4.25 \*\*\*\*/ 948 3.63 3.94 3.95 3.75 \*\*\*\*

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	3	Under-grad	23	Non-major	23
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ECON 102 0701 University of Maryland Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Instructor: GINDLING, THOMA

Enrollment: 41 Questionnaires: 27

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 525 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questions					NR	NA	Fre	equer 2		s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	-	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	 Genera	 1																
1. Did you gain n		_	m this cour	°se	0	0	Ο	0	3	8	16	4.48	670/1649	4.14	4.23	4.28	4.11	4.48
2. Did the instru					0	0	0	0	4	10	13	4.33	797/1648		4.24	4.23	4.16	4.33
3. Did the exam q					0	0	0	1	0	11	15	4.48	569/1375		4.32	4.27	4.10	4.48
4. Did other eval					0	5	0	1	2	7	12	4.36	685/1595		4.06	4.20	4.03	4.36
5. Did assigned re					0	0	1	2	6	7	11	3.93	895/1533	4.20	4.04	4.04	3.87	3.93
5. Did written as	signments contr	ibute to	o what you	learned	0	9	0	0	3	6	9	4.33	595/1512	3.99	3.93	4.10	3.86	4.33
. Was the grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined		0	0	0	0	4	7	16	4.44	581/1623	4.18	4.29	4.16	4.08	4.44
. How many times	was class canc	elled			0	2	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1646	4.30	4.57	4.69	4.67	5.00
). How would you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effect	iveness	5	2	0	0	2	10	8	4.30	632/1621	3.94	4.05	4.06	3.96	4.30
	Lectur	e																
. Were the instr	uctor's lecture	s well j	prepared		1	0	0	0	0	5	21	4.81	387/1568	4.35	4.53	4.43	4.39	4.81
. Did the instru				ect	1	0	0	0	0	2	24	4.92	473/1572	4.74	4.73	4.70	4.64	4.92
. Was lecture ma	s lecture material presented and explained clear						0	0	1	6	19	4.69	434/1564	4.22	4.28	4.28	4.20	4.69
. Did the lecture	id the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	0	1	4	20	4.76	376/1559	4.15	4.34	4.29	4.20	4.76
. Did audiovisua	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi					14	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	280/1352	3.63	3.57	3.98	3.86	4.55
	Discussion																	
. Did class disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you le	earned	14	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	561/1384	3.72	3.79	4.08	3.86	4.38
. Were all stude	nts actively en	courage	d to partic	cipate	14	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	799/1382	3.69	3.91	4.29	4.03	4.31
. Did the instru			d open disc	cussion	15	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	522/1368	4.06	4.08	4.30	4.01	4.67
. Were special to	echniques succe	ssful			15	7	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/ 948	3.63	3.94	3.95	3.75	****
	Labora	tory																
. Were you provi	ded with adequa	te back	ground info	ormation	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.08	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	tribu	ıtioı	n									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ty	pe			Majors	5
00-27 0							 quire		 or M	 aior		5	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	 2
28-55 8						1000	2411	-u _ L (	J. 1.11	ــــ	. 2	-	Gradac	_	•	11000	-	
56-83 0						Ger	nera:	L				2	Under-q	rad 2	27	Non-	-major	25
84-150 1	3.00-3.49	5	D	0													5	
Grad. 0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0		Ele	ectiv	res				2	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enou	ah
P 0													respons					•
	I 0					O+1	ner				1	.6						
			1	U		OLI	TCT					. 0						

PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS

Title PRIN OF MACROECO Instructor: PAPADANTONAKIS,

Enrollment: 39
Questionnaires: 30

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 526 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	6	4	10	10	3.80	1351/1649	4.14	4.23	4.28	4.11	3.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	6	8	13	4.03	1106/1648	4.11	4.24	4.23	4.16	4.03
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	4	13	10	4.00	950/1375	4.21	4.32	4.27	4.10	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	3	8	16	4.23	841/1595	4.12	4.06	4.20	4.03	4.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	8	19	4.50	366/1533	4.20	4.04	4.04	3.87	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	3	11	13	4.13	808/1512	3.99	3.93	4.10	3.86	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	6	5	17	4.23	838/1623	4.18	4.29	4.16	4.08	4.23
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	14	16	4.53	1166/1646	4.30	4.57	4.69	4.67	4.53
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	1	3	6	5	7	3.64	1281/1621	3.94	4.05	4.06	3.96	3.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	4	11	12	A 1A	1213/1568	4.35	4.53	4.43	4.39	4.14
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	28	4.93	414/1572	4.74	4.73	4.70	4.64	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	4	5	9			1191/1564		4.73	4.70	4.20	3.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	3	8	5			1181/1559	4.15	4.34	4.29	4.20	3.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	16	2	1	3	2			1095/1352			3.98		3.42
5. Did addiovisual techniques emhance your understanding	2	10	4	_	3	2	-1	3.42	1095/1352	3.03	3.37	3.90	3.00	3.42
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	5	3	5	6		1132/1384		3.79	4.08	3.86	3.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	6	3	3	4	5		1330/1382	3.69	3.91	4.29	4.03	2.95
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	3	1	3	4	10		1071/1368	4.06	4.08	4.30	4.01	3.81
4. Were special techniques successful	10	11	1	2	1	1	4	3.56	688/ 948	3.63	3.94	3.95	3.75	3.56
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	26	2	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	27	2	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	27	1	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	2	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 555	****	4.38	4.29	4.14	****
Seminar		_			_	•								
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	3	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	1	1	0	1	0	0		****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	2	0	0	1 1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	1	0	0	Т	0	1	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.29	3.68	3.54	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 312	****	3.73	3.68	3.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	****/ 53	****	3.86	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26 26	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 30	****	3.80 ****	4.30	4.17	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	1	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 41	****	****	4.10	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	1	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 24	****	****	4.43	4.27	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	1	0	1	1	1	0		****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****
J. MOTO CHIETE EMOUGH PROCESSES TOT ALL CHE SCUGENES	20	т	U	_	1	Τ.	U	5.00	/ 110			3.22	5.05	

Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS

Instructor: PAPADANTONAKIS,

Enrollment: 39
Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 526 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	А	5	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	11						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	General	8	Under-grad	30	Non-major	27
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	7	_		_	
				?	1						

Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS

Instructor: DASGUPTA, NANDI

Enrollment: 38
Questionnaires: 12

ROECONOMICS Baltimore County ANDI Fall 2008 Page 527 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student (	Course I	Evaluation	Quest:	ionnaire
-----------	----------	------------	--------	----------

University of Maryland

	Questions					NA	Fr	equei 2	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General																
1 Did vo	u dain new	General insights,skil		this course	1	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	710/1649	4.14	4.23	4.28	4.11	4.45
		tor make clear			1	0	0	1	3	2	5		1124/1648		4.24	4.23	4.16	4.00
		estions reflect			1	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	704/1375		4.32	4.27	4.10	4.36
		ations reflect			1	8	0	0	1	1	1		1067/1595		4.06	4.20	4.03	4.00
				hat you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	334/1533		4.04	4.04	3.87	4.55
	_	-		what you learned	1	9	0	0	0	0	2		****/1512		3.93	4.10	3.86	****
		system clearly			1	0	0	0	1	3			459/1623		4.29	4.16	4.08	4.55
		was class cance	-		1	0	0	0	2	9	0		1615/1646		4.57	4.69	4.67	3.82
				ing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	7	2		914/1621			4.06	3.96	4.00
		Lecture	2															
1. Were t	he instruc	ctor's lectures	well p	repared	1	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	917/1568	4.35	4.53	4.43	4.39	4.45
2. Did the	e instruct	or seem intere	sted in	the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1572	4.74	4.73	4.70	4.64	5.00
3. Was le	cture mate	erial presented	d and ex	plained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	822/1564	4.22	4.28	4.28	4.20	4.36
4. Did the	e lectures	s contribute to	what y	ou learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	549/1559	4.15	4.34	4.29	4.20	4.64
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques enh	nance yo	ur understanding	1	7	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	690/1352	3.63	3.57	3.98	3.86	4.00
		hat you learned	5	0	2	1	0	2			1232/1384		3.79	4.08	3.86	3.14		
		_	_	to participate	5	0	0	0	2	2			899/1382		3.91	4.29		4.14
3. Did th	e instruct	tor encourage f	air and	open discussion	5	0	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	1115/1368	4.06	4.08	4.30	4.01	3.71
2. Were v	ou provide	Laborat ed with adequat	_	round information	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 243	***	****	4.12	4.08	****
_	-	Seminar																
5. Were c	riteria fo	Seminar or grading made	="		11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	****	3.29	3.68	3.54	****
		Field W	Iorle															
1 Did fi	eld evneri			at you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3 00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****
				ation criteria	11	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 48		****	4.09	3.65	****
z. Dia yo	a cicarry	•		acion criccita		O	Ü	O	_	Ü	U	3.00	, 10			1.05	3.03	
		Self I							_									
		system contribi ions make clear		hat you learned pected goal	11 11	0	0	0	1 0	0	0 1		****/ 53 ****/ 30		3.86	4.30	4.17 4.06	****
									-		_		,					
	Fr							utio	n									
Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad							Rea	asons				Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27							quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	s	6	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 3				_										
56-83							nera	1				1	Under-g	rad 1	.2	Non-	-major	11
84-150																		
Grad.						Ele	ecti <sup>.</sup>	ves				0	#### -				_	h
	P 0											_	respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
				I 0		Otł	ner					3						
		? 1																

Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I

CROTEAU, MARCIA Instructor:

Enrollment: 41 Questionnaires: 27

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 528 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
---------	--------	------------	---------------

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	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	2	2	4	18	4.46	696/1649	4.18	4.23	4.28	4.11	4.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	8	15	4.42	672/1648	4.30	4.24	4.23	4.16	4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	1	1	2	20	4.42	641/1375	4.17	4.32	4.27	4.10	4.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	1	3	7	11	4.27	794/1595	4.04	4.06	4.20	4.03	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	2	3	3	16	4.24	643/1533	4.27	4.04	4.04	3.87	4.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	2	4	4	10	4.10	835/1512	4.06	3.93	4.10	3.86	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	4	4	17	4.42	608/1623	4.27	4.29	4.16	4.08	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	1	24	4.88	697/1646	4.85	4.57	4.69	4.67	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	4	9	6	4.11	859/1621	4.07	4.05	4.06	3.96	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	1	21	4.72	554/1568	4.64	4.53	4.43	4.39	4.72
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	2	21	4.76	912/1572	4.69	4.73	4.70	4.64	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	3	5		4.44	728/1564		4.28	4.28	4.20	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	4	6		4.28	945/1559	4.43	4.34	4.29	4.20	4.28
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	1	1	5	6	7	3.85	848/1352	3.83	3.57	3.98	3.86	3.85
3. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	1	_	5	0	,	3.03	040/1332	3.03	3.37	3.90	3.00	3.65
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	2	3	3	8	4.06	774/1384	3.91	3.79	4.08	3.86	4.06
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	2	5	1	7		1137/1382	3.82	3.91	4.29	4.03	3.69
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	3	3	9	4.25	844/1368	4.13	4.08	4.30	4.01	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	12	8	1	2	2	0	2	3.00	844/ 948	3.79	3.94	3.95	3.75	3.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	26	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	26	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	0	0	0	2	0	0		****/ 555	***	4.38	4.29	4.14	****
Seminar				•	_	•	•							
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.30	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 92	****	****	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 288	****	3.29	3.68	3.54	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	***
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	***
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 312	***	3.73	3.68	3.51	****
0.15														
Self Paced	2.4	0	0	0	2	0	1	2 (7	++++/	2 0.0	2 00	4 20	4 1 7	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	2	0	1		****/ 53	3.86 ***	3.86	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 30 ****/	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	0	0	1	U	0	0	∠.00	****/ 110			3.99	3.83	

Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I

Instructor: CROTEAU, MARCIA

Enrollment: 41
Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 528 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	 5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	11						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	7	C	7	General	2	Under-grad	27	Non-major	24
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	18	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 121 0201 University of Maryland Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Instructor: COLE, RICHARD

Enrollment: 42 Questionnaires: 32

Page 529 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluat	cion	Questior	ınaire
---------	--------	---------	------	----------	--------

							Frequencies				Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Sect		
Questions			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean		
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course					1	0	1	2	5	11	12	4 00	1183/1649	4.18	4.23	4.28	4.11	4.00
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	1	5	13	12	4.16	999/1648	4.30	4.24	4.23	4.16	4.16
		uestions reflec			1	0	1	0	8	5	17	4.19	855/1375	4.17	4.32	4.27	4.10	4.19
		uations reflect			1	11	0	1	4	6	9	4.15	943/1595	4.04	4.06	4.20	4.03	4.15
				what you learned	2	4	0	1	2	5	18	4.54	342/1533	4.27	4.04	4.04	3.87	4.54
				o what you learned	2	15	0	0	3	4	8	4.33		4.06	3.93	4.10	3.86	4.33
		g system clearl			3	0	0	0	5	9	15	4.34		4.27	4.29	4.16	4.08	4.34
		was class cand			2	1	0	0	0	1	28	4.97		4.85	4.57	4.69	4.67	4.97
How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	7	1	0	2	5	9	8	3.96			4.05	4.06	3.96	
		Lectur	e															
l. Were t	he instr	actor's lecture	_	prepared	3	0	0	0	4	5	20	4.55	791/1568	4.64	4.53	4.43	4.39	4.55
		ctor seem inter			2	0	0	3	3	3	21		1321/1572	4.69	4.73	4.70	4.64	4.40
				explained clearly	2	0	0	1	4	7	18	4.40	780/1564		4.28	4.28	4.20	4.40
		es contribute t			2	1	1	2	1	7	18	4.34		4.43	4.34	4.29	4.20	4.34
				our understanding	2	13	3	2	4	2	6		1122/1352		3.57	3.98	3.86	3.3
. Dia aa	idiovibud:	r ccciminqueb cir	nance j	our understanding	_	13	3	_	-	_	Ü	3.33	1122/1332	3.03	3.37	3.70	3.00	3.3.
ב. בגם ו		Discus			1.0	0	0	-1	2	2	4	2 46	1007/1204	2 01	2 70	4 00	2.06	2 40
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned				19	0	2	1	3	3	4		1097/1384		3.79	4.08	3.86	3.46	
<ol> <li>Were all students actively encouraged to participate</li> <li>Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion</li> </ol>				19	0	-	0	3	0	7		1170/1382	3.82	3.91	4.29	4.03	3.62	
				nd open discussion	19	0	3	0	2	1	7		1122/1368	4.13	4.08	4.30	4.01	3.69
. were s	special te	echniques succe	ssiul		19	8	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/ 948	3.79	3.94	3.95	3.75	****
		Labora	tory															
2. Were y	ou provid	ded with adequa	te back	ground information	31	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.08	***
				early specified	30	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	***	4.38	4.29	4.14	****
		Semina	r															
5. Were c	riteria 1	for grading mad	e clear	:	31	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 288	***	3.29	3.68	3.54	****
				Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	.s			Ty	pe			Majors	5
														- 				
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Red	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	`S	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	в 11														
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	8	C 9		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 3	32	Non-	-major	32
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1					jh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sigr	nificar	nt	
				I 0		Ot1	her				2	13						
				? 1														

Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I

ricic rain or raccoor

Instructor: COLE, RICHARD

Enrollment: 38
Questionnaires: 27

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Fall 2008

Page 530 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Frequencies				Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	2	3	8	12	4.08	1136/1649	4.18	4.23	4.28	4.11	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	2	3	5	14		1106/1648	4.30	4.24	4.23	4.16	4.04
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	5	7	12	4.08	925/1375	4.17	4.32	4.27	4.10	4.08
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	8	1	1	5	3	8		1213/1595	4.04	4.06	4.20	4.03	3.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	2	1	4	6	10	3.91	905/1533	4.27	4.04	4.04	3.87	3.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	16	1	0	2	2		4.00	883/1512	4.06	3.93	4.10	3.86	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	7	9		4.12	968/1623	4.27	4.29	4.16	4.08	4.12
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	9	17		1048/1646	4.85	4.57	4.69	4.67	4.65
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	0	3	9	5	4.12	847/1621	4.07	4.05	4.06	3.96	4.12
T a selection														
Lecture	_	0	0	^	2	0	1 1	4 4 4	020/1560	1 (1	4 52	4 42	4 20	4 4 4
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0 1	3 2	8 7	14	4.44		4.64		4.43	4.39	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	2	1	9	16	4.46	1273/1572	4.69	4.73		4.64	4.46 4.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3 1	0	0	1	2	8	12 15	4.42	897/1564 804/1559	4.32	4.28 4.34	4.28	4.20	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	13	1	1	5	2			1034/1352		3.57	3.98		3.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	Т	13	Т	Т	5	2	4	3.54	1034/1352	3.03	3.57	3.90	3.00	3.34
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	3	1	2	3	6	3 53	1068/1384	3.91	3.79	4.08	3.86	3.53
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	5	1	2	3	4		1316/1382	3.82	3.91	4.29	4.03	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	4	3	3	5		1143/1368	4.13	4.08	4.30	4.01	3.60
4. Were special techniques successful	11	11	0	2	1	2	0		****/ 948		3.94	3.95	3.75	****
									,					
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	7	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	2	1	0	1	2	3.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.38	4.29	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 288	****	3.29	3.68	3.54	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	2	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	1	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	****/ 312	****	3.73	3.68	3.51	****
0.10 = 1														
Self Paced	0.0	0	-	•	-	_	_	2 05	40/ 50	2 0 5	2 06	4 26	4 15	2 06
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	40/ 53	3.86	3.86	4.30	4.17	3.86
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	1	0	0	1	1	3		****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/ 24	***	****	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	2	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****

Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I

Instructor: COLE, RICHARD

Enrollment: 38
Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 530 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors				
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	 5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1	
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	13							
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	2	Under-grad	27	Non-major	26	
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough				
				P	0			responses to	gnificant			
				I	0	Other	19	_		-		
				?	1							

Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I

Instructor: MEDICUS, SUZANN

Enrollment: 38 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Fall 2008

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 531 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

