Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

Questions

Instructor: MUTTER, RYAN L

Enrollment: 41

Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 509 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Mean Mean Mean Mean

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

Frequencies

NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean

Instructor

Rank

		Cono	 1															
1. Did vo	u gain n	General ew insights.skil		this course	1	0	0	0	3	5	17	4.56	554/1576	4.08	4.24	4.30	4.11	4.56
				ected goals				0	3				528/1576					
3. Did the	e exam q	uestions reflect	t the ex	pected goals	1	0	0	0	1	9	15	4.56	521/1342	4.23	4.28	4.32	4.19	4.56
4. Did oth	her eval	uations reflect	the exp	pected goals ected goals	1	7	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	281/1520	4.02	4.12	4.25	4.09	4.72
5. Did ass	signed r	eadings contribu	ute to w	hat you learned	1	6	0	0	3	5	11	4.42	483/1465	3.90	4.08	4.12	4.02	4.42
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute to	what you learned	2	12	0	0	4	2	6	4.17	777/1434	3.89	4.05	4.14	3.94	4.17
7. Was the	e gradin	g system clearly	y explai	.ned	1	0	0	0					624/1547					
		was class cance				1	0	0	0	6	17	4.74	795/1574	4.16	4.54	4.64	4.59	4.74
9. How wor	uld you	grade the overal	ll teach	ing effectiveness	7	1	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	395/1554	4.04	4.04	4.10	4.01	4.50
		Lecture	e															
				repared	3	0	0	0	2	6	15	4.57	798/1488	4.51	4.59	4.47	4.41	4.57
				the subject								5.00						
3. Was led	cture ma	terial presented	d and ex	plained clearly									881/1486					
		es contribute to											474/1489					
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance yo	our understanding	3	11	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	463/1277	3.86	3.82	4.03	3.91	4.33
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contribu	ute to w	hat you learned	13	0							568/1279					
				l to participate		0	0	2	3	2	6	3.92	990/1270	4.00	4.00	4.35	4.09	3.92
3. Did the	e instru	ctor encourage i	fair and	l open discussion	14	0	0	1	3	1	7	4.17	870/1269	4.11	4.16	4.35	4.09	4.17
4. Were sp	pecial t	echniques succes	ssful		14	8	1	0	0	3	0	3.25	****/ 878	3.40	3.53	4.05	3.91	****
_		Laborat	-							_								
5. Were re	equireme	nts for lab repo	orts cle	early specified	19	0	0	0	0	./	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.11	4.11	4.20	4.15	4.00
F 17		Semina			20	0	0	0	_	1	0	2 17	**** / 20F	2 21	2 00	4 01	2 70	
5. were c	riteria	for grading made	e clear		20	U	U	U	5	Τ	U	3.1/	****/ 375	3.31	3.22	4.01	3.78	^^^
F 7543 ===		Field V		eld activities	1 7	0	0	0	0	1	0	2 11	244/ 326	2 10	2 00	4 02	2 (1	2 11
5. Dia coi	nierence	s neip you carry	y out ii	eld activities.	Ι/	U	U	U	8	Τ	U	3.11	244/ 326	3.10	3.09	4.03	3.64	3.11
E More +1	hawa ana	Self I		ne students	10	0	0	0	0	٥	0	2 00	212/ 202	2 1/	2 20	1 00	2 06	2 00
5. were u	nere eno	ugn proctors for	r all th	ie students	18	U	U	U	8	U	U	3.00	313/ 382	3.14	3.20	4.08	3.80	3.00
				Frequ	ıency	Dist	tribu	ution	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades					asons				Тур	e			Majors	
00-27	1	 A 6								3	Graduate	; 	0	Majo	 or	1		
28-55	1	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0	в 7		1.0					-	-	or addage	-	-			-
56-83			2	 C 5		Ger	nera	l				2	Under-gi	ad 2	26	Non-	major	25
84-150															-		5 2	
Grad.	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0							ves				2	#### - N	leans t	here a	are not	enoue	h
	-			P 0									response				_	
			3 0 I 0		Otl	ner				1	1			3				
				? 0														

Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

Instructor: THOMAS, MARK S

Enrollment: 33 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 510 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

			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
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	3	3	7	9	3.87	1274/1576	4.08	4.24	4.30	4.11	3.87
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	6	10	4.04	1113/1576	4.16	4.28	4.27	4.18	4.04
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	5	12	4.22	865/1342	4.23	4.28	4.32	4.19	4.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	16	0	1	2	1	3		1199/1520	4.02	4.12	4.25	4.09	3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	15	1	0	2	0	4		1028/1465	3.90	4.08	4.12	4.02	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	19	0	0	1	2	0		****/1434	3.89	4.05	4.14	3.94	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	1	6	13		727/1547	4.21	4.34	4.19	4.10	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	19	2		1459/1574	4.16	4.54	4.64	4.59	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	7	10	3	3.67	1227/1554	4.04	4.04	4.10	4.01	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	3	8	10	4.23	1134/1488	4.51	4.59	4.47	4.41	4.23
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	0		17		1089/1493	4.71	4.72	4.73	4.65	4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	4	3	13		1010/1486	4.23	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	5	1	15	4.36	856/1489			4.32		4.36
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	0	3	6	9	4.16	615/1277				3.91	4.16
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	2	0	1	4	2	3.44	1089/1279	3.80	3.94	4.17	3.96	3.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	1	1	3	3	3.67	1091/1270	4.00	4.00	4.35	4.09	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	1036/1269	4.11	4.16	4.35	4.09	3.75
4. Were special techniques successful	14	7	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 878	3.40	3.53	4.05	3.91	****
T. D. Const.														
Laboratory	20	0	1	0	1	^	1	2 00	**** / 040			4 25	4 00	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	1	0	1	0	1		****/ 240		****	4.35	4.29	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	3	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	****/ 379	4.11	4.11	4.20	4.15	***
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	3	0	0	5	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	3.31	3.22	4.01	3.78	****
S S														
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	2	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 326	3.10	3.09	4.03	3.64	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	2		****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	1	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	1	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 35	****		4.67	4.68	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	3	0	0	6	1	0	3.14	297/ 382	3.14	3.20	4.08	3.86	3.14

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	3	Under-grad	23	Non-major	21
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	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 ?

Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

Instructor: COOMBER, WILLIA

Enrollment: 38 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 511 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	quer	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	1	2	3	5	5		1374/1576		4.24	4.30	4.11	3.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	8	1	5	3.50	1392/1576	4.16	4.28	4.27	4.18	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	5	6		1080/1342		4.28	4.32	4.19	3.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	0	1	1	6	4.22	891/1520	4.02	4.12	4.25	4.09	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	424/1465	3.90	4.08	4.12	4.02	4.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	1	1	1	1	4	3.75	1093/1434	3.89	4.05	4.14	3.94	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	1	2	4	6	3.56	1320/1547			4.19	4.10	3.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	14	2		1411/1574		4.54	4.64	4.59	4.13
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	4	4	1	3.67	1227/1554	4.04	4.04	4.10	4.01	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	3	8	1 16	920/1488	4.51	4 50	4.47	4.41	4.46
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	3	8		1142/1493	4.71	4.72	4.73	4.65	4.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	1	5	1	5		1303/1486	4.23	4.33			3.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	2	3	2	3		1398/1489		4.35	4.32		3.02
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	1	1	4	1	4		1001/1277		3.82	4.03	3.91	
5. Did audiovisual techniques emhance your understanding	3	۷	1	1	4	1	4	3.55	1001/12//	3.00	3.04	4.03	3.91	3.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	1	4	3	3.89	906/1279	3.80	3.94	4.17	3.96	3.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	784/1270	4.00	4.00	4.35	4.09	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	0	4	4	4.11	900/1269	4.11	4.16	4.35	4.09	4.11
4. Were special techniques successful	8	5	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 878	3.40	3.53	4.05	3.91	****
Laboratory	1.5	0	0	•	•	0	-	F 00	**** / 024	ale ale ale ale	ale ale ale ale	4 00	4 00	als als als als
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 234	****	***	4.23	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.29	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 229		****	4.51	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	U	U	U	U	2	0	4.00	****/ 379	4.11	4.11	4.20	4.15	* * * *
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.52	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	209/ 375	3.31	3.22	4.01	3.78	3.50
Field Work	1.5	•	0	•	•	-	•	4 00	***** 50	als als als als	ale ale ale ale	4 40	4 00	ale ale ale ale
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	***	4.48	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	7	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.10	3.09	4.03	3.64	3.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 382	3.14	3.20	4.08	3.86	****

Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

Instructor: COOMBER, WILLIA

Enrollment: 38
Questionnaires: 16

OF MICROECONOMICS
Baltimore County
SER, WILLIA
Spring 2009

Page 511 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	 5	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	2	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 si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	7	_			
				?	1						

Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

Instructor: DASGUPTA, NANDI

Enrollment: 38
Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 512 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies

Instructor

							Fre	equei	ncie	S		Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	OMRC.	телет	Sect
	Questions						1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 Did 1101	u anin n	Genera ew insights,ski		m thia acurac	0	0	0	1	0	6	14	4.57	541/1576	4.08	4.24	4.30	4.11	4.57
		ew insignes,ski ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60		4.16	4.24	4.27	4.11	4.60
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	1	0	6	14	4.57	510/1342	4.10	4.28	4.32	4.19	4.57
		uestions reflect uations reflect			0	12	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1520	4.23	4.12	4.25	4.19	5.00
				what you learned	0	1	2	0	1	5	12	4.25		3.90	4.08	4.12	4.02	4.25
	_	-		o what you learned	0	14	1	0	1	2	3		1033/1434	3.89	4.05	4.14	3.94	3.86
		g system clearl			1	0	0	1	1	3	3 15	4.60		4.21	4.34	4.19	4.10	4.60
		was class canc		Thed	0	0	0	0	1	3 17	13		1427/1574	4.16	4.54	4.19		4.10
	_			hing effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	8	5 6		504/1554				4.01	
9. HOW WO	uia you g	grade the overa	II tead	ning effectiveness	,	U	U	U	U	0	0	4.43	504/1554	4.04	4.04	4.10	4.01	4.43
		Lectur																
1. Were th	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	248/1488	4.51	4.59	4.47	4.41	4.90
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	557/1493	4.71	4.72	4.73	4.65	4.90
		xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	5		4.48		4.23		4.32		4.48		
		you learned	0	0	0	1	0	5		4.62	-,	4.32			4.22			
				our understanding	1	13	0	1	1	0	5	4.29					3.91	
5. 21a aa.	arovibaa.	1 000111114400 011	our under bounding	_		ŭ	_	_	Ū		1.27	300, 12	3.00	3.02	1.05	3.71	1.27	
		Discus	sion															
				what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	745/1279	3.80	3.94	4.17	3.96	4.14
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively en	d to participate	14	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	582/1270	4.00	4.00	4.35	4.09	4.57	
3. Did the	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	14	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	803/1269	4.11	4.16	4.35	4.09	4.29
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		14	3	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 878	3.40	3.53	4.05	3.91	****
		T - 1																
E Works and		Labora	_	early specified	13	0	0	0	0	7	1	1 12	200/ 379	1 11	1 11	4 20	/ 1E	1 12
o. were re	equiremen	nts for lab rep	OILS CI	early specified	13	U	U	U	U	,	1	4.13	200/ 3/9	4.11	4.11	4.20	4.15	4.13
		Semina	r															
5. Were c	riteria 1	for grading mad	le clear		13	0	0	0	7	1	0	3.13	276/ 375	3.31	3.22	4.01	3.78	3.13
5 P. 1		Field			1.0	0	•	0	_	0	•	2 00	051/ 206	2 10	2 00	4 00	2 64	2 00
5. Dia coi	nierences	s neip you carr	y out i	ield activities	12	0	0	0	9	0	U	3.00	251/ 326	3.10	3.09	4.03	3.64	3.00
		Self	Paced															
5. Were th	here enou	ugh proctors fo	r all t	he students	15	0	0	0	5	1	0	3.17	291/ 382	3.14	3.20	4.08	3.86	3.17
				Frequ	ency	Dist	tribu	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Pe:	ason	c c			Туј	20			Majors	
									_ 								. – – – –	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A 7		Red	quire	ed f	or M	ajor	s	2	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 6														
56-83	56-83 3 2.00-2.99 1 C 1					Gei	nera:	1				3	Under-g	rad 2	21	Non-	-major	20
84-150	84-150 1 3.00-3.49 1 D 0												3				~	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enou	ıh
	P 0												response				_	•
	I 0						her				1	.0			–			
				? 0							_							
				? 0														

Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

Instructor: DASGUPTA, NANDI

Enrollment: 36
Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 513 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.38	818/1576	4.08	4.24	4.30	4.11	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	528/1576		4.28	4.27	4.18	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	298/1342	4.23	4.28	4.32	4.19	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	1	2	3	4		1041/1520	4.02	4.12	4.25	4.09	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	708/1465	3.90	4.08	4.12	4.02	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	13	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1434	3.89	4.05	4.14	3.94	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	4	4	7	4.20	900/1547	4.21	4.34	4.19	4.10	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	4	11	1	3.81	1535/1574	4.16	4.54	4.64	4.59	3.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	298/1554	4.04	4.04	4.10	4.01	4.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	401/1488	4.51	4.59	4.47	4.41	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	810/1493		4.72	4.73	4.65	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	0	5	9	4.47	735/1486	4.23	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0 12	0 1	0	0 1	2	13 1	4.87	240/1489 ****/1277	4.32	4.35 3.82	4.32	4.22 3.91	4.87 ****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	12	Т	U	Т	U	Τ.	3.00	~~~/12//	3.80	3.82	4.03	3.91	* * * *
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	3	0	1	3.00	1186/1279	3.80	3.94	4.17	3.96	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	1	0	2	1	3.20	1187/1270	4.00	4.00	4.35	4.09	3.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1086/1269	4.11	4.16	4.35	4.09	3.60
4. Were special techniques successful	12	4	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 878	3.40	3.53	4.05	3.91	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 379	4.11	4.11	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar	13	1	0	0	2	1	0	2 22	++++/ 275	2 21	2 22	4 01	2 70	++++
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	Τ	U	U	2	1	U	3.33	****/ 375	3.31	3.22	4.01	3.78	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	***	****	4.48	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	1	0	0	6	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.10	3.09	4.03	3.64	3.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	1	0	0	6	1	0	3.14	297/ 382	3.14	3.20	4.08	3.86	3.14
Freq	iency	Dist	ribu	ution	ı									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

Title Instructor: KAIKAI, ALPHA

Enrollment:

39 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 514 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			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	•	0	0	-	2	-	1.0	4 00	1100/1556	4 00	4 0 4	4 20	4 11	4 00
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	1	3	5	13		1100/1576		4.24	4.30	4.11	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	5	13	4.21	988/1576	4.16	4.28	4.27	4.18	4.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	5	5			1020/1342		4.28	4.32	4.19	3.96
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	1	1	3	5	5		1232/1520	4.02	4.12	4.25	4.09	3.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	6	8	7		1138/1465		4.08	4.12		3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	3	2	2	5			1297/1434		4.05	4.14	3.94	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	7	15		527/1547	4.21	4.34	4.19	4.10	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	3	20			1515/1574		4.54	4.64	4.59	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	0	13	6	4.20	772/1554	4.04	4.04	4.10	4.01	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	2	2	17	4.48	907/1488	4.51	4.59	4.47	4.41	4.48
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	2	19	4.74	947/1493	4.71	4.72	4.73	4.65	4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	4	15	4.50	678/1486	4.23	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	1	2	17	4.55	649/1489	4.32	4.35	4.32	4.22	4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	14	2	0	1	3	3	3.56	997/1277	3.86	3.82	4.03	3.91	3.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	2	2	8	4.31	625/1279	3.80	3.94	4.17	3.96	4.31
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	401/1270	4.00	4.00	4.35	4.09	4.77
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	432/1269	4.11	4.16	4.35	4.09	4.77
4. Were special techniques successful	11	8	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/ 878			4.05	3.91	****
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	0	7	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.11	4.11	4.20	4.15	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.52	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	***
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	***	****	4.61	4.55	***
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	1	0	0	5	0	1	3.33	232/ 375	3.31	3.22	4.01	3.78	3.33
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	****/ 326	3.10	3.09	4.03	3.64	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	1	0	0	7	0	1		269/ 382	3.14	3.20	4.08	3.86	3.25
		_				-	=		,					
Frem	ency	r Died	rihi	1 t i 01	า									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	 А	8	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	В	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	5	Under-grad	24	Non-major	24
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	

I 0 Other 6 ?

Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

Instructor: KAIKAI, ALPHA

Enrollment: 43

Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 515 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies

Instructor

							FL	eque	TICTE	5		TIID	LIUCLUI	Course	: Debr	UNDC	телет	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mear
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	u gain n	ew insights,ski		om this course	1	0	1	1	6	6	12	4.04	1130/1576	4.08	4.24	4.30	4.11	4.04
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	1	6	4	15		929/1576		4.28	4.27	4.18	4.27
		uestions reflec			1	0	0	3	3	10			961/1342			4.32	4.19	4.04
		uations reflect			1	15	1	2	3	2	3	3.36	1410/1520	4.02	4.12	4.25	4.09	3.36
				what you learned	1	1	2	1	10	6	6	3.52	1235/1465	3.90	4.08	4.12	4.02	3.52
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	2	19	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	****/1434	3.89	4.05	4.14	3.94	***
7. Was th	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ained	2	1	0	0	4	6	14	4.42	673/1547	4.21	4.34	4.19	4.10	4.4
B. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		2	0	0	0	6	18	1	3.80	1537/1574	4.16	4.54	4.64	4.59	3.8
How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	ching effectiveness	7	2	0	1	2	9	6	4.11	860/1554	4.04	4.04	4.10	4.01	4.1
		Lectur	e															
l. Were ti	he instr	uctor's lecture		prepared	3	0	0	0	4	6	14	4.42	982/1488	4.51	4.59	4.47	4.41	4.4
		ctor seem inter			3	0	0	0	2	4			1053/1493			4.73	4.65	4.6
				explained clearly	3	0	0	2	4				1025/1486			4.32	4.26	
		es contribute t			3	0	2	0	2				955/1489			4.32	4.22	
				our understanding	6	16	0	0	0	4			****/1277					
. Dia au	aiovibua.	r ccciniiques en	nance y	our understanding	O	10	O	O	Ü	1	_	1.20	/12//	3.00	3.02	1.05	3.71	
- · · · · ·	2.		0.0	0	•	0		2	2	4 00	641 /1050	2 00	2 04	4 15	2 06	4 6		
	class discussions contribute to what you le				20	0	0	0	1	3			641/1279	3.80		4.17	3.96	4.2
	e all students actively encouraged to partic				20	0	0	0	0	4			716/1270		4.00		4.09	
	i the instructor encourage fair and open discure special techniques successful				20	0 6	0	0	2	1 1			803/1269			4.35	4.09	
. were s	pecial to	ecnniques succe	SSIUI		20	ь	U	U	U	Τ	U	4.00	****/ 878	3.40	3.53	4.05	3.91	^ ^ ^
		Labora	-															
. Were r	equireme	nts for lab rep	orts cl	learly specified	16	0	0	0	0	10	1	4.09	210/ 379	4.11	4.11	4.20	4.15	4.0
		Semina	r															
5. Were c	riteria :	for grading mad	e clear	-	19	0	0	0	6	2	0	3.25	245/ 375	3.31	3.22	4.01	3.78	3.2
		Field	Work															
Did co	nference	s help you carr	y out f	field activities	21	0	0	0	5	0	1	3.33	****/ 326	3.10	3.09	4.03	3.64	***
		Self	Paced															
. Were t	here eno	ugh proctors fo		the students	13	0	0	0	13	1	0	3.07	309/ 382	3.14	3.20	4.08	3.86	3.0
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arnod	Cum CD3		Expected Grades	-				ason	a			rr	00			Madaza	
rearts E	arnea	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				ке 	ason	.a 			Ту]	 he			Majors	, . – – – -	
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A 13		Red	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s	2	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В 8		_		-				_	3	, -	_			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C 2		Gei	nera	Т				7	Under-g	rad 2	!7	Non-	-major	27
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	7	D 0								_						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1					jh
				P 0								_	respons	es to b	e sigr	nificar	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	ner				1	.5						
				? 2														

Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

Instructor: CARROLL, KATHLE

Enrollment: 36

Questionnaires: 19

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2009

Page 516 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fr	equei	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	•			_	_	_		4 0.5	000/4556	4 00		4 00		
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	5	11	4.37	829/1576		4.24	4.30	4.11	4.37
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	11	4.53	581/1576	4.16	4.28	4.27	4.18	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	10	4.42	683/1342		4.28	4.32	4.19	4.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	2	0	2	4	8		1041/1520	4.02	4.12	4.25	4.09	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	4	4	8		1035/1465	3.90	4.08	4.12	4.02	3.84
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	305/1434		4.05	4.14	3.94	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	4	12	4.32	774/1547	4.21	4.34	4.19	4.10	4.32
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	•	0	-	0	0	19	5.00	1/1574		4.54	4.64	4.59	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	2	8	5	4.00	924/1554	4.04	4.04	4.10	4.01	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	263/1488	4.51	4.59	4.47	4.41	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1493	4.71	4.72	4.73	4.65	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	1	6	11	4.37	861/1486	4.23	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.37
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	13	4.53	672/1489	4.32	4.35	4.32	4.22	4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	10	2	1	0	1	4	3.50	1020/1277	3.86	3.82	4.03	3.91	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	2	2	3	7	4.07	780/1279	3.80	3.94	4.17	3.96	4.07
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	2	3	2	6		1070/1270	4.00	4.00	4.35	4.09	3.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	644/1269	4.11	4.16	4.35	4.09	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	5	6	1	1	1	1		3.75	631/ 878			4.05		3.75
r. Were special techniques successful	3	Ü	-	-	-	-	-	3.73	0317 070	3.10	3.33	1.05	3.71	3.73
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 379	4.11	4.11	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.52	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 375	3.31	3.22	4.01	3.78	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 45	****	****	4.73	4.71	****
	17	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 326					****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1/	U	U	U	1	U	1	4.00	^^^^/ 326	3.10	3.09	4.03	3.64	^ ^ ^ ^
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 382	3.14	3.20	4.08	3.86	****
Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio	n									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected (Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A (6	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В 3	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C '	7	General	4	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D :	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F (0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı

P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 7 .

Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

Instructor: COOMBER, WILLIA

Enrollment: 39

Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 517 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncie	q		Tngi	tructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NΔ	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean			
× 405 010115														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	4	1	1	7	4	3 35	1491/1576	4.08	4.24	4.30	4.11	3.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	3	7	3		1433/1576	4.16	4.28	4.27	4.18	3.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	1	5	Ω		1029/1342	4.23	4.28	4.32	4.19	3.94
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0		2	1	4	3	3							3.31
		4 0	0						1427/1520	4.02		4.25	4.09	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	-	-	0	5	5	7	4.12	788/1465	3.90	4.08	4.12	4.02	4.12
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	5	3			1057/1434	3.89		4.14	3.94	3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	7			1159/1547	4.21	4.34	4.19	4.10	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	1	13			1496/1574	4.16		4.64	4.59	3.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	2	0	0	6	2	4	3.83	1110/1554	4.04	4.04	4.10	4.01	3.83
Lecture														
 Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 	0	0	0	0	4	4			1079/1488		4.59	4.47	4.41	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	4	2	11	4.41	1278/1493	4.71	4.72	4.73	4.65	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	7	3	7	4.00	1101/1486	4.23	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	6	2	7	3.76	1251/1489	4.32	4.35	4.32	4.22	3.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	2	3	2	3	5	3.40	1066/1277	3.86	3.82	4.03	3.91	3.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	2	4	1	4	3.23	1148/1279	3.80	3.94	4.17	3.96	3.23
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	5	1	6	3.85	1022/1270	4.00	4.00	4.35	4.09	3.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	793/1269	4.11	4.16	4.35	4.09	4.31
4. Were special techniques successful	4	6	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	425/ 878	3.40	3.53	4.05	3.91	4.14
•														
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.29	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	1	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	175/ 379	4.11	4.11	4.20	4.15	4.20
J. Were requirements for tab reports creatly specified	11	_	O	U	O	1	_	1.20	113/ 313	1.11	1.11	1.20	1.13	1.20
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.52	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.43	****
		0	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 80	****	****	4.61		****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	1		0	-	-	_		,				4.55	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	Τ	0	U	5	0	1	3.33	232/ 375	3.31	3.22	4.01	3.78	3.33
Dield Menle														
Field Work	1 -	0	-	0	_	_	-	2 00	****	ale ale ale ale	also also also also	4 40	4 00	***
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	1	0	0	0	0	1		, -	****	****	4.57	4.72	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	1	0	0	7	0	1	3.25	213/ 326	3.10	3.09	4.03	3.64	3.25
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	1		,	****	****	4.60	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	1	0	0	7	0	1	3.25	269/ 382	3.14	3.20	4.08	3.86	3.25

Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

Instructor: COOMBER, WILLIA

Enrollment: 39
Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 517 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	 А	3	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	9	-			
				?	1						

Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

Instructor: THOMAS, MARK S

Enrollment:

35 Questionnaires: 29 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 518 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque:	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General	1	0	0	0	2	8	17	4.50	637/1576	4.08	4.24	4.30	1 11	4.50
 Did you gain new insights, skills from this course Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 	1 1	0	0	1	3 3	8 6	17 18	4.50	668/1576	4.08	4.24	4.30	4.11 4.18	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	1	5		4.54		4.10	4.28	4.32	4.19	4.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	16	0	0	3	0	9	4.50	511/1520	4.02	4.12	4.25	4.09	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	19	0	1	4	0	4		1088/1465	3.90	4.08	4.12	4.02	3.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	20	0	1	1	0	6	4.38	554/1434	3.89	4.05	4.14		4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	3	7	17	4.39	699/1547	4.21	4.34	4.19	4.10	4.39
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	24	4	4.14	1398/1574	4.16	4.54	4.64	4.59	4.14
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	3	13	6	4.04	902/1554	4.04	4.04	4.10	4.01	4.04
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	23	4.82	370/1488	4.51	4.59	4.47	4.41	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	1	26	4.86	683/1493	4.71	4.72	4.73	4.65	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	4	22	4.71	393/1486	4.23	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	3	22	4.68	487/1489	4.32	4.35	4.32	4.22	4.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	1	0	4	3	15	4.35	455/1277	3.86	3.82	4.03	3.91	4.35
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	2	5	7	7	3.90	899/1279	3.80	3.94	4.17	3.96	3.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	9	4	7	3.76	1049/1270	4.00	4.00	4.35	4.09	3.76
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	2	1	3	5	10	3.95	960/1269	4.11	4.16	4.35	4.09	3.95
4. Were special techniques successful	8	12	1	2	4	1	1	2.89	828/ 878	3.40	3.53	4.05	3.91	2.89
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	1	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	****/ 379	4.11	4.11	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	1	0	0	6	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	3.31	3.22	4.01	3.78	****
									,					
Field Work	22	1	0	0	5	1	0	2 17	****/ 326	2 10	2 00	4 02	2 64	++++
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22		U	U	5	Т	U	3.17	/ 320	3.10	3.09	4.03	3.04	
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	14	2	0	3.13	302/ 382	3.14	3.20	4.08	3.86	3.13
Frequ	ıency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	;
00.07														
00-27 9 0.00-0.99 0 A 9 28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 9		кес	quire	ea i	or Ma	ajor	S	4	Graduat	9	0	Majo	r	0
56-83 2 2.00-2.99 5 C 4		Cer	nera:	1				3	Under-g	rad ?	19	Non	major	29
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 1 D 0		Gel	ıcıa.	_				J	onder-g.	Lau 2		14011-	ייים בייי	43
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				3	#### - I	Means +	here a	re not	enoua	rh
P 0								-	respons					
I O		Oth	ner				1	1		~				
? 0														

Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

Instructor: THOMAS, MARK S

Enrollment:

73 Questionnaires: 44

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland Page 519 Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009 Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