	<b>1</b> TD	377	Frequencies				-		ructor	Course	_		Level	
Questions	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	3	2	10	11	3.89	1279/1649	4.18	4.23	4.28	4.11	3.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	3	10	12	4.36	756/1648	4.30	4.24	4.23	4.16	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	12	11	4.19	862/1375	4.17	4.32	4.27	4.10	4.19
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	2	2	2	7	6	3.68	1323/1595	4.04	4.06	4.20	4.03	3.68
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	5	7	12	4.08	768/1533	4.27	4.04	4.04	3.87	4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	12	3	0	0	7	4	3.64	1180/1512	4.06	3.93	4.10	3.86	3.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	1	2	9	12	4.20	883/1623	4.27	4.29	4.16	4.08	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	697/1646	4.85	4.57	4.69	4.67	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	1	4	9	4	3.89	1078/1621	4.07	4.05	4.06	3.96	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	8	17	4.62	715/1568	4.64	4.53	4.43	4.39	4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	4	22	4.85	740/1572	4.69	4.73	4.70	4.64	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	3	13	8	4.00	1127/1564	4.32	4.28	4.28	4.20	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	8	14	4.27	959/1559	4.43	4.34	4.29	4.20	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	2	0	3	7	10	4.05	667/1352	3.83	3.57	3.98	3.86	4.05
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	0	2	6	6	3.88	901/1384	3.91	3.79	4.08	3.86	3.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	2	8	6	4.25	831/1382	3.82	3.91	4.29	4.03	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	654/1368	4.13	4.08	4.30	4.01	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	1	0	2	5	7	4.13	394/ 948	3.79	3.94	3.95	3.75	4.13
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	26	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	26	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	26	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 555	****	4.38	4.29	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	***	****	4.54	4.31	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	***	3.73	3.68	3.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	3.86	3.86	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	***	****	3.99	3.83	****

Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I

Instructor: MEDICUS, SUZANN

Enrollment: 38
Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 531 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	 А	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	3	
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	11							
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	8	General	1	Under-grad	28	Non-major	25	
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h	
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant		
				I	0	Other	22	-				
				?	1							

Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I

Instructor: MEDICUS, SUZANN

Enrollment: 38 Questionnaires: 26 Fall 2008

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Page 532

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	aniei	ncie	g		Tnst	tructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_	Mean	Mean	Mean
General				_	_	_								
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	5	9	11	4.24	986/1649	4.18	4.23	4.28	4.11	4.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	8	13	4.32	811/1648	4.30	4.24	4.23	4.16	4.32
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	0	4	10	9	4.08	922/1375	4.17	4.32	4.27	4.10	4.08
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	5	0	3	1	6	8	4.06	1038/1595	4.04	4.06	4.20	4.03	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	2	0	0	3	7	11	4.38	495/1533	4.27	4.04	4.04	3.87	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	8	0	3	1	5	6	3.93	980/1512	4.06	3.93	4.10	3.86	3.93
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	0	2	8	13	4.33	720/1623	4.27	4.29	4.16	4.08	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	1	2	20	4.83	799/1646	4.85	4.57	4.69	4.67	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	2	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	709/1621	4.07	4.05	4.06	3.96	4.23
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	372/1568	4.64	4.53	4.43	4.39	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	2	20	4.83	790/1572	4.69	4.73	4.70	4.64	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	3	6	11	4.29	908/1564	4.32	4.28	4.28	4.20	4.29
	4	0	0	0	1	6	15	4.64	549/1559	4.43	4.20	4.29	4.20	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	2	0	2	0	-		4.40	399/1352		3.57			4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	U	2	U	ь	12	4.40	399/1352	3.83	3.5/	3.98	3.80	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	1	5	10	4.41	530/1384		3.79	4.08	3.86	4.41
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	1	6	9	4.35	757/1382	3.82	3.91	4.29	4.03	4.35
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	1	2	2	11	4.24	855/1368	4.13	4.08	4.30	4.01	4.24
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	179/ 948	3.79	3.94	3.95	3.75	4.57
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 212	****	****	4.12	4.43	****
	24	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.38	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 555	****	4.38	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	U	U	U	U	U	2	5.00	****/ 555		4.38	4.29	4.14	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.29	3.68	3.54	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 312	****	3.73	3.68	3.51	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out freid activities	27	1	U	U	U	U		5.00	/ 312		3.13	3.00	J.J⊥	
Self Paced		_				_								
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 53	3.86	3.86	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****

Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I

Instructor: MEDICUS, SUZANN

Enrollment: 38
Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 532 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Tarned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1	
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В	9							
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	26	Non-major	25	
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h	
				Р	0			responses to	be si	gnificant		
				I	0	Other	17	-		_		
				?	0							

PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I

Title

Instructor: DAVIS, ALEXIS C

Enrollment: 41 Questionnaires: 23

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 533 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ouestions	NR	NA	Fre	eque: 2	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	4	14	4.39	789/1649		4.23	4.28	4.11	4.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	9	13	4.52	533/1648	4.30	4.24	4.23	4.16	4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	2	8	10	4.09	922/1375	4.17	4.32	4.27	4.10	4.09
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5 2	1	1 1	1	6	9 13	4.17 4.45	930/1595	4.04	4.06	4.20	4.03	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1 1	∠ 5	0	1	2 2	4 4	10	4.45	432/1533 574/1512	4.27 4.06	4.04 3.93	4.04	3.87 3.86	4.45 4.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	2	5	12	4.35	894/1623	4.06	4.29	4.10	4.08	4.35
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	0		4.10	664/1646	4.27	4.29	4.16	4.08	4.10
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	2	0	0	2	12		4.11	847/1621		4.05	4.06		4.11
J. Now would fou grade the overall teaching elicotiveness	3	-	Ü	Ü	-		•		017/1021	1.07	1.05	1.00	3.50	1.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	3	18	4.70	588/1568		4.53	4.43	4.39	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	21	4.87	690/1572	4.69	4.73	4.70	4.64	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	5	15	4.48	689/1564	4.32	4.28	4.28	4.20	4.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0 14	0	1	3 3	2	18 3	4.65 3.78	524/1559 900/1352	4.43	4.34	4.29 3.98	4.20 3.86	4.65 3.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques emhance your understanding	U	14	U	1	3	2	3	3.78	900/1352	3.83	3.57	3.98	3.80	3.78
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	4	6	8	4.11	761/1384	3.91	3.79	4.08	3.86	4.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	1	3	6	8	4.00	946/1382	3.82	3.91	4.29	4.03	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	3	3		4.53	639/1368	4.13	4.08	4.30	4.01	4.53
4. Were special techniques successful	4	10	1	0	4	2	2	3.44	727/ 948	3.79	3.94	3.95	3.75	3.44
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	1	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/ 555	****	4.38	4.29	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	****	3.29	3.68	3.54	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	1.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 312	***	3.73	3.68	3.51	***
0.15 5 1														
Self Paced	0.1	^	0	0	^	-1	-1	4 50	++++/	2 06	2 00	4 20	A 10	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 53 ****/ 20	3.86 ****	3.86	4.30	4.17	****
<ol> <li>Did study questions make clear the expected goal</li> <li>Were your contacts with the instructor helpful</li> </ol>	21 21	0	0	0	0	1 1	1 1	4.50	****/ 30 ****/ 41	****	****	4.16 4.43	4.06 4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 24	****	****	4.43	4.27	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****
3. Here there enough proceeds for all the students	21	U	J	0	_	U	_	1.00	/ 110			3.99	5.05	

Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I

Instructor: DAVIS, ALEXIS C

Enrollment: 41
Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 533 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	22
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14	-		_	
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 122 0101 University of Maryland

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING II Instructor: MCBRIDE, CHUCK

Enrollment: 38
Questionnaires: 36

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

 ryland
 Page 534

 nty
 FEB 11, 2009

 8
 Job IRBR3029

								FIE	equer	icres			Inst	cructor	Course	Dept	OMBC	телет	Sect
		Question	s		I	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mear
		Genera	 1																
1. Did v	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course		20	0	0	2	2	5	7	4.06	1142/1649	4.23	4.23	4.28	4.11	4.06
		ctor make clear				20	0	0	3	1	2			977/1648			4.23	4.16	4.19
		uestions reflec		-		20	0	1	1	0	3		4.38			4.32	4.27	4.10	4.38
		uations reflect				20	6	1	0	3	3			1311/1595		4.06	4.20	4.03	3.70
		eadings contrib		-		20	1	1	0	1	3	10		476/1533		4.04	4.04	3.87	4.40
		signments contr				20	9	1	0	2	1	3		****/1512		3.93	4.10	3.86	****
		g system clearl		-		20	0	1	0	1	2	-	4.50			4.29	4.16		4.50
		was class cand		11100		19	0	1	0	0	8			1370/1646		4.57	4.69	4.67	
	-	grade the overa		hing effective		21	1	0	1	3	6			1030/1621				3.96	
							_	-	_	_	-	_							
		Lectur		_															
		uctor's lecture				20	0	0	1	2	4	9		1070/1568			4.43	4.39	
		ctor seem inter		-		20	0	0	1	0	2	13		1046/1572		4.73		4.64	
		terial presente			ly :	20	0	0	4	2	4			1297/1564		4.28	4.28	4.20	3.75
	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	3	1	1	1	10	3.88	1211/1559	4.14	4.34	4.29	4.20	3.88
5. Did a	udiovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understand	ing :	20	13	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/1352	3.45	3.57	3.98	3.86	****
		Discus	sion																
1. Did c	lass disc	ussions contrib		what vou learn	ed .	31	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	****/1384	4.07	3.79	4.08	3.86	***
		nts actively en				31	0	0	2	0	2	1		****/1382		3.91	4.29	4.03	***
		ctor encourage				31	0	0	2	1	1			****/1368		4.08	4.30	4.01	***
		echniques succe		a open arboabb		31	3	1	0	0	1	_		****/ 948					****
		-												, -					
	_	Labora	-		_														
5. Were	requiremen	nts for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	d :	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.38	4.29	4.14	****
				Ī	Freque	ncy	Dist	ribu	atior	1									
Credits I	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Gra	ades				Rea	sons				Ty	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 8				nnire	ed fo	or Ma	ior		2	Graduat	 e	0	Majo		0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			1000	1411	-u _ (	,	ΞΟ.	_	_	Graduat	_		1.10. ) (	·±	3
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C 2			Ger	neral					0	Under-q	rad ?	6	Non-	major	36
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			Gel	ıcı aı	-				U	onder -g	raa 3	0	11011-	a JUL	50
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0			E1-	ectiv	700				0	#### - 1	Maana +	horo -	re not	anoua	rh
Grau.	U	3.30-4.00	3	P 0			ЕТЕ	CLIV	65				U	respons					111
				I 0			Oth	or				1	1	respons	co LU L	c sign	ııııdı.	LC	
								TC: T											
				5 0			001					_	-						

Course-Section: ECON 122 0201 University of Maryland Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING II

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Instructor: MCBRIDE, CHUCK Enrollment:

40

Questionnaires: 25

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 535

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

		Questions	· 			NR	NA	Fr∈ 1	_	ncie 3		5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
2. Did the 3. Did the 4. Did ot: 5. Did as 6. Did wr 7. Was the 8. How many	e instruc e exam qu her evalu signed re itten ass e grading ny times	General w insights,skil tor make clear estions reflect adings contribu ignments contri system clearly was class cance rade the overal	ls from the exp the exp the exp te to w bute to rexplain	ected goals epected goals ected goals hat you learn what you lea	arned	0 0 0 0 0 0 0		0 0 0 1 0 0 0	1 0 0 1 0 2 0 0	3 4	2	7 14 9 15 7	4.20 4.44 3.94 4.40 4.13 4.46 4.29	1057/1649 966/1648 617/1375 1161/1595 476/1533 817/1512 1370/1646 1426/1621	4.40 4.49 4.02 4.19 3.69 4.49 4.58	4.32 4.06 4.04 3.93 4.29 4.57	4.28 4.23 4.27 4.20 4.04 4.10 4.16 4.69 4.06		4.16 4.20 4.44 3.94 4.40 4.13 4.46 4.29 3.35
Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful					rly ding ned ate sion	0 0 0 0 0 0	17	2 1 2 0 1 0	5 4 0 1 2	4 0 1	2 8 4	21 8 10 0	4.76 3.72 3.68 2.00 3.88 3.63 3.88	1279/1568 912/1572 1311/1564 1315/1559 1335/1352 901/1384 1165/1382 1043/1368 ****/ 948	4.76 4.18 4.14 3.45 4.07 4.21 4.08	4.73 4.28 4.34 3.57 3.79 3.91 4.08	4.70 4.28 4.29 3.98 4.08 4.29 4.30	4.64 4.20 4.20 3.86 3.86 4.03 4.01	4.00 4.76 3.72 3.68 2.00 3.88 3.63 3.88 ****
5. Were c	riteria f	Seminar or grading made				24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	***	3.29	3.68	3.54	***
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Gr	Freque	ency	Dist	cribu		n ason	s			Ty	pe			Majors	
00-27 28-55 56-83 84-150 Grad.	0 3 2 6 0	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99 2.00-2.99 3.00-3.49 3.50-4.00	0 0 2 2 2 9	A 10 B 8 C 3 D 0 F 0 P 0 I 0			Ger Ele	quire neral ectiv	ed f				1 0 1 8	Graduat Under-g #### - :	e rad 2 Means t		Majo Non- re not	or major enoug	0 25

Course-Section: ECON 122 0401 University of Maryland

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Title	PRIN OF ACCOUNTING II
Instructor:	MCBRIDE, CHUCK
- 11	2.0

Enrollment: 39 Questionnaires: 10

Page 536 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
---------	--------	------------	---------------

		Fre	eaner	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	Λ	Λ	Λ	6	1	4.40	776/1649	4.23	4.23	4.28	4.11	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	441/1648	4.40	4.24	4.23	4.16	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	665/1375		4.32	4.27	4.10	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	7	2	2	4.14	956/1595	4.49	4.32	4.27	4.10	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	476/1533	4.19	4.04	4.20	3.87	4.40
	-	2	-	1	0	2	_	4.25	687/1512		3.93	4.10	3.86	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.40	635/1623				4.08	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	6	4				4.29	4.16		
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	4		1287/1646		4.57	4.69	4.67	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	U	U	U	U	ь	2	4.25	687/1621	3.98	4.05	4.06	3.96	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	731/1568	4.35	4.53	4.43	4.39	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	7		1034/1572	4.76	4.73	4.70	4.64	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	887/1564	4.18	4.28	4.28	4.20	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	832/1559	4.14	4.34	4.29	4.20	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	0	2	1	0	1		1219/1352		3.57	3.98	3.86	3.00
5. Did dudiovisual recimitates emance your understanding	U	O	O		_	U	_	3.00	1217/1332	3.13	3.37	3.70	3.00	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	673/1384	4.07	3.79	4.08	3.86	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	616/1382	4.21	3.91	4.29	4.03	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	844/1368	4.08	4.08	4.30	4.01	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	1	0	1	0	0		****/ 948	3.92	3.94	3.95	3.75	****
1. HOLO DECOLUL CCOMILMACO DACCEDDIAL	•		_	J	_	J	J	2.00	, 510	5.72	3.71	5.75	3.73	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	9
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there a	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sign	nificant	
				I	0	Other	9	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 122 0501 University of Maryland Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING II Baltimore County Instructor: HARDY, TIMOTHY

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 8

15

Page 537 FEB 11, 2009 Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

		Ouestionnaire

							Fre		ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	-	UMBC		
		Question	ıs		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did vo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski		m this course	1	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	933/1649	4.23	4.23	4.28	4.11	4.29
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	672/1648		4.24	4.23	4.16	4.43
		uestions reflec			1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	488/1375	4.49	4.32	4.27	4.10	4.57
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	956/1595	4.02	4.06	4.20	4.03	4.14
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	966/1533	4.19	4.04	4.04	3.87	3.86
6. Did wr	ritten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	2	1	1	1	2	0	1	2.80	1476/1512	3.69	3.93	4.10	3.86	2.80
7. Was th	ne gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	671/1623	4.49	4.29	4.16	4.08	4.38
8. How ma	ny times	was class cand	elled		1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1646	4.58	4.57	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	812/1621	3.98	4.05	4.06	3.96	4.14
		Lectur	·e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	prepared	1	0	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	1279/1568	4.35	4.53	4.43	4.39	4.00	
		n the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	715/1572	4.76	4.73	4.70	4.64	4.86		
3. Was le	cture ma	xplained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	754/1564	4.18	4.28	4.28	4.20	4.43		
4. Did th	Was lecture material presented and explained clear Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	0	1	4	2	4.14	1045/1559	4.14	4.34	4.29	4.20	4.14
5. Did av	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand						0	1	0	4	2	4.00	690/1352	3.45	3.57	3.98	3.86	4.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	937/1384	4.07	3.79	4.08	3.86	3.80
2. Were a	all stude	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	342/1382	4.21	3.91	4.29	4.03	4.80
3. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	3	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	948/1368	4.08	4.08	4.30	4.01	4.00
4. Were s	special t	echniques succe	ssful		3	2	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	645/ 948	3.92	3.94	3.95	3.75	3.67
				Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	<b>:</b>
00-27							quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	;	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	1
28-55								_						_			_	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 4		Gei	nera	l				1	Under-g	rad	8	Non-	major	7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 3.50-4.00	3 0	D 0											_			
Grad.	0	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### -				_	jh		
				P 0								_	respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Ot]	her					5						

Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING II

Instructor: MEDICUS, SUZANN

Enrollment: 40
Questionnaires: 24

MEDICUS, SUZANN Fal

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2008

Page 538 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
---------	--------	------------	---------------

		Question	S		NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain new	insights,ski		this course	1	0	0	0	2	13	8	4.26	954/1649	4.23	4.23	4.28	4.11	4.26
_	_	or make clear			1	0	0	0	1	7	15	4.61	441/1648	4.40	4.24	4.23	4.16	4.61
		stions reflec			1	0	0	0	1	6	16	4.65		4.49	4.32	4.27	4.10	4.65
		tions reflect			1	7	0	0	3	7	6	4.19		4.02	4.06	4.20	4.03	4.19
5. Did as	signed rea	dings contrib	ute to wl	nat you learned	1	1	0	3	3	9	7	3.91	915/1533	4.19	4.04	4.04	3.87	3.91
				what you learned	1	13	1	0	3	4	2	3.60	1202/1512	3.69	3.93	4.10	3.86	3.60
		system clearl			1	0	0	0	1	4	18	4.74	241/1623	4.49	4.29	4.16	4.08	4.74
8. How man	ny times w	as class canc	elled		1	1	0	0	1	0	21	4.91	664/1646	4.58	4.57	4.69	4.67	4.91
9. How wo	uld you gr	ade the overa	ll teach	ing effectiveness	10	1	0	0	1	8	4	4.23	709/1621	3.98	4.05	4.06	3.96	4.23
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instruc	tor's lecture	s well p	repared	2	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	372/1568	4.35	4.53	4.43	4.39	4.82
2. Did the	e instruct	or seem inter	ested in	the subject	2	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	815/1572	4.76	4.73	4.70	4.64	4.82
3. Was le	cture mate	rial presente	d and exp	plained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	7	15	4.68	447/1564	4.18	4.28	4.28	4.20	4.68
4. Did the	e lectures	contribute t	o what y	ou learned	2	0	0	0	2	5	15	4.59	596/1559	4.14	4.34	4.29	4.20	4.59
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques en	hance yo	ur understanding	2	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	129/1352	3.45	3.57	3.98	3.86	4.82
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discus	nat you learned	13	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	582/1384	4.07	3.79	4.08	3.86	4.36		
2. Were a	Did class discussions contribute to what you learne Were all students actively encouraged to participat					0	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	1031/1382	4.21	3.91	4.29	4.03	3.91
3. Did the						0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	881/1368	4.08	4.08	4.30	4.01	4.18
4. Were s	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussi Were special techniques successful					0	0	1	0	6	4	4.18	370/ 948	3.92	3.94	3.95	3.75	4.18
		Labora	tory															
5. Were r	equirement	s for lab rep	orts clea	arly specified	22	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 555	***	4.38	4.29	4.14	***
		Semina	r															
5. Were c	riteria fo	or grading mad	e clear		22	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 288	****	3.29	3.68	3.54	****
		Field	Work															
5. Did co	nferences	help you carr	y out fi	eld activities	21	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 312	****	3.73	3.68	3.51	****
		Self	Paced															
5. Were th	here enoug	h proctors for	r all the	e students	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	***
		Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	n											
Credits E	arned	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	;		
00-27												0	Cradust		0	 Ma≓a		0
00-27 28-55	0 5	1.00-1.99	0	A 5 B 9		кес	4uır	ea I	or Ma	ijor	B	U	Graduate	<del>=</del>	U	Majo	Σ	U
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	3	C 5		Ger	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad 2	4	Non-	major	24
84-150	34-150 2 3.00-3.49 3 D 0												5				3	
Grad.						Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### - I	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ıh
	ad. 0 3.50-4.00 4 F 0												response				_	
				I 0		Oth	her				1	.6	_		3			
				? 1														

Baltimore County

University of Maryland Page 539 Fall 2008

		Ouestionnaire

		Questions		NR	NA	Fr 1	_	ncies 3	5 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	e Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General															
1 Did vo	nı dəin ne	ew insights,skills fr	om this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	996/1649	4.22	4.23	4.28	4.29	4.22
		tor make clear the $\epsilon$		0	0	0	0	2	6	1		1245/1648		4.24	4.23	4.25	3.89
		estions reflect the		0	0	0	1	2	3	3		1044/1375		4.32	4.27	4.37	3.89
		sations reflect the $\epsilon$		0	6	0	0	1	1	1		1067/1595		4.06	4.20	4.22	4.00
		adings contribute to		0	0	0	1	1	5	2	3.89	935/1533	3.89	4.04	4.04	4.04	3.89
		signments contribute		0	6	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	883/1512		3.93	4.10	4.14	4.00
		system clearly expl		0	0	0	2	0	1	6	4.22	849/1623	4.22	4.29	4.16	4.21	4.22
		was class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.57	4.69	4.63	5.00
		grade the overall tea	ching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1123/1621	3.83	4.05	4.06	4.01	3.83
		Lecture															
1. Were t	the instru	ctor's lectures well	prepared	1	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	1121/1568	4.25	4.53	4.43	4.39	4.25
		tor seem interested		1	0	1	0	1	0	6	4.25	1400/1572	4.25	4.73	4.70	4.73	4.25
		erial presented and		1	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1235/1564	3.88	4.28	4.28	4.27	3.88
4. Did th	ne lecture	es contribute to what	you learned	1	0	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	1060/1559		4.34	4.29	4.33	4.13
5. Did au	udiovisual	your understanding	2	0	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	1016/1352	3.57	3.57	3.98	4.07	3.57	
		Discussion															
		ussions contribute to		5	0	1	0	1	1	1		1192/1384			4.08	3.99	3.25
		nts actively encourag		5	0	1	1	0	0	2		1275/1382		3.91	4.29	4.19	3.25
		ctor encourage fair a	nd open discussion	5	0	0	2	0	0			1181/1368		4.08	4.30	4.21	3.50
4. Were s	special te	echniques successful		5	3	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 948	****	3.94	3.95	3.89	****
		Laboratory															
5. Were n	requiremen	nts for lab reports o	learly specified	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.38	4.29	4.33	****
		Seminar		_			_		_								
5. Were d	criteria f	for grading made clea	r	7	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 288	****	3.29	3.68	3.65	****
E Did as	an farangag	Field Work help you carry out	field agriculting	8	0	٥	1	0	0	0	2 00	****/ 312	****	2 72	2 60	2 50	****
5. Dia co	Jillerences	s help you carry out	ileid accivities	0	U	U		U	U	U	2.00	/ 312		3.73	3.00	3.39	
			Frequ	ıency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27						 quir	ed f	or Ma	 ajors	 5	0	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r r	0
28-55						-			-						3		
56-83						nera	1				2	Under-g	rad	9	Non-	-major	9
84-150												_				-	
Grad.	d. 0 3.50-4.00 0 F 0					ecti	ves				0	#### -	Means t	there a	are not	enoug	jh
			P 0									respons	es to k	oe sigr	nificar	nt	
			I 0		Ot!	her					2						
			? 0														

Course-Section: ECON 263 0101 Title SPORTS ECONOMICS

Instructor: COATES, DENNIS

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 9 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029 Course-Section: ECON 280 0101 University of Maryland Baltimore County

Title INTERNATIONAL ECONOMY Fall 2008

Instructor: TAKACS, WENDY E

Enrollment: 21 Questionnaires: 10

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 540

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

			Fr	eque	ncies	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	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	4	4	4.20	1027/1649	4.20	4.23	4.28	4.29	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	441/1648	4.60	4.24	4.23	4.25	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	855/1375	4.20	4.32	4.27	4.37	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	2	3	3.70	1311/1595	3.70	4.06	4.20	4.22	3.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	945/1533	3.88	4.04	4.04	4.04	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learne	d 0	0	1	0	1	5	3	3.90	1022/1512	3.90	3.93	4.10	4.14	3.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	757/1623	4.30	4.29	4.16	4.21	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	1004/1646	4.70	4.57	4.69	4.63	4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivenes	s 2	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	687/1621	4.25	4.05	4.06	4.01	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	852/1568	4.50	4.53	4.43	4.39	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	931/1572		4.73	4.70	4.73	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2		0	0	1	2	5	4.50	651/1564		4.28	4.28	4.27	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	861/1559	4.38	4.34	4.29	4.33	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	1219/1352	3.00	3.57	3.98	4.07	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	0	3 50	****/1384	****	3.79	4.08	3.99	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	774/1382		3.91	4.29	4.19	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/1368		4.08	4.30	4.21	****
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 948			3.95		****
Fre	quenc	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
		0	2											
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade	S			Re	asons	S			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 3		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	5	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	3

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	10	Non-major	7
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ī
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	6	_			
				?	0						

Title INTERMED ACCOUNTING I

Instructor: ST MARTIN, JEAN

Enrollment: 34
Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 541 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	mier	ncies			Tnet	ructor	Course	Dent	UMBC	T.evel	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NΙΔ	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	9	17	4.59	523/1649	4.61	4.23	4.28	4.27	4.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	18	4.59	452/1648	4.67	4.24	4.23	4.18	4.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	20	4.67	401/1375	4.74	4.32	4.27	4.22	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	3	6	15	4.36	685/1595	4.51	4.06	4.20	4.21	4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	1	3	6	11	4.29	594/1533	4.21	4.04	4.04	4.05	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	2	1	5	2	13	4.00	883/1512	3.96	3.93	4.10	4.11	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	3	20	4.56	448/1623	4.65	4.29	4.16	4.08	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	21	4.81	833/1646	4.74	4.57	4.69	4.67	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	216/1621	4.84	4.05	4.06	4.02	4.68
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	7	16	4.56	779/1568	4.75	4.53	4.43	4.39	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	7	18	4.65	1084/1572	4.83	4.73	4.70	4.64	4.65
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	5	19	4.72	406/1564	4.73	4.28	4.28	4.25	4.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	4	19	4.62	573/1559	4.70	4.34	4.29	4.23	4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	14	3	0	0	3	4	3.50	1049/1352	3.85	3.57	3.98	3.97	3.50
Discussion					_	_	_							
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	1	3		****/1384	3.20	3.79	4.08	4.11	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	0	0	1	1	3		****/1382	4.30	3.91	4.29	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	0	0	2	1	2		****/1368	4.10	4.08	4.30	4.39	****
4. Were special techniques successful	22	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 948	***	3.94	3.95	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/ 221	****	****	1 16	4.07	****
		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	****	$4.16 \\ 4.12$	3.89	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	26 26	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 212	****	****	4.12	4.21	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	26	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 209	****	****	4.40	4.12	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	26	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 555	****	4.38	4.35	4.12	****
J. Were requirements for tab reports creatry specified	20	U	U	U	U	U	_	3.00	/ 333		1.30	1.27	7.22	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.55	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.30	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	4.46	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	****	3.29	3.68	3.58	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.43	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 312	****	3.73	3.68	3.60	****
Self Paced					_	_	•				0 0 5	4 0 5	4 0.5	
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	***	3.86	4.30	4.32	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.44	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	0	0	1	0	0	0	∠.00	****/ 110	^ ~ * * *	^ ^ * *	3.99	4.05	^ ^ * *

Title INTERMED ACCOUNTING I

Instructor: ST MARTIN, JEAN

Enrollment: 34
Questionnaires: 27

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 541 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	27	Non-major	27
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	19	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 301 0201 University of Maryland Title INTERMED ACCOUNTING I

Baltimore County Fall 2008

ST MARTIN, JEAN Instructor:

Enrollment: 28 Questionnaires: 16

Page 542 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
---------	--------	------------	---------------

		Question	s		NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	 1															
		w insights,ski			0	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	484/1649	4.61	4.23	4.28	4.27	4.63
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	263/1648	4.67	4.24	4.23	4.18	4.75
		estions reflec			0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	226/1375	4.74	4.32	4.27	4.22	4.81
		ations reflect			0	4	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	321/1595	4.51	4.06	4.20	4.21	4.67
				hat you learned	0	2	1	0	2	4	7	4.14	718/1533	4.21	4.04	4.04	4.05	4.14
				what you learned	0	2	2	0	3	1	8	3.93	994/1512	3.96	3.93	4.10	4.11	3.93
		system clearl		ned	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	220/1623	4.65	4.29	4.16	4.08	4.75
	-	was class canc			0	1	0	0	0	5	10		1037/1646	4.74	4.57	4.69	4.67	4.67
9. How wou	ıld you g	grade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	4	1	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1621	4.84	4.05	4.06	4.02	5.00
		Lectur																
		ctor's lecture			1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	171/1568	4.75	4.53	4.43	4.39	4.93
		tor seem inter			1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1572	4.83	4.73	4.70	4.64	5.00
				plained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	374/1564	4.73	4.28	4.28	4.25	4.73
		es contribute t	_		2	0	0	0	0 1	3 2	11	4.79	347/1559	4.70	4.34	4.29	4.23	4.79
5. Did aud	liovisual	tecnniques en	nance yo	our understanding	1	10	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	556/1352	3.85	3.57	3.98	3.97	4.20
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute to v	hat you learned	6	0	2	1	3	1	3	3.20	1209/1384	3.20	3.79	4.08	4.11	3.20
2. Were al	ll studer	nts actively en	couraged	l to participate	6	0	1	0	1	1	7	4.30	799/1382	4.30	3.91	4.29	4.37	4.30
3. Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair and	l open discussion	6	0	1	0	2	1	6	4.10	920/1368	4.10	4.08	4.30	4.39	4.10
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succe	ssful		6	7	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 948	****	3.94	3.95	4.00	***
		Semina	r															
5. Were cr	riteria f	for grading mad	e clear		15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	***	3.29	3.68	3.58	***
				Frequ	ıency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors			
														-  -				
00-27 28-55	0	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0	A 5 B 5		ке	quir	ea I	or Ma	ıjor	S	1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	)r.	2
28-55 56-83	6	2.00-2.99	2	В 5 С 5		Co	nera	1				4	Under-q	rad 1	.6	Non	-major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0		GE	пета.	т				7	onder-g.	rau 1	. 0	MOII-	iiia jut	14
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		E.I	ecti	ves.				0	#### - 1	Means +	here a	re not	enoua	h
Grau.	U	3.30-4.00	J	P 0		ът	CCCI	v CD				U	respons				_	11
				I 0		0+	her					9	I CSPOIIS		,c bigi	ıııcaı		
				5 0		JL						-						

INTERMED ACCOUNTING II

Title Instructor: CROTEAU, MARCIA

Enrollment: 13 Questionnaires: 10

Fall 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 543 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

							Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		Mean
		~																
1 Did 110	aain na	Genera		. this source	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	186/1649	4.90	4.23	4.28	4.27	4 00
_	_	v insights,ski			0	0	0	0	0	1 2	8	4.80	216/1648		4.23	4.28	4.27	4.90 4.80
		or make clear	_	_	-	-	-	-	0	_	-							
	_	estions reflec		_	0	0	0	0	-	2	8	4.80	233/1375		4.32	4.27	4.22	4.80
		ations reflect	_	_	0	1	0	0	0	2	7		218/1595		4.06	4.20	4.21	4.78
	_	_		what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	327/1533		4.04	4.04	4.05	4.56
				what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	263/1512		3.93	4.10	4.11	4.67
		system clearl		ined	1	0	0	0	0	1		4.89	130/1623		4.29	4.16	4.08	4.89
		vas class canc			0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1646		4.57	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How wo	uld you gi	rade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	374/1621	4.50	4.05	4.06	4.02	4.50
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instruc	ctor's lecture		prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	245/1568	4.90	4.53	4.43	4.39	4.90
		or seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1572			4.70	4.64	5.00
				plained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	263/1564		4.28	4.28	4.25	4.80
		s contribute t			0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70			4.34	4.29	4.23	4.70
					0	0	1	1	1	1	6		475/1559					
5. Did au	.aiovisuai	techniques en	nance yo	our understanding	U	U	1	1	Τ	1	О	4.00	690/1352	4.00	3.57	3.98	3.97	4.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discus	what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	201/1384	4.80	3.79	4.08	4.11	4.80		
2. Were a	Did class discussions contribute to what you learn Were all students actively encouraged to participa					0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	342/1382	4.80	3.91	4.29	4.37	4.80
	Were all students actively encouraged to participation of the instructor encourage fair and open discuss:					0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	369/1368	4.80	4.08	4.30	4.39	4.80
	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discuss:					3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 948			3.95	4.00	****
		_																
E Works re	o and moment	Labora	-	early specified	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/ 555	****	1 20	4.29	4.22	****
o. were i	equirement	s for lab rep	OILS CIE	early specified	9	U	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	/ 555		4.30	4.29	4.22	
		Field																
1. Did fi	eld experi	lence contribu	te to wh	nat you learned	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****
2. Did yo	u clearly	understand yo	ur evalı	uation criteria	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	***	4.09	4.21	****
4. To wha	t degree o	could you disc	uss your	evaluations	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	***	****	4.38	4.32	****
		Self	Dagod															
1 Did co	lf-paged s			what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	3.86	4.30	4.32	****
		ions make clea			9	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.44	****
_,	1			-F	-	_	-	-	_		_		,					
				Frequ	lency	Dist	trib	ution	1									
Credits E	arned	Expected Grades				Rea	sons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	}		
												1						
00-27 28-55	0 0	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0 1	A 3 B 4		кес	quire	ed fo	or Ma	:Jor	ន	1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or,	0
	-			= =		0		1				0	IIn.d	~~d 1	0	NT	mn +	1.0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1			Gei	nera:	L				U	Under-g	rad 1	. 0	non-	-major	10
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D 0								•		_				
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		EΙθ	ecti	ves				0	#### -				_	ın
		P 0								_	respons	es to b	e sign	ıficar	ıt			
				I 0		Otl	ner					6						
				? 0														

Course-Section: ECON 311 0101 University of Maryland

Title Baltimore County INTERM MICROECON ANALY Instructor: COATES, DENNIS Fall 2008

Enrollment: 79

Questionnaires: 53

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 544

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

			Fr	eque	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	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	Ω	1	1	Q	19	24	4 21	1018/1649	3.66	4.23	4.28	4.27	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	11	19	20		1070/1648	3.63	4.24	4.23	4.18	4.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	4	17	29	4.36	714/1375	3.75	4.32	4.27	4.22	4.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	34	1	4	5	5	4		1459/1595	3.26	4.06	4.20	4.21	3.37
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	22	3	7	8	7	4		1430/1533	3.14	4.04	4.04	4.05	3.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	44	2	2	1	1	0		****/1512	2.76	3.93	4.10	4.11	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	4	9	11	27	4.20	883/1623	4.06	4.29	4.16	4.08	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0		51	5.00	1/1646	4.90	4.57	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	2	1	1	4	23	12	4.07	875/1621	3.77	4.05	4.06	4.02	4.07
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	6	11	33	4.44	930/1568	4.15	4.53	4.43	4.39	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	6	14	31	4.49	1249/1572	4.50	4.73	4.70	4.64	4.49
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	3	5	18	25	4.27	918/1564	3.72	4.28	4.28	4.25	4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	5	9	35	4.46	749/1559	3.87	4.34	4.29	4.23	4.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	35	2	2	2	4	4	3.43	1090/1352	3.33	3.57	3.98	3.97	3.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	28	0	7	2	4	9	3		1272/1384	2.73	3.79	4.08	4.11	2.96
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	29	0	5	3	7	3	6		1311/1382	3.40	3.91	4.29	4.37	3.08
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	29	0	4	2	7	6	5		1252/1368	3.39	4.08	4.30	4.39	3.25
4. Were special techniques successful	28	22	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 948	3.13	3.94	3.95	4.00	****
Fire en		. D	d lo-											
Frequ	iency	DIST	Lrib	utlo	11									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	А	4	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	В	18						
56-83	11	2.00-2.99	4	C	12	General	2	Under-grad	53	Non-major	50
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	36				
				?	1						

INTERM MICROECON ANALY

Title Instructor: BRADLEY, MICHAE

Enrollment: 33 Questionnaires: 17

Fall 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 545 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