		Question	S		NR	NA	Fre	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank		e Dept Mean			Sect Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did you	gain new	insights,ski		m this course	0	0	6	1	11	18	8	3.48	1456/1576	4.08	4.24	4.30	4.11	3.48
2. Did the	instruct	or make clear	the ex	pected goals	1	0	3	3	12	16	9	3.58	1372/1576	4.16	4.28	4.27	4.18	3.58
		stions reflec			0	0	5	5	5	14	15		1169/1342		4.28	4.32	4.19	3.66
		tions reflect			0	22	4	1	5	4	8		1362/1520		4.12	4.25	4.09	3.50
	_	-		what you learned	2	24	6	3	3	1	5		1429/1465		4.08	4.12	4.02	2.78
				o what you learned	2	26	3	2 4	3 8	4	4		1313/1434		4.05	4.14	3.94	3.25 3.65
		system clearly as class canc		inea	4 1	0	4 0	1	8	10 32	14 9		1281/1547 1405/1574		4.34	4.19 4.64	4.10 4.59	3.65 4.14
_				hing effectiveness	7	1	1	4		13	-		1360/1554			4.10	4.01	
		Lectur	e															
		tor's lecture			4	0	2	1	10	17	10	3.80	1343/1488	4.51	4.59	4.47	4.41	3.80
		or seem inter			4	0	2	2	4	11	21		1382/1493		4.72	4.73	4.65	4.18
				xplained clearly	6	0	3	3	8	12	12		1269/1486		4.33	4.32	4.26	3.71
		contribute t			5 5	1 10	3 2	1	5 5	12 9	17 9	4.03 3.66	1107/1489 948/1277		4.35	4.32	4.22 3.91	4.03 3.66
5. Did audi	ovisuai	ceciniques en	nance y	our understanding	5	10	2	4	5	9	9	3.00	948/12//	3.80	3.84	4.03	3.91	3.00
1 Did also	a diaana	Discus		what you learned	23	0	4	3	5	5	4	2 10	1174/1279	3.80	3.94	4.17	3.96	3.10
				d to participate	23	0	3	0	5	3	10		1033/1270		4.00	4.17	4.09	3.10
		-	_	d open discussion	23	0	3	2	4	5	7		1110/1269		4.16	4.35	4.09	3.52
		hniques succe		a open alboabbion	24	9	2	2	4	2			835/ 878		3.53	4.05	3.91	
		_ ,	_															
5. Were req	uirement	Labora s for lab rep	_	early specified	30	0	0	0	0	11	3	4.21	168/ 379	4.11	4.11	4.20	4.15	4.21
		Semina	r															
5. Were cri	teria fo	r grading mad	e clear		31	0	0	0	10	2	1	3.31	237/ 375	3.31	3.22	4.01	3.78	3.31
		Field	Work															
5. Did conf	erences	help you carr	y out f	ield activities	22	0	0	0	18	3	1	3.23	219/ 326	3.10	3.09	4.03	3.64	3.23
1 54316		Self		- A	4.0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2 50	****/ 10	****		4 60	4 44	****
	_	ons make clea		what you learned	42 42	0	0	0	1 1	1 1	0		****/ 40 ****/ 24		****	4.60 4.83	4.44 4.71	****
		ts with the i			42	0	0	0	2	0	0		****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****
_		tutoring by		_	42	0	0	0	2	0	0		****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	***
		h proctors for	-	_	18	0	0	0	24	2	0	3.08	309/ 382		3.20	4.08	3.86	3.08
				Frequ	iency	Dist	ribu	ıtio	n									
Credits Ear	ned	Expected Grades	_				ason	s			Ту	ne			Majors			
		Cum. GPA												. - 				
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 8		Rec	quire	ed f	or M	ajor	s	9	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	0
28-55 56-83	3 1	1.00-1.99 2.00-2.99	0 1	B 9 C 8		Ger	neral					2	Under-g	rad 4	14	Non-	major	44
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D 1		501	-C- U	-				-	onacı g			14011		**
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 1		Ele	ectiv	res				1	#### - 1				_	h	
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
			I 0		Oth	ner				1	2							

Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS

Instructor: GINDLING, THOMA

Spring 2009

Page 520 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

Enrollment: 81 Questionnaires: 47

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

							_	ncie				tructor		e Dept		Level	Sect	
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 															
1. Did voi	ı gain ne	ew insights,skil		this course	1	0	0	1	3	12	30	4.54	582/1576	4.22	4.24	4.30	4.11	4.54
_	-	ctor make clear			1	0	0	1	2	11	32	4.61	476/1576		4.28	4.27	4.18	4.61
		uestions reflect	_	_	1	0	0	0	2	9	35	4.72	345/1342			4.32	4.19	4.72
	_	uations reflect		_	1	10	2	2	3	7	22	4.25	859/1520			4.25	4.09	4.25
		eadings contribu	_	_	0	0	2	3	10	11	21	3.98	891/1465			4.12		3.98
	_			what you learned	0	8	0	1	6	12	20	4.31	625/1434		4.05	4.14		4.31
		g system clearly		_	0	1	0	0	2	10		4.70	303/1547		4.34	4.19		4.70
		was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	10	37	4.79	702/1574		4.54	4.64		4.79
				ing effectiveness	6	0	0	0	7	17		4.24			4.04	4.10	4.01	
		Lecture	2															
1 Were th	ne instr	uctor's lectures		repared	1	0	0	0	1	5	40	4.85	339/1488	4.55	4.59	4.47	4.41	4.85
		ctor seem intere			0	0	0	0	0	6	41	4.87	632/1493		4.72	4.73	4.65	4.87
		terial presented		_	0	0	0	0	1	12		4.70	407/1486		4.33	4.32	4.26	4.70
		es contribute to			0	0	0	0	1	8	38	4.79	336/1489		4.35	4.32		4.79
			_	ur understanding	2	30	2	1	5	1			1006/1277		3.82		3.91	
J. Did au	aiovisua.	r ceciniiques ein	iance you	ur understanding	2	30	2		J		O	3.33	1000/12//	3.37	3.02	4.03	3.71	3.33
1 1 - 1		Discuss			0.4	0	0	4	2		10	4 00	EEE /10E0	2 6 11	2 04	4 15	2 06	4 00
				_	24	0	2	1	3	4		4.09	777/1279			4.17	3.96	4.09
	d class discussions contribute to what you learn are all students actively encouraged to participa d the instructor encourage fair and open discuss				24	0	2	1	5	3		3.96	967/1270		4.00	4.35	4.09	3.96
	d the instructor encourage fair and open discuss				24	0	1	0	5	3	14	4.26	814/1269		4.16	4.35	4.09	4.26
4. Were sp	Were special techniques successful				24	17	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	****/ 878	3.44	3.53	4.05	3.91	****
		Laborat	-															
				round information		0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 240		****	4.35	4.29	****
5. Were re	equireme	nts for lab repo	orts clea	arly specified	38	1	0	0	0	8	0	4.00	****/ 379	4.17	4.11	4.20	4.15	****
		Seminar	<u>-</u>															
1. Were as	ssigned t	topics relevant	to the a	announced theme	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.52	****
2. Was the	e instru	ctor available f	or indi	vidual attention	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****
5. Were cr	riteria :	for grading made	e clear		37	1	0	0	9	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	3.14	3.22	4.01	3.78	****
		Field W	Vork															
1. Did fie	eld expe	rience contribut	te to wha	at you learned	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****
2. Did you	ı clearl	y understand you	ır evalu	ation criteria	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****
4. To what	t degree	could you discu	ıss your	evaluations	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****
5. Did cor	nference	s help you carry	out fi	eld activities	36	2	0	0	9	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	3.00	3.09	4.03	3.64	****
		Self I	Paced															
1. Did sel	lf-paced	system contribu	ite to wl	hat you learned	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****
	_	ugh proctors for		_	31	1	0	0	13	2	0	3.13	299/ 382	3.18	3.20	4.08	3.86	3.13
		Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n											
Credits Ea	arnod	Cum. GPA	Exported Crades				D.O.	agan	a			Т.	no.			Majore		
			Expected Grades					ason					pe 			Majors 	, 	
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	A 14		Red	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s	8	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	5	
28-55	6 7	1.00-1.99	0	B 22		0		1				3	TIM al a se	20 d	17	NT	mo =	40
56-83		2.00-2.99	6 7	C 5		Gei	nera	Т				3	Under-g	rau 4	17	NON-	-major	42
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	7	D 0		m1	0 a t d					2	щини	Moo=== '	-ho			-h
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0		E⊥€	ecti	ves				3	#### -	means t	inere a	are not	enoug	ın	