							Fre	equer	ncies	;		Inst	ructor	<u>.</u>	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Ran	ık	Mean	_	Mean		Mean
		General						_	_	_	_								
		v insights,skil			0	0	0	3	3	5	6		1335/1		3.66		4.28	4.27	3.82
		or make clear			0	0	0	2	4	5	6		1245/1		3.63		4.23	4.18	3.88
		estions reflect			0	0	0	2	3	4	8		932/1			4.32	4.27	4.22	4.06
		ations reflect			0	14 0	0	2 1	-	0	1		****/1			4.06	4.20	4.21	
	_	-		what you learned	0		-	1	4 1	6	6				3.14		4.04	4.05	4.00
				o what you learned	0	13 0	1	0	2	1 5	0		****/1			3.93	4.10	4.11	
		system clearly was class cance		Inea	0	0	0	0	0	3		4.47	541/1 799/1		4.06 4.90	4.29	4.16	4.08	4.47
				hing effectiveness	4	0	0	2	2	3 ⊿					3.77		4.69 4.06		4.82 3.92
9. HOW WOL	uia you gi	ade the overal	.i teaci	ning effectiveness	4	U	U	۷	۷	4	5	3.94	1030/1	.021	3.77	4.05	4.00	4.02	3.94
		Lecture	2																
1. Were th	he instruc	ctor's lectures	well i	orepared	0	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	969/1	568	4.15	4.53	4.43	4.39	4.41
		or seem intere			0	0	0	0	0	3			790/1		4.50	4.73	4.70	4.64	
				xplained clearly	0	0	0	4	2	4	7	3.82	1262/1	564	3.72	4.28	4.28	4.25	3.82
		s contribute to			0	0	2	2	0	4	9	3.94	1166/1	.559	3.87	4.34	4.29	4.23	3.94
				our understanding	2	10	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	1177/1	.352	3.33	3.57	3.98	3.97	3.20
		1	1																
		Discuss	sion																
1. Did cla	ass discus	ssions contribu	ite to	what you learned	9	0	3	2	1	0	2	2.50	1346/1	.384	2.73	3.79	4.08	4.11	2.50
2. Were al	ll student	s actively end	courage	d to participate	9	0	1	2	1	1	3	3.38	1240/1	.382	3.40	3.91	4.29	4.37	3.38
3. Did the	e instruct	or encourage f	air and	d open discussion	9	0	1	2	1	1	3	3.38	1215/1	368	3.39	4.08	4.30	4.39	3.38
4. Were sp	pecial ted	chniques succes	sful	_	9	5	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/	948	3.13	3.94	3.95	4.00	****
		Laborat	-																
2. Were yo	ou provide	ed with adequat	e back	ground information	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	243	****	****	4.12	3.89	****
1		Seminar		2 . 1	1.4	-	0	•	0	-	-	4 50	4.4.4.4./	0.0	ale ale ale ale	ale ale ale ale	4 = 4	4 60	ate ate ate ate
1. Were as	ssigned to	opics relevant	to the	announced theme	14	1	0	0	0	1	Τ	4.50	****/	88	****	****	4.54	4.63	***
		Field W	Iork																
1 Did fi	old owners			hat you learned	16	0	1	Λ	0	0	0	1.00	****/	52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****
				uation criteria	16	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/	48	****	****	4.09		****
z. Dia you	a cicarry	unacistana you	ii cvai	uacion criccita	10	O	O	U	_	O	Ü	3.00	,	10			1.05	1.21	
				Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ition	1										
				_	-														
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	;				Tyr	pe			Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А б		Rec	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	S	1	Grad	luate	9	0	Majo	r	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В 5								_				_			
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	5	C 2		Ger	neral	-				2	Unde	er-gi	rad 1	7	Non-	major	15
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D 0								-	p. 0. 12 ··		_				,
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ectiv	res				1			Means t			_	n
				P 0		0.1					_	0	resp	onse	es to b	e sign	ııııcar	IT	
				I 0		Oth	ıer				1	2							
				? 1															

Course-Section: ECON 311 0301 University of Maryland Title INTERM MICROECON ANALY Baltimore County

Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 546 FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: VIAUROUX, CHRIS

Enrollment: 37
Ouestionnaires: 23

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions 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 7 0 7 5 4 2.96 1611/1649 3.66 4.23 4.28 4.27 2.96 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 4 5 5 7 2 2.91 1604/1648 3.63 4.24 4.23 4.18 2.91 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 8 2 2 8 3 2.83 1349/1375 3.75 4.32 4.27 4.22 2.83 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 2 3 5 2 6 4 3.15 1513/1595 3.26 4.06 4.20 4.21 3.15 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 3 9 3 2 4 2 2.35 1520/1533 3.14 4.04 4.04 4.05 2.35 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 6 5 2 4 4 2 2.76 1479/1512 2.76 3.93 4.10 4.11 2.76 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 2 3 5 7 6 3.52 1379/1623 4.06 4.29 4.16 4.08 3.52 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 3 20 4.87 731/1646 4.90 4.57 4.69 4.67 4.87 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 3 1 5 7 3 3.32 1436/1621 3.77 4.05 4.06 4.02 3.32 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 3 0 2 1 5 7 5 3.60 1440/1568 4.15 4.53 4.43 4.39 3.60 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3 0 0 1 2 9 8 4.20 1419/1572 4.50 4.73 4.70 4.64 4.20 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3 0 5 0 7 5 3 3.05 1492/1564 3.72 4.28 4.28 4.25 3.05 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 4 0 4 2 3 6 4 3.21 1446/1559 3.87 4.34 4.29 4.23 3.21 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 0 2 2 6 7 3 3.35 1122/1352 3.33 3.57 3.98 3.97 3.35 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 12 0 2 3 3 2 1 2.73 1327/1384 2.73 3.79 4.08 4.11 2.73 12 0 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 1 4 3 3 3.73 1116/1382 3.40 3.91 4.29 4.37 3.73 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 12 0 2 1 4 3 3.55 1165/1368 3.39 4.08 4.30 4.39 3.55 1 4. Were special techniques successful 12 3 0 2 3 1 3.13 831/948 3.13 3.94 3.95 4.00 3.13 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 22 0 0 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 88 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.54 4.63 \*\*\*\* 0 0 0 1 0 1 0 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 92 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.35 4.46 \*\*\*\* 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 22 0 0 Ω 22 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 \*\*\*\*/ 288 \*\*\*\* 3.29 3.68 3.58 \*\*\*\* 5. Were criteria for grading made clear Field Work 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 22 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 312 \*\*\*\* 3.73 3.68 3.60 \*\*\*\* Frequency Distribution

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	6	C	6	General	1	Under-grad	23	Non-major	22
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	19	_			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: ECON 312 0101 University of Maryland Title INTERM MACROECON ANALY

Baltimore County

Instructor: CINYABUGUMA, MA

Enrollment: 37 Questionnaires: 7

FEB 11, 2009 Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Page 547

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questic	onnaire
---------	--------	------------	---------	---------

			Fr	equei	ncie	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
a 1														
General	0	0	^	1	4	^	_	2 42	1510/1640	2 05	4 00	4 00	4 07	2 42
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	Τ	4	0	2		1518/1649	3.95	4.23	4.28	4.27	3.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	1	2	2		1558/1648	3.97	4.24	4.23	4.18	3.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	•	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	,	4.46	4.32	4.27	4.22	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	Τ	1	3	2		1231/1595	4.27	4.06	4.20	4.21	3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	T	0	Τ	3	2		1103/1533	3.98	4.04	4.04	4.05	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	1	1		1363/1512	3.89	3.93	4.10	4.11	3.29
<ol> <li>Was the grading system clearly explained</li> </ol>	0	0	1	2	0	0	4		1359/1623	4.07	4.29	4.16	4.08	3.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	4		1130/1646		4.57	4.69	4.67	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	914/1621	3.98	4.05	4.06	4.02	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	1096/1568	4.56	4.53	4.43	4.39	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	5		1003/1572		4.73	4.70	4.64	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	2	3		1127/1564	4.23	4.28	4.28	4.25	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	1	1	2		1479/1559	3.94	4.34	4.29	4.23	3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	1	1	1	1		1049/1352	4.14	3.57	3.98		3.50
5. Fix dadiovibaai ocominques emianos your anacistanaing	Ü		Ü	_	_	_	_	3.30	1017, 1002		3.37	3.70	3.77	3.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1254/1384	3.68	3.79	4.08	4.11	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1316/1382	3.65	3.91	4.29	4.37	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1181/1368	3.88	4.08	4.30	4.39	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 948	4.00	3.94	3.95	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	Ο	0	0	1	Λ	Λ	3 00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.07	****
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	U	U	U	U	т	U	U	3.00	/ 221			4.10	4.07	
Frequ	ency	. Die	trib	utio	1									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	В	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	mificant	
				I	0	Other	5	-	_		
				2	0						

Course-Section: ECON 312 0301 University of Maryland Title

INTERM MACROECON ANALY Baltimore County Fall 2008

Instructor: LI, VICTOR

Enrollment: 25 Ouestionnaires: 15

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 548 FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 1 2 12 4.73 350/1649 3.95 4.23 4.28 4.27 4.73 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 1 3 11 4.67 362/1648 3.97 4.24 4.23 4.18 4.67 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 2 12 4.73 321/1375 4.46 4.32 4.27 4.22 4.73 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 0 0 2 12 4.86 162/1595 4.27 4.06 4.20 4.21 4.86 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 2 0 0 0 2 10 4.83 137/1533 3.98 4.04 4.04 4.05 4.83 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 3 0 0 1 2 8 4.64 286/1512 3.89 3.93 4.10 4.11 4.64 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 0 0 4 10 4.71 261/1623 4.07 4.29 4.16 4.08 4.71 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 0 0 0 0 1 12 4.92 531/1646 4.51 4.57 4.69 4.67 4.92 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 0 0 14 5.00 1/1568 4.56 4.53 4.43 4.39 5.00 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 0 14 5.00 1/1572 4.58 4.73 4.70 4.64 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 0 2 12 4.86 216/1564 4.23 4.28 4.28 4.25 4.86 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 0 14 5.00 1/1559 3.94 4.34 4.29 4.23 5.00 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1 0 0 1 2 10 4.69 188/1352 4.14 3.57 3.98 3.97 4.69 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 0 2 5 4.71 284/1384 3.68 3.79 4.08 4.11 4.71 0 1 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8 0 0 0 6 4.71 435/1382 3.65 3.91 4.29 4.37 4.71 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8 0 0 0 1 1 5 4.57 601/1368 3.88 4.08 4.30 4.39 4.57 4. Were special techniques successful 8 3 1 0 0 0 3 4.00 431/948 4.00 3.94 3.95 4.00 4.00 Seminar 14 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 \*\*\*\* 288 \*\*\*\* 3.29 3.68 3.58 \*\*\*\* 5. Were criteria for grading made clear

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11	-			
				2	0						

Course-Section: ECON 312 0401 University of Maryland Title INTERM MACROECON ANALY

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Instructor: THOMAS, MARK S

Enrollment: 42 Questionnaires: 31

Page 549 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
---------	--------	------------	---------------

		Ouestion	_		MD	3.7.7	Fre	_	ncie 3	s	_		tructor		Dept		Level	
		Question 	s 		NR	NA	т					Mean	Rank 	mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did you	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	1	3	9	10	8	3.68	1422/1649	3.95	4.23	4.28	4.27	3.68
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	1	10	9	11	3.97	1166/1648	3.97	4.24	4.23	4.18	3.97
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflec	t the e	expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	7	16	4.23	831/1375	4.46	4.32	4.27	4.22	4.23
4. Did otl	her evalı	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	18	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	1021/1595	4.27	4.06	4.20	4.21	4.08
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	13	2	2	7	1	6	3.39	1323/1533	3.98	4.04	4.04	4.05	3.39
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	1	22	1	1	1	1	4	3.75	1119/1512	3.89	3.93	4.10	4.11	3.75
		g system clearl		ined	0	2	0	3	8	6	12	3.93	1134/1623	4.07	4.29	4.16	4.08	3.93
		was class canc			1	1	0	0	1	26	2	4.03	1532/1646	4.51	4.57	4.69	4.67	4.03
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	ll tead	hing effectiveness	5	0	0	1	15	9	1	3.38	1412/1621	3.98	4.05	4.06	4.02	3.38
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instru	actor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	5	9	17	4.39	1002/1568	4.56	4.53	4.43	4.39	4.39
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	0	0	1	1	9	5	15	4.03	1458/1572	4.58	4.73	4.70	4.64	4.03
3. Was le	cture mat	erial presente	d and e	explained clearly	0	0	3	0	6	12	10	3.84	1256/1564	4.23	4.28	4.28	4.25	3.84
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	5	0	4	9	13	3.81	1246/1559	3.94	4.34	4.29	4.23	3.81
5. Did au	diovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	1	1	2	2	8	16	4.24	521/1352	4.14	3.57	3.98	3.97	4.24
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu			what you learned	22	0	2	1	1	2	3	3.33	1159/1384	3.68	3.79	4.08	4.11	3.33
				d to participate	22	0	2	0	4	0	3		1284/1382		3.91	4.29	4.37	3.22
		_	_	d open discussion	22	0	0	1	5	0	3	3.56	1162/1368	3.88	4.08	4.30	4.39	3.56
		echniques succe			22	4	2	0	1	0	2	3.00	****/ 948			3.95	4.00	****
		Labora	torv															
5. Were re	equiremer		_	early specified	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.38	4.29	4.22	****
		Field	Words															
5. Did co	nferences			ield activities	28	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 312	***	3.73	3.68	3.60	***
			_	_		<u> </u>												
				Frequ	lency	r Dist	tribu	ıtıo	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 8		Red	 quire	ed f	or M	 lajor		0	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r •	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	в 10			_			_						,		
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	3	С 6		Ger	neral	L				3	Under-g	rad 3	31	Non-	major	29
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D 0									_				-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0	#### -	Means t	here a	are not	enoue	jh
				P 0									respons	es to b	oe sign	nificar	ıt	
				I 0		Oth	ner				2	2	_		_			
				? 1														

Title QUANT MTHDS:MANAGEMENT

Instructor: PALMATEER, JASO

Enrollment: 55
Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 550 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
---------	--------	------------	---------------

		Ouestions	•		MB	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
			, . – – – – – – –															
		General	=															
		ew insights,skil			0	0	1	0	3	14	15	4.27	943/1649	4.27	4.23	4.28	4.27	4.27
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	3	15	14	4.27	873/1648	4.27	4.24	4.23	4.18	4.27
		uestions reflect			0	0	0	1	3	16	13	4.24	814/1375	4.24	4.32	4.27	4.22	4.24
		uations reflect			1	2	0	2	3	16	9		1032/1595	4.07	4.06	4.20	4.21	4.07
	-	eadings contribu		-	0	8	0	3	8	7	7		1093/1533	3.72	4.04	4.04	4.05	3.72
				what you learned	0	7	0	3	2	11	10	4.08	849/1512	4.08	3.93	4.10	4.11	4.08
		g system clearly		ed	0	0	0	2	3	13	15	4.24	826/1623	4.24	4.29	4.16	4.08	4.24
	-	was class cance		55	0	0	1	2	8	11	11		1608/1646	3.88	4.57	4.69	4.67	3.88
). How wor	uld you g	grade the overal	.l teachi	ng effectiveness	8	0	0	1	4	12	8	4.08	870/1621	4.08	4.05	4.06	4.02	4.08
		Lecture	2															
l. Were th	he instru	actor's lectures	well pr	epared	1	0	0	1	2	6	23	4.59	743/1568	4.59	4.53	4.43	4.39	4.59
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor seem intere	sted in	the subject	1	0	1	2	0	10	19	4.38	1339/1572	4.38	4.73	4.70	4.64	4.38
. Was led	cture mat	terial presented	l and exp	lained clearly	1	0	0	1	5	8	18	4.34	844/1564	4.34	4.28	4.28	4.25	4.34
. Did the	e lecture	es contribute to	what yo	u learned	1	0	0	0	5	7	20	4.47	749/1559	4.47	4.34	4.29	4.23	4.47
. Did aud	diovisual	l techniques enh	ance you	r understanding	2	2	1	2	4	9	13	4.07	655/1352	4.07	3.57	3.98	3.97	4.07
		Discuss	sion															
l. Did cla	ass discu	ussions contribu		at vou learned	19	0	1	0	3	2	8	4.14	737/1384	4.14	3.79	4.08	4.11	4.14
		nts actively end		-	19	0	0	1	5	3	5		1050/1382	3.86	3.91	4.29	4.37	3.86
		ctor encourage f			19	0	0	1	3	4	6	4.07	928/1368	4.07	4.08	4.30	4.39	4.07
		echniques succes		-F	19	1	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	,		3.94	3.95	4.00	
		Seminar																
. Were ci	riteria f	for grading made			31	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.29	3.68	3.58	***
5 Did cor	nferences	Field W s help you carry		ld activities	31	0	0	2	0	0	0	2 00	****/ 312	****	3 73	3.68	3.60	****
J. Dia coi	III CI CIICCI	s neip you carry	Out IIc	ia accivicies	31	O	O	2	O	Ü	Ü	2.00	/ 512		3.73	3.00	3.00	
				Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	ution	ı									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27	 1	0.00-0.99	0	A 8		Re	 quir	ed fo	 or M	aior		1	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 13											-	) -		
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	6	C 4		Ge	nera:	1				3	Under-q	rad 3	3	Non-	major	23
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	5	D 0								-			-		5	
Grad.						El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enous	h
	-	- · · · · · · · ·		P 0		_							respons				_	
				I O		Ot!	her				2	12			J-			
				? 1			-				_							
				• -														

Course-Section: ECON 374 0101 University of Maryland

Title FUND FINANCIAL MGMT

Instructor: LAMDIN, DOUGLAS
Enrollment: 34
Questionnaires: 19

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Baltimore County

Fall 2008

Page 551 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

		Questions		NR	NA	Fro	_	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		e Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1 Did	ou soin no	General w insights,skills fr	om this source	1	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	644/1649	4.48	4.23	4.28	4 27	4.50
		ctor make clear the e		1	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	362/1648		4.24	4.23		4.67
		estions reflect the	_	0	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	488/1375		4.32	4.27		4.58
		ations reflect the e		1	2	0	1	2	6	7	4.19	903/1595		4.06	4.20		4.19
		adings contribute to		1	8	2	1	1	2	4		1249/1533		4.04	4.04	4.05	3.50
		signments contribute		2	3	1	0	5	4	4		1143/1512		3.93	4.10	4.11	3.71
		system clearly expl		1	0	0	0	0	5	13		251/1623		4.29	4.16	4.08	4.72
8. How ma	any times	was class cancelled		2	1	0	0	0	9	7	4.44	1258/1646	4.36	4.57	4.69	4.67	4.44
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the overall tea	ching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	632/1621	4.43	4.05	4.06	4.02	4.31
		Lecture															
		actor's lectures well		1	0	0	0	0	1	17		147/1568		4.53	4.43	4.39	4.94
		ctor seem interested		1	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	640/1572		4.73	4.70		4.89
		terial presented and	-	2	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	570/1564		4.28	4.28		4.59
		es contribute to what	-	1	0	1	1	2	1	13	4.33	901/1559		4.34	4.29		4.33
5. Did a	udiovisual	techniques enhance	your understanding	1	5	1	1	3	3	5	3.77	907/1352	3.77	3.57	3.98	3.97	3.77
!!		Discussion		10	0				_			4405/4004	0.45				
	<ol> <li>Did class discussions contribute to what you learned</li> <li>Were all students actively encouraged to participate</li> </ol>					2	0	0	6			1105/1384			4.08		
		1 9		10	0	1	1	2	5	0		1284/1382		3.91	4.29		3.22
		ctor encourage fair a echniques successful	na open alscussion	10 11	0 5	1 0	0	3 2	3 0			1162/1368 ****/ 948		4.08 3.94	4.30 3.95	4.39	3.56 ****
		Laboratory															
5. Were	requiremen	nts for lab reports c	learly specified	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.38	4.29	4.22	****
		Seminar															
5. Were	criteria f	for grading made clea	r	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.29	3.68	3.58	****
		Field Work															
5. Did co	onferences	s help you carry out	field activities	17	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 312	****	3.73	3.68	3.60	****
			Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits I	Earned	Expected Grades	es Reasons			Ту	pe			Majors	\$						
00-27	00-27						Required for Majors 1 Graduate 0				0	Majo	 r	1			
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 10		100	-1011	- A I	J_ 1710	-JUL	~	_	Gradac	_	•	11000	-	_
56-83					Gei	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad 1	L9	Non-	major	18
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 6	D 0										_			3	-
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	jh
			P 0									respons	es to b	oe sign	nificar	ıt	
			I 0		Ot1	her				1	.5					Mean 4.27 4.18 4.22 4.21 4.05 4.11 4.08 4.67 4.02  4.39 4.64 4.25 4.23 3.97  4.11 4.37 4.39 4.00  4.22  3.58  3.60  Majors r major enough	
			? 0														

#### Course-Section: ECON 374 0201 University of Maryland Title FUND FINANCIAL MGMT Baltimore County

Instructor: ROSE, MORGAN

Enrollment: 21

Questionnaires: 15

Fall 2008

Page 552

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Questions  General  1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course  2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals  3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	NR  0 0 0	NA  0 0	0	2	3	4	5 	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General  1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course  2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals  3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1										
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0 0	0	1										
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	-	0			0	5	9	4.47	696/1649	4.48	4.23	4.28	4.27	4.47
	0		0	0	2	3	10	4.53	521/1648	4.60	4.24	4.23	4.18	4.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals		0	0	1	1	5	8	4.33	733/1375	4.46	4.32	4.27	4.22	4.33
	0	3	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	930/1595	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.21	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	6	6	4.00	815/1533	3.75	4.04	4.04	4.05	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1512	3.71	3.93	4.10	4.11	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	4	8	4.13	947/1623	4.43	4.29	4.16	4.08	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	10	4	4.29	1377/1646	4.36	4.57	4.69	4.67	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	331/1621	4.43	4.05	4.06	4.02	4.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	0	5	8	4.36	1031/1568	4.65	4.53	4.43	4.39	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	3	10	4.57	1174/1572	4.73	4.73	4.70	4.64	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	3	4	6	4.00	1127/1564	4.29	4.28	4.28	4.25	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	0	4	8	4.14	1045/1559	4.24	4.34	4.29	4.23	4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	13	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1352	3.77	3.57	3.98	3.97	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1081/1384	3.47	3.79	4.08	4.11	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	616/1382	3.86	3.91	4.29	4.37	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	426/1368	4.15	4.08	4.30	4.39	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	***	3.94	3.95	4.00	****
Freque	ency	Dist	tribu	ıtior	1									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	son	s			Туј	pe			Majors	<u> </u>

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	redits Earned Cum. GPA			Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	 6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	14
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14	_			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: ECON 408 0101 University of Maryland Title MANAGERIAL ECONOMICS Baltimore County Instructor: DASGUPTA, NANDI Fall 2008

University of Maryland Page 553
Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009
Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	33	
Questionnaires:	21	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fr	equei	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	274/1649	4.80	4.23	4.28	4.50	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	0	18	4.70	323/1648	4.70	4.24	4.23	4.36	4.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	172/1375	4.89	4.32	4.27	4.48	4.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	1	0	1	3	10	4.40	636/1595	4.40	4.06	4.20	4.36	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	198/1533	4.72	4.04	4.04	4.14	4.72
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	0	3	3	10	4.24	711/1512	4.24	3.93	4.10	4.26	4.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	125/1623	4.89	4.29	4.16	4.27	4.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	1	14	4	4.16	1469/1646	4.16	4.57	4.69	4.71	4.16
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	75/1621	4.93	4.05	4.06	4.24	4.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.53	4.43	4.54	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	355/1572	4.95	4.73	4.70	4.79	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	101/1564	4.95	4.28	4.28	4.40	4.95
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	216/1559	4.89	4.34	4.29	4.41	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	9	2	0	1	0	5	3.75	914/1352	3.75	3.57	3.98	4.07	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	394/1384	4.57	3.79	4.08	4.35	4.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	812/1382	4.29	3.91	4.29	4.56	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	316/1368	4.86	4.08	4.30	4.58	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	14	3	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 948	****	3.94	3.95	4.31	****
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.38	4.29	4.41	***
Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	ason	.s			Ту	ре			Majors	}
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 13		Re	quir	ed fo	 or M	ajor		1 Graduate 0			 Majo	 r	 4	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	13	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	21	Non-major	17
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	10	-			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: ECON 410A 0101

RISK MNGMT FINANCIAL I

Title Instructor: CARPENTER, ROBE

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 10 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 554 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Stude	nt Course	Evaluation	Questionna	aire
-------	-----------	------------	------------	------

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	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	1	0	0	3	5	4.22	996/1649	4.22	4.23	4.28	4.50	4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	3	1	1	3	3.50	1481/1648	3.50	4.24	4.23	4.36	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1375	****	4.32	4.27	4.48	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	2	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1260/1595	3.80	4.06	4.20	4.36	3.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	740/1533	4.11	4.04	4.04	4.14	4.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	595/1512	4.33	3.93	4.10	4.26	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	7	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	1615/1623	2.00	4.29	4.16	4.27	2.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	3	5	1	3.78	1619/1646	3.78	4.57	4.69	4.71	3.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	595/1621	4.33	4.05	4.06	4.24	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	2	1	6	4.10	1235/1568	4.10	4.53	4.43	4.54	4.10
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.73	4.70	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	780/1564	4.40	4.28	4.28	4.40	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	1075/1559	4.10	4.34	4.29	4.41	4.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	1090/1352	3.43	3.57	3.98	4.07	3.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	613/1384	4.33	3.79	4.08	4.35	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1382		3.91	4.29	4.56	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	337/1368	4.83	4.08	4.30	4.58	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	4	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	****	3.94	3.95	4.31	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.66	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	4.44	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 288	****	3.29	3.68	3.71	****

Credits Ea	Credits Earned Cum. GPA			Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	10	Non-major	8
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I 0	Other 7		-				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ECON 410B 0101 University of Maryland Page 555 Title VENTURE CAPT MARKET IM Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009

Instructor: ROSE, MORGAN

Enrollment: 23 Questionnaires: 7

# Fall 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

		Frequencies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
Questions	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	2	5	4.71	372/1649	4.71	4.23	4.28	4.50	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	300/1648	4.71	4.24	4.23	4.36	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	199/1375	4.86	4.32	4.27	4.48	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.06	4.20	4.36	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	454/1533	4.43	4.04	4.04	4.14	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	427/1623	4.57	4.29	4.16	4.27	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	1377/1646	4.29	4.57	4.69	4.71	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	754/1621	4.20	4.05	4.06	4.24	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	316/1568	4.86	4.53	4.43	4.54	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	715/1572	4.86	4.73	4.70	4.79	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	580/1564	4.57	4.28	4.28	4.40	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	448/1559	4.71	4.34	4.29	4.41	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1301/1352	2.50	3.57	3.98	4.07	2.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	Λ	1	2	Λ	2	3 60	1039/1384	3.60	3.79	4.08	4.35	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	2	2	0	1		1316/1382	3.00	3.79	4.29	4.56	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	n	0	٥	2	2	1		1071/1368	3.80	4.08	4.30	4.58	3.80
3. Did the instructor encourage rair and open discussion	4	U	U	U	2	4		5.00	10/1/1300	5.00	T.00	<del>1</del> .30	Ŧ.50	5.00

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General		Under-grad	7	Non-major	6
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	Ī
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0 Other	Other	5	-	-	-	
				2	0						

TOPICS IN MICROECONOMI

Instructor: MITCH, DAVID F

Enrollment: 37

Ouestionnaires: 23

# Fall 2008

University of Maryland

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 556

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 1 0 1 2 4 9 6 3.77 1366/1649 3.77 4.23 4.28 4.50 3.77 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 1 2 5 7 7 3.77 1333/1648 3.77 4.24 4.23 4.36 3.77 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 0 2 0 4 5 11 4.05 936/1375 4.05 4.32 4.27 4.48 4.05 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 1 1 1 1 9 2 8 3.71 1305/1595 3.71 4.06 4.20 4.36 3.71 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0 2 3 7 3 .45 1283/1533 3.45 4.04 4.04 4.14 3.45 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 1 1 3 3 7 7 3.76 1113/1512 3.76 3.93 4.10 4.26 3.76 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 1 4 3 7 7 3.68 1308/1623 3.68 4.29 4.16 4.27 3.68 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 1 0 0 9 12 4.41 1287/1646 4.41 4.57 4.69 4.71 4.41 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 1 1 0 8 8 2 3.53 1336/1621 3.53 4.05 4.06 4.24 3.53 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 1 1 4 8 8 3.95 1313/1568 3.95 4.53 4.43 4.54 3.95 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 1 0 2 5 14 4.41 1321/1572 4.41 4.73 4.70 4.79 4.41 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 5 5 5 7 3.64 1348/1564 3.64 4.28 4.28 4.40 3.64 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 2 1 5 6 8 3.77 1264/1559 3.77 4.34 4.29 4.41 3.77 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 12 2 3 1 0 4 3.10 1207/1352 3.10 3.57 3.98 4.07 3.10 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10 0 3 1 3 3 3.15 1228/1384 3.15 3.79 4.08 4.35 3.15 2 3 5 3.57 1187/1382 3.57 3.91 4.29 4.56 3.57 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9 0 1 3 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 1 3 3 7 4.14 900/1368 4.14 4.08 4.30 4.58 4.14 4. Were special techniques successful 9 6 0 2 1 0 5 4.00 431/948 4.00 3.94 3.95 4.31 4.00 Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 22 0 0 0 0 1.00 \*\*\*\* 243 \*\*\* \*\*\* 4.12 4.61 \*\*\*\* 1 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 555 \*\*\*\* 4.38 4.29 4.41 \*\*\*\* 21 1 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 0 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 21 0 0 0 1 1 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 88 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.54 4.66 \*\*\*\* 1 4.50 \*\*\*\*/ 85 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.47 4.54 \*\*\*\* 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 21 0 0 0 1 0 0 1 1 4.50 \*\*\*\*/ 81 \*\*\*\* 4.43 4.57 \*\*\*\* 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 21 0 1 0 0 0 1 3.00 \*\*\*\*/ 92 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.35 4.44 \*\*\*\* 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 0 2 0 3.00 \*\*\*\*/ 288 \*\*\*\* 3.29 3.68 3.71 \*\*\*\* 20 0 1 Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 22 0 0 0 0 2.00 \*\*\*\*/ 52 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.06 4.86 \*\*\*\* 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 22 0 0 0 0 2 00 \*\*\*\*/ 48 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4 09 4 42 \*\*\*\* 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 22 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 \*\*\*\*/ 39 \*\*\*\* \*\*\* 4.47 4.52 \*\*\*\* 22 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 \*\*\*\*/ 39 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.38 4.59 \*\*\*\* 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 21 0 0 1 0 1 0 3.00 \*\*\*\*/ 312 \*\*\*\* 3.73 3.68 3.95 \*\*\*\* Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 22 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 \*\*\*\*/ 53 \*\*\*\* 3.86 4.30 4.64 \*\*\*\* 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 22 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 \*\*\*\*/ 30 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.16 4.24 \*\*\*\* 22 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 \*\*\*\*/ 41 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.43 4.84 \*\*\*\* 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful

Title TOPICS IN MICROECONOMI

Instructor: MITCH, DAVID F

Enrollment: 37
Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 556 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Carned Cum. GPA			Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	5	Under-grad	23	Non-major	9
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	1			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	15	_		_	
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 413 0101 University of Maryland Page 557 Title INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIO Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009

Instructor: CARROLL, KATHLE

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 12

Fall 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Job IRBR3029

							Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did yo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	1	1	6	4	4.08	1129/1649	4.08	4.23	4.28	4.50	4.08
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	1	3	3	5	4.00	1124/1648	4.00	4.24	4.23	4.36	4.00
3. Did th	ne exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	1	3	3	5	4.00	950/1375	4.00	4.32	4.27	4.48	4.00
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	6	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1372/1595	3.60	4.06	4.20	4.36	3.60
5. Did as	ssigned r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	5	3	3.67	1139/1533	3.67	4.04	4.04	4.14	3.67
6. Did wr	ritten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	7	1	1	0	2	1	3.20	1395/1512	3.20	3.93	4.10	4.26	3.20
7. Was th	ne gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	1	1	6	4	4.08	989/1623	4.08	4.29	4.16	4.27	4.08
8. How ma	any times	was class cand	elled		0	0	0	0	0	9	3	4.25	1398/1646	4.25	4.57	4.69	4.71	4.25
9. How wo	9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness					0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1087/1621	3.88	4.05	4.06	4.24	3.88
	Lecture																	
1. Were t	Λ	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	969/1568	4.42	4.53	4.43	4.54	4.42				
					0	0	0	0	1	0	11				4.73	4.70	4.79	4.83
	<ol> <li>Did the instructor seem interested in the subject</li> <li>Was lecture material presented and explained clearly</li> </ol>					0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	939/1564		4.28	4.28	4.40	4.25
		es contribute t			0	0	0	1	2	0	9				4.34	4.29	4.41	4.42
				our understanding	1	8	1	0	1	1	0		1287/1352		3.57		4.07	
		- ·																
1 544		Discus			_	0	0	1	_	-	2	2 06	011/1204	2 06	2 70	4 00	4 25	2 06
				what you learned	5	0	0	Ţ	2	1	3	3.86	911/1384		3.79	4.08	4.35	3.86
				d to participate d open discussion	5 5	0	0	0 2	0	1 1	6 4	4.86	292/1382 948/1368		3.91 4.08	4.29	4.56	4.86
				a open discussion	5 5	3	0	0	2	U T	2		,					
4. were s	special t	echniques succe	ssiui		5	3	U	U	2	U	2	4.00	431/ 948	4.00	3.94	3.95	4.31	4.00
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	 0	0 00 0 00		~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~								0	Cmaduat		0	Mo do		10
00-27 28-55	0	0.00-0.99 0 A 2				ке	quire	eu I	or Ma	Jor	b	U	Graduat	e	U	Majo	)T	ΤÜ
26-55 56-83	2					Cor	nera:	1				3	Under-q	rad 1	.2	Non	-major	2
	84-150 5 3.00-3.49 5 D 0					Gel	иста.	L				J	onder-g	Lau I	. 4	NOII-	iia jul	4
Grad.						. רק	oati.	700				0	#### - 1	Maana +	horo -	re not	enous	rh
Grau.	U	3.30-4.00	U	г 0 Р 0	Elective				ctives 0		U	respons				_	111	
I 0				O±1	her					8	respons	co co r	e algi.	ıııcaı.	ıı			
				± 0		Other						0						

? 0

Title ECON STRATEGIC INTERAC

Instructor: VIAUROUX, CHRIS

Enrollment: 20
Questionnaires: 16

Fall 2008

Page 558 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Frequencies					Tnsi	tructor	Course Dept		TIMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		-		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	2	1	5	7		1086/1649	4.13	4.23	4.28	4.50	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	966/1648	4.20	4.24	4.23	4.36	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	797/1375	4.27	4.32	4.27	4.48	4.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	608/1595	4.43	4.06	4.20	4.36	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	594/1533	4.29	4.04	4.04	4.14	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	687/1512	4.25	3.93	4.10	4.26	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	7	5	4.21	861/1623	4.21	4.29	4.16	4.27	4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	,	4.93	4.57	4.69	4.71	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	4	3	4	4.00	914/1621	4.00	4.05	4.06	4.24	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	904/1568	4.47	4.53	4.43	4.54	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	840/1572	4.80	4.73	4.70	4.79	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	5	7	4.27	929/1564	4.27	4.28	4.28	4.40	4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	4	9	4.33	901/1559	4.33	4.34	4.29	4.41	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	1	2	3	7	4.00	690/1352	4.00	3.57	3.98	4.07	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	795/1384	4.00	3.79	4.08	4.35	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1069/1382	3.80	3.91	4.29	4.56	3.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	752/1368	4.40	4.08	4.30	4.58	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	104/ 948	4.80	3.94	3.95	4.31	4.80
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.73	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.61	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.63	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.38	4.29	4.41	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.66	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.54	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.57	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	4.44	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 288	****	3.29	3.68	3.71	****
			_	·	ŭ	ŭ	_	3.00	, 200		3.23	3.00	J., 1	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	4.86	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.42	****

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	В	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	4	Under-grad	16	Non-major	9
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	í
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	8	-			
				2	Λ						

Title INTRO TO ECONOMETRICS

Instructor: YUAN, CHUNMING

Enrollment: 31
Questionnaires: 17

Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 559 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

			Fre	equer	cies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	_		•	_	_	_	_			4 00		4 00	4 = 0	4 00
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	Ι	0	0	Ι	3	-/	5		1183/1649	4.00	4.23	4.28	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	Ι	0	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	897/1648	4.25	4.24	4.23	4.36	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	Ι	0	0	0	2	-/	./	4.31	753/1375	4.31	4.32	4.27	4.48	4.31
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	Ι	-/	0	Ι	1	1	6	4.33	722/1595	4.33	4.06	4.20	4.36	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	Τ	5	0	Τ	4	2	4		1006/1533	3.82	4.04	4.04	4.14	3.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	1	0	1	1	4		883/1512	4.00	3.93	4.10	4.26	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	- ,	4.56	4.29	4.16	4.27	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1646		4.57	4.69	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	4	6	2	3.69	1240/1621	3.69	4.05	4.06	4.24	3.69
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	699/1568	4.63	4.53	4.43	4.54	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.73	4.43	4.79	5.00
	1	0	0	1	4	-	10 5		1/15/2		4.73	4.70	4.79	3.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned		0	0	1	4	6	5 7		1093/1559	4.06		4.29		
	1 1	7	3	0	2	4	7					3.98	4.41	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	Т	/	3	U	2	Т	3	3.11	1204/1352	3.11	3.5/	3.98	4.07	3.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	795/1384	4.00	3.79	4.08	4.35	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	946/1382	4.00	3.91	4.29	4.56	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	1	0	5	4.29	827/1368	4.29	4.08	4.30	4.58	4.29
4. Were special techniques successful	10	4	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 948	****	3.94	3.95	4.31	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	***	****	4.16	4.73	****
. Were you provided with adequate background information		0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.61	****
. Were necessary materials available for lab activities		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	***	****	4.40	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.63	****
_														

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	 5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	17	Non-major	12
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	10	-		-	
				2	1						

Course-Section: ECON 443 0101

Title HIST OF ECON THOUGHT I

Instructor:

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 13

Baltimore County BRADLEY, MICHAE Fall 2008

? 0

Page 560 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Questions						NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain new	insights,ski		n this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	395/1649	4.69	4.23	4.28	4.50	4.69
		or make clear			0	0	1	0	0	7	5	4.15	1010/1648	4.15	4.24	4.23	4.36	4.15
		stions reflect			0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	206/1375	4.85	4.32	4.27	4.48	4.85
		tions reflect			0	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	660/1595	4.38	4.06	4.20	4.36	4.38
5. Did as:	signed rea	dings contrib	ute to v	what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	4	7	4.23	643/1533	4.23	4.04	4.04	4.14	4.23
6. Did wr	itten assi	gnments contr	ibute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	627/1512	4.31	3.93	4.10	4.26	4.31
7. Was the	e grading	system clearly	y explai	ined	0	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	838/1623	4.23	4.29	4.16	4.27	4.23
		as class cance			0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	531/1646	4.92	4.57	4.69	4.71	4.92
9. How wo	uld you gr	ade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	1	0	0	1	0	6	5	4.25	687/1621	4.25	4.05	4.06	4.24	4.25
	Lecture																	
1. Were t	he instruc	ctor's lecture:	s well p	prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	344/1568	4.83	4.53	4.43	4.54	4.83
2. Did the	e instruct	or seem inter	ested in	n the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	532/1572	4.92	4.73	4.70	4.79	4.92
3. Was le	cture mate	erial presented	d and ex	xplained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	767/1564	4.42	4.28	4.28	4.40	4.42
4. Did the	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	1	11	4.92	184/1559	4.92	4.34	4.29	4.41	4.92
5. Did au	. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding					8	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1160/1352	3.25	3.57	3.98	4.07	3.25
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discus			what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	795/1384	4.00	3.79	4.08	4.35	4.00
				d to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	292/1382	4.86	3.91	4.29	4.56	4.86
				d open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	316/1368	4.86	4.08	4.30	4.58	4.86
		chniques succes		- of one one one	6	6	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 948	***	3.94	3.95	4.31	****
		Labora	tory															
5. Were re	equirement		-	early specified	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.38	4.29	4.41	****
		Field W	Work															
5. Did co	nferences	help you carry	y out fi	ield activities	9	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.73	3.68	3.95	4.00
		Self 1																
5. Were t	here enoug	gh proctors for	r all th	ne students	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	4.22	***
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	ı									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Туј	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jor	 s	 1	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r	8
28-55							-			-						J -		
56-83						Ger	nera	1				6	Under-g	rad 1	.3	Non-	major	5
84-150 5 3.00-3.49 5 D 0													5				_	
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0						Electives					0 #### - Means there are				_	ŗh		
P 0 I 0				responses to be signific Other 6					ıııcar	ıĊ								
				± 0		Other						U						

Course-Section: ECON 453 0101

Title HOUSEHOLD ECONOMICS

Instructor: LORD, WILLIAM

Enrollment: 40

Questionnaires: 20

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 561 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions			Fre	equei 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General	0	0	0	2	3	6	9	4 10	1116/1649	3.70	4.23	4.28	4.50	4.10
<ol> <li>Did you gain new insights, skills from this course</li> <li>Did the instructor make clear the expected goals</li> </ol>	0	0	0	1	3	5	11	4.10	839/1648	4.00	4.23	4.28	4.36	4.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	4	12	4.35	714/1375	3.95	4.32	4.27	4.48	4.35
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	853/1595	3.40	4.06	4.20	4.36	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	545/1533		4.04	4.04	4.14	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	13	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	799/1512		3.93	4.10	4.26	4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	502/1623	4.25	4.29	4.16	4.27	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	1015/1646	4.61	4.57	4.69	4.71	4.68
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	870/1621	3.66	4.05	4.06	4.24	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	731/1568		4.53	4.43		4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	18	4.85	715/1572	4.61	4.73	4.70	4.79	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	651/1564	3.99	4.28	4.28	4.40	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	15	4.60	586/1559	3.93	4.34	4.29	4.41	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	0	1	3	5	5	4.00	690/1352	3.50	3.57	3.98	4.07	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	437/1384		3.79	4.08	4.35	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	394/1382	4.32	3.91	4.29	4.56	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful	12 12	0 4	0	0 1	2	1	5 2	4.38	771/1368 ****/ 948	4.09 ****	4.08	4.30	4.58 4.31	4.38
4. Were special techniques successiul	12	4	U	1	U	1	2	4.00	***/ 948		3.94	3.95	4.31	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.73	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.61	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.63	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	U	U	U	0	2	5.00	****/ 555	^^^	4.38	4.29	4.41	* * * *
Seminar		•			•	•								
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.66	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18 18	0 1	0	0	0	0	2 1		****/ 85 ****/ 81	****	****	4.47 4.43	4.54 4.57	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 92	****	****	4.43	4.44	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 288	****	3.29	3.68	3.71	****
· ·	10	_	O	Ü	O	Ü	_	3.00	, 200		3.23	3.00	3.71	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 52	****	****	4.06	4.86	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 48	***	****	4.09	4.42	***
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.52	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19 19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****		4.38	4.59	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	U	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	****/ 312	***	3.73	3.68	3.95	* * * *
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19 19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	3.86	4.30	4.64	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal			0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.24	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful			0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.84	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful			0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.85	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	4.22	***

Course-Section: ECON 453 0101

Title HOUSEHOLD ECONOMICS

Instructor: LORD, WILLIAM

Enrollment: 40
Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 561 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	 6	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	В	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	3	Under-grad	20	Non-major	16
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 453 0201 University of Maryland Title HOUSEHOLD ECONOMICS

Ρ

I

0

0

1

Baltimore County Instructor: LORD, WILLIAM Fall 2008

Enrollment: 40 Questionnaires: 20

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Questions				NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	-		Level Mean	
		General	_															
	1 0	w insights,skil			0	0	1	5	4	7	3		1548/1649		4.23		4.50	3.30
		ctor make clear			0	0	1	2	5	6	6		1382/1648		4.24	4.23	4.36	3.70
		estions reflect			0	0	1	2	8	3	6	3.55	1188/1375	3.95	4.32	4.27	4.48	3.55
4. Did	other evalu	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	12	1	2	3	1	0	2.57	1581/1595		4.06	4.20	4.36	2.57
5. Did	assigned re	eadings contribu	ite to	what you learned	1	1	1	3	5	6	3	3.39	1323/1533	3.86	4.04	4.04	4.14	3.39
6. Did	written ass	signments contri	ibute t	o what you learned	1	12	0	3	1	2	1	3.14	1408/1512	3.64	3.93	4.10	4.26	3.14
7. Was	the grading	g system clearly	y expla	ined	1	0	1	1	4	4	9	4.00	1029/1623	4.25	4.29	4.16	4.27	4.00
8. How	many times	was class cance	elled		1	0	0	0	0	9	10	4.53	1175/1646	4.61	4.57	4.69	4.71	4.53
9. How	would you	grade the overal	ll teac	hing effectiveness	3	0	2	2	6	4	3	3.24	1456/1621	3.66	4.05	4.06	4.24	3.24
		Lecture	2															
1. Were	e the instru	ctor's lectures	well	prepared	1	0	0	1	4	5	9	4.16	1198/1568	4.38	4.53	4.43	4.54	4.16
2. Did	the instruc	tor seem intere	ested i	n the subject	1	0	0	2	2	2	13	4.37	1346/1572	4.61	4.73	4.70	4.79	4.37
3. Was	lecture mat	erial presented	d and e	xplained clearly	1	0	1	4	5	3	6	3.47	1399/1564	3.99	4.28	4.28	4.40	3.47
		es contribute to			1	0	3	3	5	2	6	3.26	1438/1559	3.93	4.34	4.29	4.41	3.26
				our understanding	2	3	3	2	6	0	4	3.00	1219/1352	3.50	3.57	3.98	4.07	3.00
		-	-	3														
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did	class discu	ssions contribu	ite to	what you learned	10	0	2	0	4	2	2	3.20	1209/1384	3.85	3.79	4.08	4.35	3.20
				d to participate	10	0	0	0	5	1	4	3.90	1031/1382	4.32	3.91	4.29	4.56	3.90
				d open discussion	10	0	0	0	6	0	4		1071/1368		4.08	4.30	4.58	3.80
		chniques succes		- of	10	6	0	1	2	0			****/ 948			3.95	4.31	****
		1000											, , , , ,					
		Field V	Jork															
5. Did	conferences			ield activities	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 312	****	3.73	3.68	3.95	****
J. DIG	CONTELENCE	neip you carry	, out I	icia accivicies		Ü	Ü	_	Ü	0	Ü	2.00	, 312		3.73	3.00	3.75	
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits	s Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ty	pe			Majors	}
														- 				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 5			-			-						3		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	6	C 7	General					1	Under-g	rad 2	:0	Non-	major	14		
84-150	0 7	3.00-3.49	4	D 0	GCIICIAI							J				-		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ecti	<i>r</i> es				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enouc	ıh
																	-	

Other

14

Page 562

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

Course-Section: ECON 454 0101

Title ECON:EDUC/HUMAN CAPITA

Instructor: DICKSON, LISA

Enrollment: 32
Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2008

Page 563 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Questions	5		NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Ranl	2	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General						_											
		insights, skil			0	0	0	0	2 1	4	17	4.65	446/16		4.65	4.23	4.28	4.50	4.65
		or make clear	_	-	0	0	0	0	2	3	15 18	4.61 4.70	441/16 370/13		4.61 4.70	4.24 4.32	4.23	4.36 4.48	4.61 4.70
	_	stions reflect tions reflect	_	-	1	0	0	1	4	8	18	4.70	970/15		4.14	4.32	4.27	4.48	4.70
				at you learned	1	0	1	0	4	4	13	4.27	604/15		4.27	4.04	4.04	4.14	4.27
				what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	9		4.36	564/15		4.36	3.93	4.10	4.26	4.36
	-	system clearly		-	1	0	0	0	2	4		4.64	358/16		4.64	4.29	4.16	4.27	4.64
		as class cance		Σα	1	0	0	0	0	18			1447/16		4.18	4.57	4.69		4.18
	-			ng effectiveness	5	1	1	0	2	6	8	4.18	777/16		4.18	4.05	4.06	4.24	4.18
		Lecture	<u> </u>																
1. Were th	e instruct	tor's lectures	well pre	epared	2	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	461/15	568	4.76	4.53	4.43	4.54	4.76
2. Did the	instructo	or seem intere	ested in t	the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	715/15	572	4.86	4.73	4.70	4.79	4.86
				lained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	326/15		4.76	4.28	4.28	4.40	4.76
		contribute to			2	0	1	0	0	2	18	4.71	448/15	559	4.71	4.34	4.29	4.41	4.71
5. Did aud	iovisual t	techniques enh	nance your	r understanding	3	11	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	690/13	352	4.00	3.57	3.98	4.07	4.00
		Discuss	sion																
				at you learned	10	0	1	0	1	2		4.38	561/13		4.38	3.79	4.08	4.35	4.38
		_	_	to participate	10	0	0	1	1	5		4.23	844/13		4.23	3.91	4.29	4.56	4.23
				open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	569/13		4.62	4.08	4.30	4.58	4.62
4. Were sp	ecial tech	nniques succes	ssful		10	4	1	1	0	3	4	3.89	542/ 9	948	3.89	3.94	3.95	4.31	3.89
		Laborat	_																
2. Were yo	u provideo	d with adequat	e backgro	ound information	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 2	243	****	****	4.12	4.61	***
		Field V	Jork																
	_	ence contribut		-	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	52	****	****	4.06	4.86	****
2. Did you	clearly u	understand you	ır evaluat	tion criteria	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	48	****	****	4.09	4.42	****
		Self I	aced																
1. Did sel	f-paced sy	ystem contribu	ate to wha	at you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	53	****	3.86	4.30	4.64	****
		ons make clear			22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	30	****	****	4.16	4.24	****
-		s with the in		-	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	1.00	****/	41	****	****	4.43	4.84	****
4. Was the	feedback,	tutoring by p	roctors l	nelpful	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	24	****	****	4.42	4.85	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ation	1										
Credits Ea	rned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	sons	5				Тур	e			Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 10		Rec	 guire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	 s	1	Gradı	 ıate	:	1	 Majo	 r	7
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 6			_			-							_		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	6	C 2		Ger	neral	_				5	Under	r-gr	rad 2	2	Non-	major	16
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	5	D 0															
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ectiv	res				1			leans t			_	h
				P 0							_	•	respo	onse	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Oth	ıer				1	3							
				3 0															

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: ECON 467 0101 HEALTH ECONOMICS Fall 2008 GOLDFARB, MARSH

Ρ

I

?

0

0

0

Page 564 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

Enrollment:	44	
Questionnaires:	26	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Title

Instructor:

Questions		Frequencies Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4		_		ructor	Course	-		Level	Sect								
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course			Questions			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course			General																
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 0 0 0 4 2 19 4.60 441/1648 4.63 4.24 4.23 4.36 4.60 4.01 A Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 0 0 0 0 4 2 19 4.60 461/1375 4.80 4.32 4.27 4.48 4.60 4.01 A DID to the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 17 1 0 1 0 6 4.25 818/1595 4.13 4.06 4.20 4.36 4.25 Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 2 1 2 3 3 3 13 4.14 725/1533 4.32 4.04 4.04 4.14 4.14 DID to the grading system clearly explained 2 2 1 1 2 3 3 3 13 4.14 725/1533 4.32 4.04 4.04 4.14 4.14 DID to the grading system clearly explained 2 1 7 1 0 1 0 5 4.14 799/1512 4.14 3.93 4.10 4.26 4.14 7.00 Mas the grading system clearly explained 2 0 0 0 0 1 2 17 4.42 621/1623 4.46 4.29 4.16 4.27 4.42 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 0 3 8 10 4.33 595/1621 4.04 4.05 4.06 4.24 4.33 DID to the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 1 3 21 4.80 387/1568 4.90 4.53 4.43 4.54 4.80 Mas leaves and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 0 1 5 19 4.72 406/1564 4.36 4.28 4.28 4.40 4.72 4.50 Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 1 5 19 4.72 406/1564 4.36 4.28 4.28 4.40 4.72 4.50 Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 1 5 19 4.72 406/1564 4.36 4.28 4.28 4.40 4.72 4.50 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 18 0 1 1 0 0 4 4.17 ****/1352 2.00 3.57 3.98 4.07 ****  Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 2 3 0 6 3.91 886/1384 2.95 3.79 4.08 4.35 3.91 2.00 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 18 0 1 1 0 0 0 3.00 ****/ 555 **** 4.38 4.29 4.41 ****  Laboratory  5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 25 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 555 **** 4.38 4.29 4.41 ****  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 8 4.41 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 4 C 5 General 3 Under-grad 26 Non-major 18 18 4-150 11 3.00-3.49 1 D D 0	1. Did v	ou gain ne		ls fro	m this course	1	0	0	0	2	6	17	4.60	510/1649	4.47	4.23	4.28	4.50	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1 0 0 0 0 4 2 19 4.60 464/1375 4.80 4.32 4.27 4.48 4.60 4.01 dother evaluations reflect the expected goals   1 7 1 0 1 0 6 4.25 818/1595 4.13 4.06 4.22 4.36 4.52 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   2 2 1 2 3 3 3 13 4.14 725/1533 4.32 4.04 4.04 4.14 4.14 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned   2 17 1 0 1 0 5 4.14 799/1512 4.14 3.93 4.10 4.26 4.14 7.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.14 4.14 4.14 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned   2 0 1 0 0 1 0 5 4.14 799/1512 4.14 3.93 4.10 4.26 4.14 7.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.0						1	0	0	0	4	2	19		,				4.36	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 17 1 0 1 0 6 4.25 818/1595 4.13 4.06 4.20 4.36 4.25   5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 2 1 1 2 3 3 13 4.14 725/1533 4.32 4.04 4.04 4.14 4.14 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 17 1 0 1 0 5 4.14 729/1512 4.14 3.93 4.10 4.26 4.14 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 2 0 1 0 4 2 17 4.42 621/1623 4.46 4.29 4.16 4.27 4.42 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 0 3 8 10 4.33 595/1621 4.04 4.05 4.06 4.24 4.33    Lecture 1					-	1	0	0	0	4	2	19					4.27	4.48	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 2 1 1 2 3 3 1 3 4.14 725/1533 4.32 4.04 4.04 4.14 4.14 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 17 1 0 1 0 5 4.14 799/1512 4.14 3.93 4.10 4.26 4.14 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 2 0 1 0 4 2 17 4.42 621/1623 4.46 4.29 4.16 4.27 4.42 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 0 0 0 1 1 2 11 4.42 1277/1646 4.33 4.57 4.69 4.71 4.42 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 0 1 3 8 10 4.33 595/1621 4.04 4.05 4.06 4.24 4.33    Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 1 3 21 4.80 387/1568 4.90 4.53 4.43 4.54 4.80 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 2 3 20 4.72 1003/1572 4.69 4.73 4.70 4.79 4.72 4.50 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1		_			_	1	17	1	0	1	0	6	4.25	818/1595	4.13	4.06	4.20	4.36	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 17 1 0 1 0 5 4.14 799/1512 4.14 3.93 4.10 4.26 4.14 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 2 0 1 0 4 2 17 4.42 621/1623 4.46 4.29 4.16 4.27 4.42 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 0 0 0 1 12 11 4.42 1277/1646 4.33 4.57 4.69 4.71 4.42 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 0 3 8 10 4.33 595/1621 4.04 4.05 4.06 4.24 4.33   Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 0 1 3 21 4.80 387/1568 4.90 4.53 4.43 4.54 4.80 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 1 5 19 4.72 1003/1572 4.69 4.73 4.70 4.79 4.72 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 1 5 19 4.72 406/1564 4.36 4.28 4.40 4.72 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50					-	2	2	1	2	3	3	13	4.14	725/1533	4.32	4.04	4.04	4.14	4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 2 0 1 0 4 2 17 4.42 62/1/623 4.46 4.29 4.16 4.27 4.42 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 0 0 0 1 12 11 4.42 1277/1646 4.33 4.57 4.69 4.71 4.42 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 0 3 8 10 4.33 595/1621 4.04 4.05 4.06 4.24 4.33    Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 0 1 3 21 4.80 387/1568 4.90 4.53 4.43 4.54 4.80 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 1 5 19 4.72 1003/1572 4.69 4.73 4.70 4.79 4.72 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 1 5 19 4.72 406/1564 4.36 4.28 4.28 4.40 4.72 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 1 0 2 22 4.80 318/1559 4.90 4.34 4.29 4.41 4.80 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 18 0 1 1 0 4 4.17 ****/1352 2.00 3.57 3.98 4.07 ****  Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 2 3 0 6 3.91 886/1384 2.95 3.79 4.08 4.35 3.91 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 15 0 1 1 2 1 6 3.91 1031/1382 3.20 3.91 4.29 4.56 3.91 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 15 0 1 1 1 0 8 4.18 881/1386 3.59 4.08 4.03 4.58 4.31 4.34 4.39 4.31 ****  Laboratory  5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 25 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 555 **** 4.38 4.29 4.41 ****  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  0-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 7 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 8 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 1 B 11 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 4 C 5 General 3 Under-grad 26 Non-major 18 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 4 C 5 General 3 Under-grad 26 Non-major 18 56-50 11 3.00-3.49 1 D 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0						2	17	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	799/1512	4.14	3.93	4.10	4.26	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled 2 0 0 0 1 1 12 11 4.42 1277/1646 4.33 4.57 4.69 4.71 4.42 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 0 3 8 10 4.33 595/1621 4.04 4.05 4.06 4.24 4.33    Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 0 1 3 21 4.80 387/1568 4.90 4.53 4.43 4.54 4.80 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 2 3 20 4.72 1003/1572 4.69 4.73 4.70 4.79 4.72 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 1 5 19 4.72 406/1564 4.36 4.28 4.28 4.40 4.72 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 1 0 2 22 4.80 318/1559 4.90 4.34 4.29 4.41 4.80 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 18 0 1 1 0 4 4.17 ****/1352 2.00 3.57 3.98 4.07 ****  Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 2 3 0 6 3.91 886/1384 2.95 3.79 4.08 4.35 3.91 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 15 0 1 1 2 1 6 3.91 1031/1382 3.20 3.91 4.29 4.55 3.91 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 15 0 1 1 2 1 6 3.91 1031/1382 3.20 3.91 4.29 4.55 3.91 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 15 0 1 1 2 0 8 4.18 881/1368 3.59 4.08 4.30 4.58 4.18 4.08 4.09 4.31 4.30 4.58 4.18 4.09 4.31 4.30 4.58 4.18 4.09 4.31 4.30 4.58 4.18 4.09 4.31 4.30 4.58 4.18 4.09 4.31 4.30 4.58 4.18 4.09 4.31 4.30 4.59 4.31 4.30 4.59 4.31 4.30 4.59 4.31 4.30 4.59 4.31 4.30 4.59 4.31 4.30 4.59 4.31 4.30 4.59 4.31 4.30 4.30 4.59 4.31 4.30 4.30 4.59 4.31 4.30 4.30 4.59 4.31 4.30 4.30 4.31 4.30						2	0	1	0	4	2	17	4.42	621/1623	4.46	4.29	4.16	4.27	4.42
How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness   5 0 0 0 0 3 8 10 4.33 595/1621 4.04 4.05 4.06 4.24 4.33						2	0	0	0	1	12	11	4.42	1277/1646	4.33	4.57	4.69	4.71	4.42
Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared  1. 0 0 0 1 3 21 4.80 387/1568 4.90 4.53 4.43 4.54 4.80  2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1. 0 0 0 0 2 3 20 4.72 1003/1572 4.69 4.73 4.70 4.79 4.72  3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned  5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  1. Did class discussions  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  1. Did class discussions contribute to participate  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  1. Did class discussions  1. Did class discussions  1. Did class discussions  1.					hing effectiveness		0	0	0	3	8	10	4.33	595/1621			4.06	4.24	4.33
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 1 3 21 4.80 387/1568 4.90 4.53 4.43 4.54 4.80 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 2 3 20 4.72 1003/1572 4.69 4.73 4.70 4.79 4.72 4.79 4.70 4.79 4.72 4.70 4.79 4.72 4.70 4.79 4.72 4.70 4.79 4.72 4.70 4.79 4.72 4.70 4.79 4.72 4.70 4.79 4.79 4.79 4.79 4.79 4.70 4.79 4.79 4.70 4.79 4.70 4.79 4.70 4.79 4.70 4.79 4.70 4.79 4.70 4.79 4.70 4.79 4.70 4.70 4.70 4.70 4.70 4.70 4.70 4.70		2	,		<b>J</b>														
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 2 3 20 4.72 1003/1572 4.69 4.73 4.70 4.79 4.72 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 1 5 19 4.72 406/1564 4.36 4.28 4.28 4.04 4.72 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 1 0 2 22 4.80 3184/1559 4.90 4.34 4.29 4.14 4.80 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 18 0 1 1 0 4 4.17 ****/1352 2.00 3.57 3.98 4.07 ****  Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 2 3 0 6 3.91 886/1384 2.95 3.79 4.08 4.35 3.91 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 15 0 1 1 2 1 6 3.91 1031/1382 3.20 3.91 4.29 4.56 3.91 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 15 0 1 1 1 0 8 4.18 881/368 3.59 4.08 4.30 4.58 4.18 4. Were special techniques successful 15 7 0 0 1 1 2 4.25 ****/ 948 **** 3.94 3.95 4.31 ****  Laboratory  5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 25 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 555 **** 4.38 4.29 4.41 ****  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 7 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 8 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 1 B 11 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 4 C 5 General 3 Under-grad 26 Non-major 18 84-150 11 3.00-3.49 1 D 0																			
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 1 5 19 4.72 406/1564 4.36 4.28 4.28 4.40 4.72 4.01 the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 1 0 2 22 4.80 318/1559 4.90 4.34 4.29 4.41 4.80 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 18 0 1 1 0 4 4.17 ****/1352 2.00 3.57 3.98 4.07 ****  Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 2 3 0 6 3.91 886/1384 2.95 3.79 4.08 4.35 3.91 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 15 0 1 1 2 1 6 3.91 1031/1382 3.20 3.91 4.29 4.56 3.91 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 15 0 1 1 2 1 6 3.91 1031/1382 3.20 3.91 4.29 4.56 3.91 4.80 4.30 4.58 4.18 4.80 4.90 4.35 4.18 4.80 4.90 4.35 4.18 4.80 4.90 4.35 4.18 4.80 4.90 4.35 4.18 4.80 4.90 4.36 4.36 4.38 4.29 4.41 ****  Laboratory  5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 25 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 555 **** 4.38 4.29 4.41 ****  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 7 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 8 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 1 B 11 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 4 C 5 General 3 Under-grad 26 Non-major 18 84-150 11 3.00-3.49 1 D D 0						1	0	0	0	1	_			,				4.54	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 1 0 2 22 4.80 318/1559 4.90 4.34 4.29 4.41 4.80 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 18 0 1 1 0 4 4.17 ****/1352 2.00 3.57 3.98 4.07 ****  Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 2 3 0 6 3.91 886/1384 2.95 3.79 4.08 4.35 3.91 2.00 3.00 **** 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10					_	1	0	0	0	2				, -			4.70	4.79	4.72
Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 2 3 0 6 3.91 886/1384 2.95 3.79 4.08 4.35 3.91 2.00 3.57 3.98 4.07 ****  Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 2 3 0 6 3.91 886/1384 2.95 3.79 4.08 4.35 3.91 2.00 3.00 ****  2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 15 0 1 1 2 1 6 3.91 1031/1382 3.20 3.91 4.29 4.56 3.91 3.01 dthe instructor encourage fair and open discussion 15 0 1 1 1 0 8 4.18 881/1368 3.59 4.08 4.30 4.58 4.18 4.00 Were special techniques successful 15 7 0 0 1 1 2 4.25 ****/ 948 **** 3.94 3.95 4.31 ****  Laboratory  5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 25 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 555 **** 4.38 4.29 4.41 ****  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  O0-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 7 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 8 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 1 B 11 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 4 C 5 General 3 Under-grad 26 Non-major 18 84-150 11 3.00-3.49 1 D 0						1	0	0	-	_								4.40	
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 2 3 0 6 3.91 886/1384 2.95 3.79 4.08 4.35 3.91 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 15 0 1 1 2 1 6 3.91 1031/1382 3.20 3.91 4.29 4.56 3.91 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 15 0 1 1 1 0 8 4.18 881/1368 3.59 4.08 4.30 4.58 4.18 4. Were special techniques successful 15 7 0 0 1 1 2 4.25 ****/ 948 **** 3.94 3.95 4.31 ****  Laboratory 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 25 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 555 **** 4.38 4.29 4.41 ****  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 7 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 8 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 1 B 11 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 4 C 5 General 3 Under-grad 26 Non-major 18 84-150 11 3.00-3.49 1 D 0						1		0	_	0	2	22	4.80	318/1559	4.90	4.34	4.29	4.41	4.80
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 2 3 0 6 3.91 886/1384 2.95 3.79 4.08 4.35 3.91 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 15 0 1 1 2 1 6 3.91 1031/1382 3.20 3.91 4.29 4.56 3.91 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 15 0 1 1 1 0 8 4.18 881/1368 3.59 4.08 4.30 4.58 4.18 4. Were special techniques successful 15 7 0 0 1 1 2 4.25 ****/ 948 **** 3.94 3.95 4.31 ****  Laboratory  5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 25 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 555 **** 4.38 4.29 4.41 ****  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 7 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 8 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 1 B 11 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 4 C 5 General 3 Under-grad 26 Non-major 18 84-150 11 3.00-3.49 1 D 0	5. Did a	udiovisual	l techniques enh	ance y	our understanding	2	18	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	****/1352	2.00	3.57	3.98	4.07	****
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 2 3 0 6 3.91 886/1384 2.95 3.79 4.08 4.35 3.91 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 15 0 1 1 2 1 6 3.91 1031/1382 3.20 3.91 4.29 4.56 3.91 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 15 0 1 1 1 0 8 4.18 881/1368 3.59 4.08 4.30 4.58 4.18 4. Were special techniques successful 15 7 0 0 1 1 2 4.25 ****/ 948 **** 3.94 3.95 4.31 ****  Laboratory  5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 25 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 555 **** 4.38 4.29 4.41 ****  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 7 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 8 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 1 B 11 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 4 C 5 General 3 Under-grad 26 Non-major 18 84-150 11 3.00-3.49 1 D 0			Diagua	ion															
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 15 0 1 1 2 1 6 3.91 1031/1382 3.20 3.91 4.29 4.56 3.91 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 15 0 1 1 1 0 8 4.18 881/1368 3.59 4.08 4.30 4.58 4.18 4. Were special techniques successful 15 7 0 0 1 1 2 4.25 ****/ 948 **** 3.94 3.95 4.31 ****  Laboratory  5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 25 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 555 **** 4.38 4.29 4.41 ****  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 7 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 8 10 0.00 1 0 0 0.00-0.99 1 B 11 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 4 C 5 General 3 Under-grad 26 Non-major 18 84-150 11 3.00-3.49 1 D 0	1 Did a	logg diggs			what was laamad	1 =	0	0	2	2	0	6	2 01	006/1201	2 05	2 70	4 00	/ 2E	2 01
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 15 0 1 1 1 0 8 4.18 881/1368 3.59 4.08 4.30 4.58 4.18 4. Were special techniques successful 15 7 0 0 1 1 2 4.25 ****/ 948 **** 3.94 3.95 4.31 ****  Laboratory  5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 25 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 555 **** 4.38 4.29 4.41 ****  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 7 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 8 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 1 B 11 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 4 C 5 General 3 Under-grad 26 Non-major 18 84-150 11 3.00-3.49 1 D 0					-			•	1			0							
4. Were special techniques successful  15 7 0 0 1 1 2 4.25 ****/ 948 **** 3.94 3.95 4.31 ****  Laboratory  5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 25 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 555 **** 4.38 4.29 4.41 ****  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 7 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 8 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 1 B 11 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 4 C 5 General 3 Under-grad 26 Non-major 18 84-150 11 3.00-3.49 1 D 0			-	_						1		0		,					
Laboratory  5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 25 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 555 **** 4.38 4.29 4.41 ****  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 7 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 8 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 1 B 11 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 4 C 5 General 3 Under-grad 26 Non-major 18 84-150 11 3.00-3.49 1 D 0			_		d open discussion			_	_	1				,					
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 25 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 555 **** 4.38 4.29 4.41 ****  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 7 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 8 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 1 B 11 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 4 C 5 General 3 Under-grad 26 Non-major 18 84-150 11 3.00-3.49 1 D 0	4. were	special te	ecnniques succes	siui		15	/	U	U	1	Т	2	4.25	^^^^/ 948		3.94	3.95	4.31	* * * *
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 25 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 555 **** 4.38 4.29 4.41 ****  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 7 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 8 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 1 B 11 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 4 C 5 General 3 Under-grad 26 Non-major 18 84-150 11 3.00-3.49 1 D 0			Laborat	ory															
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 7 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 8 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 1 B 11 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 4 C 5 General 3 Under-grad 26 Non-major 18 84-150 11 3.00-3.49 1 D 0	5. Were	requiremer		-	early specified	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 555	****	4.38	4.29	4.41	****
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 7 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 8 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 1 B 11 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 4 C 5 General 3 Under-grad 26 Non-major 18 84-150 11 3.00-3.49 1 D 0					Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio	ı									
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 7 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 8 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 1 B 11 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 4 C 5 General 3 Under-grad 26 Non-major 18 84-150 11 3.00-3.49 1 D 0					1-														
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 1 B 11 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 4 C 5 General 3 Under-grad 26 Non-major 18 84-150 11 3.00-3.49 1 D 0	Credits 1	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	1
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 1 B 11 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 4 C 5 General 3 Under-grad 26 Non-major 18 84-150 11 3.00-3.49 1 D 0	00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 7		Red	auir	ed f	or M	 aior		0	Graduat	 е	0	Maic	 or	8
56-83 1 2.00-2.99 4 C 5 General 3 Under-grad 26 Non-major 18 84-150 11 3.00-3.49 1 D 0		-						-1 ~~~			)	-	-	01 00000	-	-			Ü
84-150 11 3.00-3.49 1 D 0		-		_			Gei	nera	1				3	Under-a	rad 2	26	Non-	-maior	18
** -** **** *** - * *						General					-	9		-		5			
				_		Electives					0	#### -	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	h		

Other

19

Course-Section: ECON 467 0201 University of Maryland Page 565 Title Baltimore County HEALTH ECONOMICS Instructor: GOLDFARB, MARSH Fall 2008

111001 00001	00
Enrollment:	8
Questionnaires:	4

Field Work

FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies In				Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
Questions	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	2	1	4.33	871/1649	4.47	4.23	4.28	4.50	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	362/1648	4.63	4.24	4.23	4.36	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1375	4.80	4.32	4.27	4.48	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1067/1595	4.13	4.06	4.20	4.36	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	366/1533	4.32	4.04	4.04	4.14	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	502/1623	4.46	4.29	4.16	4.27	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1398/1646	4.33	4.57	4.69	4.71	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1192/1621	4.04	4.05	4.06	4.24	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1568	4.90	4.53	4.43	4.54	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1071/1572	4.69	4.73	4.70	4.79	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1127/1564	4.36	4.28	4.28	4.40	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1559	4.90	4.34	4.29	4.41	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1335/1352	2.00	3.57	3.98	4.07	2.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	Λ	1	Λ	Λ	2 00	1366/1384	2.95	3.79	4.08	4.35	2.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	0	1	0		1363/1382	3.20	3.79	4.29	4.56	2.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	0	U	1		1286/1368	3.59	4.08	4.30	4.58	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage rail and open discussion	۷	U		U	U	J	_	3.00	1200/1300	3.33	1.00	7.30	7.30	3.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

#### Frequency Distribution

5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 3 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 68/312 4.00 3.73 3.68 3.95 4.00

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	С	3	General	0	Under-grad	4	Non-major	2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	Ĺ
				P	0			responses to	be sign	nificant	
				I	0	Other	3	-	_		
				2	0						

Course-Section: ECON 475 0101
Title FINANCIAL INVSTMNT ANA

FINANCIAL INVSTMNT ANA Baltimore County LAMDIN, DOUGLAS Fall 2008

Instructor: LAMDIN, DOUGLAS

Enrollment: 40
Questionnaires: 26

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Page 566 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

					Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General															
1. Did you gain new	v insights, skills fr	om this course	1	0	0	0	4	5	16	4.48	670/1649	4.48	4.23	4.28	4.50	4.48
2. Did the instruct	or make clear the e	expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	8	16	4.60	441/1648	4.60	4.24	4.23	4.36	4.60
3. Did the exam que	estions reflect the	expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	22	4.84	206/1375	4.84	4.32	4.27	4.48	4.84
4. Did other evalua	ations reflect the e	expected goals	1	1	1	2	1	4	16	4.33	722/1595	4.33	4.06	4.20	4.36	4.33
5. Did assigned rea	adings contribute to	what you learned	2	2	1	1	2	2	16	4.41	476/1533	4.41	4.04	4.04	4.14	4.41
6. Did written assi	gnments contribute	to what you learned	2	6	1	1	2	2	12	4.28	663/1512	4.28	3.93	4.10	4.26	4.28
7. Was the grading	system clearly expl	ained	2	0	0	0	1	4	19	4.75	220/1623	4.75	4.29	4.16	4.27	4.75
8. How many times w	was class cancelled		2	0	0	0	0	7	17	4.71	993/1646	4.71	4.57	4.69	4.71	4.71
9. How would you gr	ade the overall tea	ching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	13	11	4.40	511/1621	4.40	4.05	4.06	4.24	4.40
	Lecture															
1. Were the instruc		prepared	1	0	0	Ο	0	3	22	4.88	273/1568	4.88	4.53	4.43	4.54	4.88
	or seem interested	1 1	1	0	0	0	1	2	22	4.84	740/1572	4.84	4.73	4.70	4.79	4.84
	erial presented and		1	0	0	0	2	5	18	4.64	498/1564	4.64	4.28	4.28	4.40	4.64
	s contribute to what		1	0	0	1	3	2	19	4.56	629/1559	4.56	4.34	4.29	4.41	4.56
	techniques enhance	-	1	9	2	0	3	1	10	4.06	655/1352		3.57	3.98	4.07	4.06
	Diament															
1 Did alasa disasa	Discussion		17	0	2	1	2	0	1	2 22	1150/1204	2 22	2 70	4 00	4.35	2 22
1. Did class discus		-		0	1	1	2	1	4		1159/1384		3.79	4.08		3.33
	s actively encourage for encourage fair a		17 17	0	0	1	2 4	1	4		1146/1382 1085/1368	3.67 3.78	3.91 4.08	4.29	4.56 4.58	3.67 3.78
	_	ind open discussion	17	4	0	1	0	1	4		****/ 948			3.95	4.38	3./8 ****
4. Were special tec	milques successiui		1/	4	U	1	U	1	3	4.20	****/ 948		3.94	3.95	4.31	
	Seminar															
5. Were criteria fo	or grading made clea	ır	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 288	****	3.29	3.68	3.71	***
		Frequ	iency	Dist	ribu	ution	1									
						_										
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	S			Tyj	pe			Majors	

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	2	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	24	Non-major	26
84-150	14	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	21	-			
				2	0						

Course-Section: ECON 477 0101

Title DERIVATIVE SECURITIES

Instructor: GETTER, DARYL

Enrollment: 31 Questionnaires: 28

### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 567 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies								Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	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	2	2	1	22	4.46	696/1649	4.46	4.23	4.28	4.50	4.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	4	18	4.32	811/1648	4.32	4.24	4.23	4.36	4.32
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	4	5	16	4.18	868/1375	4.18	4.32	4.27	4.48	4.18
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	2	8	3	11	3.84	1236/1595	3.84	4.06	4.20	4.36	3.84
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	13	3	3	3	1	5	3.13	1411/1533	3.13	4.04	4.04	4.14	3.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	ed 0	10	1	2	4	3	8	3.83	1068/1512	3.83	3.93	4.10	4.26	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	5	20	4.61	395/1623	4.61	4.29	4.16	4.27	4.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.57	4.69	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	ss 4	0	0	1	3	5	15	4.42	497/1621	4.42	4.05	4.06	4.24	4.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	2	3	21	4.59	743/1568	4.59	4.53	4.43	4.54	4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	23	4.81	815/1572	4.81	4.73	4.70	4.79	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	4	3		4.37	812/1564	4.37	4.28	4.28	4.40	4.37
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	3	21	4.59	596/1559	4.59	4.34	4.29	4.41	4.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	, 2	21	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	****/1352	****	3.57	3.98	4.07	****
Discussion							_							
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	3	0	2		****/1384	****	3.79	4.08	4.35	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	0	0	2	1	3		****/1382	****	3.91	4.29	4.56	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion		0	0	0	2	0	4		****/1368	****	4.08	4.30	4.58	****
4. Were special techniques successful	22	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	****	3.94	3.95	4.31	****
T - 12														
Laboratory	0.5	•	0	0	0	_	-	F 00	***** / 001	****	als als als als	4 16	4 50	at at at at
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 221	***	****	4.16	4.73	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information		0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.61	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities		0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	27	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.63	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.38	4.29	4.41	****
Seminar														
	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.66	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme		0	0	0	0	0	1		,	***	****	4.47		****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0		0				5.00	,	****	****		4.54	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	, -	****	****	4.43	4.57	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27 27	0	0	0	-	•	1		****/ 92	****		4.35	4.44	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	U	U	U	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288		3.29	3.68	3.71	^ ^ ^ ^
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	4.86	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,	****	****	4.47	4.52	****
	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,	****	****	4.47	4.52	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 312	****	3.73	3.68	3.95	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	∠0	U	U	U	U	1		4.50	^^^/ 312		3./3	3.08	3.95	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 53	****	3.86	4.30	4.64	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.24	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,	****	****	4.43	4.84	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.85	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	27	0	0	0	0	0	_		****/ 110	****	****	3.99	4.22	****
3. Here energy proceeds for all the students	۱ کے ۱	U	J	U	U	U	_	3.00	, 110			3.79	1.22	

Course-Section: ECON 477 0101

Title DERIVATIVE SECURITIES

Instructor: GETTER, DARYL

Enrollment: 31
Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 567 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	Α	10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	6	C	5	General	4	Under-grad	27	Non-major	28
84-150	15	3.00-3.49	6	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	20	_			
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 481 0101

INTERNATIONAL TRADE TH

Title Instructor: TAKACS, WENDY E

Enrollment: 38 Questionnaires: 29 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 568 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
---------	--------	------------	---------------

	Questions					NA	Fre	equer 2	ncie:	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General	=							_								
		ew insights,skil			0	0	0	1	3	8	17	4.41		4.41	4.23	4.28	4.50	4.41
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	0 1	4	7	17	4.46	614/1648	4.46	4.24	4.23	4.36	4.46
		uestions reflect uations reflect			1	0 13	0 1	1	5 1	8 5	14 8	4.25	806/1375 983/1595	4.25 4.13	4.32	4.27	4.48	4.25
		uations reffect eadings contribu			1	13	3	1	T	8	10		1045/1533	3.78	4.06	4.20	4.14	3.78
	-	-		what you learned	1	16	0	1	0	4	7	4.42		4.42	3.93	4.10	4.26	4.42
		g system clearly			1	10	0	1	2	3	22	4.64	345/1623	4.64	4.29	4.16	4.27	4.64
		was class cance		irea	2	0	0	0	0	13			1184/1646	4.52	4.57	4.69	4.71	4.52
	-			ing effectiveness	8	0	0	0	3	10	8		709/1621		4.05	4.06	4.24	
	1 1 1			J														
1 1.7	ha daar	Lecture			_	0	0	0	1	1	2.2	4 70	440/1560	4 70	4 52	4 42	4 54	4 70
		uctor's lectures ctor seem intere			2	0	0	0	U T	4	22 23	4.78 4.85	442/1568	4.78 4.85	4.53 4.73	4.43	4.54 4.79	4.78 4.85
		terial presented			4	0	0	1	3	3	23 18	4.85	715/1572 630/1564	4.85	4.73	4.70	4.79	4.83
		es contribute to			3	0	1	1	2	4	18	4.42	804/1559	4.42	4.20	4.29	4.40	4.42
			_		4	16	1	0	2	3	3	3.78	900/1352		3.57	3.98	4.41	3.78
o. Dia aa	d audiovisual techniques enhance your understand					10	_	U	2	5	5	3.70	J00/1332	3.70	3.37	3.50	1.07	3.70
	Discussion																	
	Discussion id class discussions contribute to what you learn				17	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	673/1384		3.79	4.08	4.35	4.25
		nts actively end			18	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	925/1382	4.09	3.91	4.29	4.56	4.09
				open discussion	17	0	1	0	1	2	8	4.33	796/1368	4.33	4.08	4.30	4.58	4.33
4. Were s	special te	echniques succes	sful		17	11	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	****	3.94	3.95	4.31	****
		Laborat	orv															
5. Were r	eguiremen	nts for lab repo	-	arly specified	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.38	4.29	4.41	****
				2									,					
	_	Field V								_	•							
o. Did co	nierences	s help you carry	out fi	eld activities	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.73	3.68	3.95	****
								ution	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	S			Ty	pe			Majors	;	
	07 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0																	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 11		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	`S	2	Graduat	e	1	Majo	or	10
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 5		<b>a</b>		1				1	TTm d a sc			Mari		1.0
56-83	2 11	2.00-2.99	6	C 6 D 1		Gei	nera:	L				4	Under-g	rad 2	28	non-	-major	19
84-150							ectiv					0	#### - 1	Moona +	homo -			.h
Grad.							=CL1	ves				U	respons				_	111
				P 0 I 0		<b>∩</b> +1	her				7	1	respons	es to L	e sigi	ıııcaı	10	
				? 2		ULI	TET				2	1						

Course-Section: ECON 482 0101

Title INTERNATIONAL FINANCE

Instructor: YUAN, CHUNMING

Enrollment: 39
Questionnaires: 26

Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 569 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

			Fre	equer	ncies	2		Tnei	tructor	Course	Dent	UMBC	T.evel	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<u> </u>														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	4	8	13	4.23	986/1649	4.23	4.23	4.28	4.50	4.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	10	10	4.04	1106/1648	4.04	4.24	4.23	4.36	4.04
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	4	8	12	4.24	823/1375	4.24	4.32	4.27	4.48	4.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	3	1	0	7	8	3.84	1236/1595	3.84	4.06	4.20	4.36	3.84
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	3	1	2	5	8	3.74	1084/1533	3.74	4.04	4.04	4.14	3.74
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	13	1	1	3	4	4	3.69	1154/1512	3.69	3.93	4.10	4.26	3.69
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	4	5	14	4.12	968/1623	4.12	4.29	4.16	4.27	4.12
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	1	0	0	8	16	4.52	1175/1646	4.52	4.57	4.69	4.71	4.52
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	2	0	4	8	8	3.91	1060/1621	3.91	4.05	4.06	4.24	3.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	9	14	4.38	1002/1568	4.38	4.53	4.43	4.54	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	2	22	4.80	840/1572	4.80	4.73	4.70	4.79	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	2	2	7	13	4.16	1028/1564	4.16	4.28	4.28	4.40	4.16
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	8	14	4.32	911/1559	4.32	4.34	4.29	4.41	4.32
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	18	1	0	2	0	3	3.67	****/1352	****	3.57	3.98	4.07	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	571/1384	4.38	3.79	4.08	4.35	4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	790/1382	4.31	3.91	4.29	4.56	4.31
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	722/1368	4.44	4.08	4.30	4.58	4.44
4. Were special techniques successful	10	10	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	****/ 948	****	3.94	3.95	4.31	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.73	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00		****	****	4.12	4.61	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.63	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.38	4.29	4.41	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.66	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.54	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.57	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 92	****	****	4.35	4.44	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	****	3.29	3.68	3.71	****
Field Work				•	•	•								
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 52	****	****	4.06	4.86	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	, -	****	****	4.09	4.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.52	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.59	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 312	****	3.73	3.68	3.95	****
Self Paced	0.5	-		•	•	_	_	F 05			2 25	4 22	4 - 4	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	3.86	4.30	4.64	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.24	***
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00		***	****	4.43	4.84	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.85	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	4.22	****

Course-Section: ECON 482 0101

Title INTERNATIONAL FINANCE

Instructor: YUAN, CHUNMING

Enrollment: 39
Questionnaires: 26

YUAN, CHUNMING

Baltimore County Fall 2008

University of Maryland

Page 569 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	 А	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	11						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General	3	Under-grad	26	Non-major	19
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	19	-			
				?	2						

Course-Section: ECON 490 0101 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County ANALYTIC METHODS IN EC

Instructor: CINYABUGUMA, MA

Enrollment: 28 Questionnaires: 14

Fall 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 570

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies							Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	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	5	7	4.46	696/1649	4.46	4.23	4.28	4.50	4.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	672/1648	4.43	4.24	4.23	4.36	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	521/1375		4.32	4.27	4.48	4.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	0	2	3	5		1067/1595	4.00	4.06	4.20	4.36	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	4	6	2	3.83	986/1533	3.83	4.04	4.04	4.14	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	1042/1512	3.88	3.93	4.10	4.26	3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	2	8	4.29	780/1623	4.29	4.29	4.16	4.27	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	977/1646	4.71	4.57	4.69	4.71	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	7	3	4.18	766/1621	4.18	4.05	4.06	4.24	4.18
Lecture				_	_	_	_	4 40	056/4560		4 = 0	4 40		4 40
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	Τ	6	-/	4.43	956/1568		4.53	4.43	4.54	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	Τ	2	11		1003/1572		4.73	4.70	4.79	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	754/1564		4.28	4.28	4.40	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	Ţ	4	9	4.57	618/1559		4.34	4.29	4.41	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	0	1	3	2	0	3.17	1189/1352	3.17	3.57	3.98	4.07	3.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	247/1384	4.75	3.79	4.08	4.35	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	394/1382	4.75	3.91	4.29	4.56	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	654/1368	4.50	4.08	4.30	4.58	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 948	****	3.94	3.95	4.31	****
T					_									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	13
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 600 0101

POLICY CONSQ:ECON ANAL

Title Instructor:

Enrollment: 21 Questionnaires: 21

Baltimore County BRENNAN, TIMOTH Fall 2008

Page 571 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Overtions	MD	NA	Fre	_	ncie 3	s 4	5		tructor	Course	-		Level	
Questions	INIX.	NA.				<del></del>		Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	8	8	5	3.86	1311/1649	3.86	4.23	4.28	4.46	3.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	10	3		1375/1648	3.71	4.24	4.23	4.34	3.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	3	7	5	5	3.60	1169/1375	3.60	4.32	4.27	4.44	3.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	1	2	9	5	3.89	1213/1595	3.89	4.06	4.20	4.35	3.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	5	8	3	3.40	1317/1533	3.40	4.04	4.04	4.28	3.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	0	3	8	5	4.13	817/1512	4.13	3.93	4.10	4.35	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	3	4	4	8	3.89	1186/1623	3.89	4.29	4.16	4.29	3.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.57	4.69	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	8	7	2	3.56	1323/1621	3.56	4.05	4.06	4.20	3.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	6	12	4.38	1002/1568	4.38	4.53	4.43	4.52	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	19	4.86	715/1572	4.86	4.73	4.70	4.83	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	10	6	4		1356/1564		4.28	4.28	4.41	3.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	6	6	8		1159/1559			4.29	4.41	3.95
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	15	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	****/1352	****	3.57	3.98	4.10	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	4	8	4	1	2 71	1329/1384	2 71	3.79	4.08	4.30	2.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	3	2	4	5	7		1207/1382		3.91	4.29	4.52	3.52
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	2	0	4	6	9	3.95	990/1368	3.95	4.08	4.30	4.56	3.95
4. Were special techniques successful	0	20	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 948	****		3.95	4.03	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	***	***	4.12	4.61	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 288	****	3.29	3.68	3.87	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	4.51	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.47	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.58	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.44	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.73	3.68	3.83	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 53	****	3.86	4.30	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.49	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	***	****	4.43	4.43	****

Credits E	Tarned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	2	 А	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	18	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	11					_	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	2	General	1	Under-grad	3	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0			-		-	
Grad.	18	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to		_	
				I	0	Other	19	-	•	_	

? 1

Course-Section: ECON 601 0101 University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Title MICROECONOMIC ANALYSIS Instructor: FARROW, ROBERT

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 12 Fall 2008

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 572 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank		Dept Mean			Sect Mean
General  1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course  2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals  3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0 1 1	0 0 0	0 0	0 0	0 1 1	0 5 6	12 5 4	5.00 4.36 4.27	1/1649 756/1648 788/1375		4.23 4.24 4.32	4.28 4.23 4.27	4.46 4.34 4.44	5.00 4.36 4.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled	1 1 1 1	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 1 0 0	1 1 0 0	5 0 3 1	5 9 7 10 11	4.36 4.55 4.55 4.91 5.00	,	4.91	4.06 4.04 3.93 4.29	4.20 4.04 4.10 4.16 4.69	4.35 4.28 4.35 4.29 4.81	4.36 4.55 4.55 4.91 5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  Lecture	5	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	1/1646 654/1621	4.29	4.57	4.06	4.20	4.29
<ol> <li>Were the instructor's lectures well prepared</li> <li>Did the instructor seem interested in the subject</li> <li>Was lecture material presented and explained clearly</li> <li>Did the lectures contribute to what you learned</li> <li>Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding</li> </ol>	1 0 1 0 0	0 0 0 0 4	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 1 0 2	2 0 1 1 3	9 12 9 11 2	4.82 5.00 4.73 4.92 3.75	372/1568 1/1572 390/1564 184/1559 914/1352	5.00 4.73 4.92	4.53 4.73 4.28 4.34 3.57	4.43 4.70 4.28 4.29 3.98	4.52 4.83 4.41 4.41 4.10	4.82 5.00 4.73 4.92 3.75
Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  4. Were special techniques successful	9 9 9	0 0 0 2	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	2 0 0 0	1 3 3 1	5.00	613/1384 1/1382 1/1368 ****/ 948	5.00 5.00	3.79 3.91 4.08 3.94	4.08 4.29 4.30 3.95	4.30 4.52 4.56 4.03	4.33 5.00 5.00 ****
Laboratory 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified Seminar	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	***	4.38	4.29	4.66	***
5. Were criteria for grading made clear  Field Work  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 288 ****/ 312		3.29	3.68	3.87	****
		Dis	Ü	utio	Ü	1	U	4.00	/ 312		3.73	3.00	3.03	
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	S 			Ту:	pe 			Majors	
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 1 A 5 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 3 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 84-150 5 3.00-3.49 2 D 0			quir nera		or Ma	ijor		0	Graduat Under-g		0	Majo Non-	major	4 8
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0 P 0 I 0 ? 0			ecti her	ves				0 9	#### - : respons				_	h

University of Maryland Page 573 Baltimore County Fall 2008

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

					Fr	equei	ncies			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General															
1 Did	l vou gai	n new insights, skills from	n this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	256/1649	4 82	4.23	4 28	4.46	4.82
		tructor make clear the exp		0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	161/1648	4.88	4.24	4.23	4.34	4.88
		m questions reflect the ex		0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94		4.94	4.32	4.27	4.44	4.94
		valuations reflect the exp	_	0	1	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.06	4.20	4.35	5.00
		d readings contribute to w		0	0	0	2	1	1	13	4.47		4.47	4.04	4.04	4.28	4.47
6. Did	d written	assignments contribute to	what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	194/1512	4.75	3.93	4.10	4.35	4.75
7. Was	the gra	ding system clearly explai	ined	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	85/1623	4.94	4.29	4.16	4.29	4.94
8. How	many ti	mes was class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	697/1646	4.88	4.57	4.69	4.81	4.88
9. How	would y	ou grade the overall teach	ning effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1621	5.00	4.05	4.06	4.20	5.00
		Lecture															
1. Wer	e the in	structor's lectures well p	prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.53	4.43	4.52	5.00
		tructor seem interested in	_	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1572	5.00		4.70	4.83	5.00
		material presented and ex		1	0	0	0	0	1		4.94			4.28	4.28	4.41	
		tures contribute to what y		1	0	0	0	1	0	15	4.88	238/1559	4.88	4.34	4.29	4.41	4.88
		sual techniques enhance yo		2	5	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	188/1352	4.70	3.57	3.98	4.10	4.70
		Discussion															
1 154	l aloga d	what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	571/1384	4.38	3.79	4.08	4.30	4.38	
			9 9	0	0	0	1	0			394/1382		3.79	4.08	4.52	4.38	
	ere all students actively encouraged to participat				0	0	0	1	0	7				4.08	4.29	4.52	4.75
	id the instructor encourage fair and open discussions special techniques successful				4	0	0	0	0			****/ 948			3.95		****
		1										,					
_		Laboratory															
5. Wer	re requir	ements for lab reports cle	early specified	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.38	4.29	4.66	****
		Field Work															
5. Did	d confere	nces help you carry out fi	ield activities	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.73	3.68	3.83	****
		Self Paced															
5. Wer	re there	enough proctors for all th	ne students	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	***	****	3.99	3.92	***
			Frequ	anav	Diet	-rih	utio	2									
			11040	iciicy	DIS	CLID	uc101										
Credit	s Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	7 1	A 7		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jor	 s	0	Graduat	 e	6	Majo	or	1	
28-55						-			_						3 -		
56-83	3 0	2.00-2.99 0	C 1		Ger	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad 1	.1	Non-	-major	16
84-15	50 5	D 0															
Grad.							ves				0	#### - 1					ſh
		P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nifican	ıt		
			I 0		Oth	ner				1	4						
			? 0														

Course-Section: ECON 611 0101 Title ECONOMETRICS I

Instructor: GINDLING, THOMA Enrollment: 17 Questionnaires: 17

FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029 University of Maryland Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: ECON 652 0101 Title ECONOMICS OF HEALTH GOLDFARB, MARSH Fall 2008

Instructor:

Enrollment: 7 Questionnaires: 7

Page 574

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect														
			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	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	2	5	4.71	372/1649	4.71	4.23	4.28	4.46	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.24	4.23	4.34	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.32	4.27	4.44	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	162/1595	4.86	4.06	4.20	4.35	4.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	311/1533	4.57	4.04	4.04	4.28	4.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	133/1512	4.86	3.93	4.10	4.35	4.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	145/1623	4.86	4.29	4.16	4.29	4.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1130/1646	4.57	4.57	4.69	4.81	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	313/1621	4.57	4.05	4.06	4.20	4.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.53	4.43	4.52	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.73	4.70	4.83	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.28	4.28	4.41	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.34	4.29	4.41	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	690/1352	4.00	3.57	3.98	4.10	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	437/1384	4.50	3.79	4.08	4.30	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	616/1382	4.50	3.91	4.29	4.52	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	654/1368	4.50	4.08	4.30	4.56	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	3.94	3.95	4.03	5.00
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •														

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	5	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	2	Non-major	7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						