Other

28

Ρ I

0

? 1

PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS

Title Instructor: PAPADANTONAKIS,

Enrollment: 35 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 521 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

			Fre	equer	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	0	0	1	0	2	5	14	4.41	787/1576	4.22	4.24	4.30	4.11	4.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	4	13	4.23	968/1576	4.29	4.28	4.27	4.18	4.23
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	14	4.55	541/1342	4.31	4.28	4.32	4.19	4.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	4	4	13	4.43	648/1520	4.24	4.12	4.25	4.09	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	4	15	4.50	366/1465	4.12	4.08	4.12	4.02	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	6	11	4.23	716/1434	4.14	4.05	4.14	3.94	4.23
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	7	5	8	3.86	1174/1547	4.20	4.34	4.19	4.10	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	18	4	4.18	1373/1574	4.56	4.54	4.64	4.59	4.18
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	2	5	5	7	3.89	1067/1554	3.97	4.04	4.10	4.01	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	3	4	13	4 23	1134/1488	4.55	4.59	4.47	4.41	4.23
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	0	20	4.77	868/1493		4.72	4.73	4.65	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	3	10	7		1101/1486		4.33		4.26	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	5	4	9		1266/1489		4.35	4.32		3.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	13	4	0	3	0	-		1234/1277		3.82		3.91	
J. Did addiovisual techniques emiance your understanding	U	13	-	U	J	U	2	2.50	1234/12//	3.37	3.02	1.03	3.91	2.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	5	4	3	3.62	1018/1279	3.67	3.94	4.17	3.96	3.62
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	2	1	3	7	4.15	876/1270	3.78	4.00	4.35	4.09	4.15
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	2	2	8	4.23	830/1269	3.93	4.16	4.35	4.09	4.23
4. Were special techniques successful	9	10	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 878	3.44	3.53	4.05	3.91	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	2	0	0	1	0	Λ	3.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 240	***	****	4.35	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	1	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	77/ 379		4.11		4.43	4.50
5. Were requirements for tab reports clearly specified	15	T	U	U	U	3	3	4.50	11/ 319	4.1/	4.11	4.20	4.15	4.50
Seminar														
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	1	0	0	4	1	0	3.20	****/ 375	3.14	3.22	4.01	3.78	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	1	0	0	7	0	0	3.00	251/ 326		3.09	4.03	3.64	
3. Did conferences help you carry out freid activities	T.4	1	U	U	,	U	U	3.00	Z31/ 3Z0	3.00	3.09	±.U3	3.04	3.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	,	****	****	4.60	4.44	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	1	0	0	6	1	0	3.14	297/ 382	3.18	3.20	4.08	3.86	3.14

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	 7	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	7	General	2	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	10	-	•	_	

? 0

Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS

Instructor: TAKACS, WENDY E

Enrollment: 81
Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 522 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque:	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	5	0	9	5	11	3.57	1424/1576	4.22	4.24	4.30	4.11	3.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	11	7	10		1275/1576	4.29	4.28	4.27	4.18	3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	5	4	8	12	3.83	1097/1342	4.31	4.28	4.32	4.19	3.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	13	0	0	4	5	8	4.24	880/1520	4.24	4.12	4.25	4.09	4.24
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	2	3	5	16	4.00	850/1465	4.12	4.08	4.12	4.02	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	19	0	3	4	0	4	3.45	1233/1434	4.14	4.05	4.14	3.94	3.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	4	6	18	4.33	755/1547	4.20	4.34	4.19	4.10	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	3	25	4.77	739/1574	4.56	4.54	4.64	4.59	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	0	1	6	8	4	3.79	1145/1554	3.97	4.04	4.10	4.01	3.79
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	4	3	20	4.41	982/1488	4.55	4.59	4.47	4.41	4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	1	5			1065/1493	4.82	4.72	4.73	4.65	4.66
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	2	5	6	15	4.10	1069/1486	4.38	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.10
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	1	3	10	11	3.79	1239/1489	4.30	4.35	4.32	4.22	3.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	11	1	3	3	2	7	3.69	933/1277	3.39	3.82	4.03	3.91	3.69
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	2	3	1	0	2		1238/1279	3.67	3.94	4.17	3.96	2.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	3	1	0	4	2		1200/1270	3.78	4.00	4.35	4.09	3.10
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	2	1	4	1	2		1210/1269	3.93	4.16	4.35	4.09	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	21	8	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 878	3.44	3.53	4.05	3.91	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	28	2	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.29	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	29	1	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	30	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 379	4.17	4.11	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar												4 =0	4 50	
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	1	0	0	0	0	Τ		****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.52	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	30	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.43	***
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	1	0	4	0	0	2.60	****/ 375	3.14	3.22	4.01	3.78	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	30	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	30	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	29	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	30	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	****/ 326	3.00	3.09	4.03	3.64	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	1	0	1	5	1	0	3.00	****/ 382	3.18	3.20	4.08	3.86	****

Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS

Instructor: TAKACS, WENDY E

Enrollment: 81
Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 522 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	 5	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1	В	11						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	8	General	2	Under-grad	31	Non-major	27
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	1			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12	-			
				?	1						

Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS

Instructor: GOLDFARB, MARSH

Enrollment: 36
Questionnaires: 27

Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 523 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

							Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did voi	u gain ne	ew insights,ski		this course	0	0	0	0	2	8	17	4.56	568/1576	4.22	4.24	4.30	4.11	4.56
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	2	6	19	4.63			4.28	4.27	4.18	4.63
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	0	1	5	21		310/1342		4.28	4.32	4.19	4.74
		uations reflect			0	12	1	0	2	4	8	4.20			4.12	4.25	4.09	4.20
				hat you learned	1	2	1	0	1	11		4.29			4.08	4.12	4.02	
	_	-		what you learne		18	0	1	1	1	6		594/1434		4.05	4.14	3.94	4.33
		g system clearl			0	0	0	3	8	3			1082/1547		4.34	4.19		3.96
		was class canc		iica	1	1	0	0	4	14	7		1411/1574		4.54	4.64		
	-			ing effectivenes		1	0	1	3	8	8		816/1554				4.01	
J. HOW WO	uiu you s	grade the overa	II CEACII	ing effectivenes	· 5 0		U	1	5	O	O	4.13	010/1334	3.71	1.01	4.10	4.01	4.13
		Lectur																
		uctor's lecture			1	0	1	0	0	7	18	4.58	786/1488		4.59	4.47	4.41	4.58
		ctor seem inter		-	1	0	0	0	0	2		4.92			4.72	4.73	4.65	4.92
				plained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	7	17	4.58			4.33	4.32	4.26	
		es contribute t			1	0	0	0	0	6	20	4.77	,		4.35	4.32		4.77
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance yo	ur understanding	2	12	1	2	2	2	6	3.77	882/1277	3.39	3.82	4.03	3.91	3.77
		Discus																
1 Did cl	ass disc	hat you learned	20	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	641/1279	3.67	3.94	4.17	3.96	4.29		
		-	20	0	1	0	1	2			1019/1270		4.00	4.35	4.09	3.86		
	Were all students actively encouraged to particip Did the instructor encourage fair and open discus						1	0	1	1		4.00	928/1269		4.16	4.35	4.09	4.00
	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discus Were special techniques successful						0	0	1	1			****/ 878				3.91	
1. Were b	peciai c		20	2	Ü	O	_	_	3	1.10	, 010	3.11	3.33	1.05	3.71			
		Labora	-		4.5			•				4 00	000/050					
5. Were r	equireme	nts for lab rep	orts cle	arly specified	17	0	0	0	Ü	10	U	4.00	229/ 379	4.17	4.11	4.20	4.15	4.00
		Semina																
5. Were c	riteria :	for grading mad	e clear		20	0	0	0	6	1	0	3.14	270/ 375	3.14	3.22	4.01	3.78	3.14
		Field	Work															
5. Did co	nference	s help you carr	y out fi	eld activities	19	0	0	0	8	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.00	3.09	4.03	3.64	3.00
		Self	Daged															
5. Were t	here eno	ugh proctors fo		e students	16	1	0	0	9	1	0	3.10	308/ 382	3.18	3.20	4.08	3.86	3.10
				Fre	quenc	, Die	trib:	utio	n									
				FIE	quenc	, DIP	LIID	ucio	11									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grade	s			Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	5	
00-27		Re	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	 :s	2	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	0				
28-55	3 1	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0	A 6 B 9						J						3 -		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C 4		Ge	nera	1				2	Under-g	rad 2	7	Non-	-major	27
	2	3.00-3.49	4	D 0									3				3	
84-150						E1	ecti	ves				1	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enous	яh
	0	3.50-4.00																
84-150 Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	= -								_					_	
	0	3.50-4.00	2				her				1		respons				_	

Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS

Instructor: TAKACS, WENDY E

Enrollment: 40
Questionnaires: 28

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2009

Page 524 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Quanting	NID	3.7.7	Fre	equer 2			_	Ins Mean	tructor	Course	-	UMBC		Sect
Questions	NR	NA 			3 	4		mean	Rank	mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	4	12	10	4.04	1130/1576	4.22	4.24	4.30	4.11	4.04
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	9	13	4.14	1040/1576	4.29	4.28	4.27	4.18	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	5	9	9	3.71	1150/1342	4.31	4.28	4.32	4.19	3.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	7	2	0	1	8	9	4.10	994/1520	4.24	4.12	4.25	4.09	4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	3	3	8	11	3.85	1028/1465	4.12	4.08	4.12	4.02	3.85
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	18	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	524/1434	4.14	4.05	4.14	3.94	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	5	6	14	4.15	939/1547	4.20	4.34	4.19	4.10	4.15
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	375/1574	4.56	4.54	4.64	4.59	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	2	1	2	16	4	3.76	1159/1554	3.97	4.04	4.10	4.01	3.76
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	1	2	23	4.70	610/1488	4.55	4.59	4.47	4.41	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	24	4.89	607/1493		4.72	4.73	4.65	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	0	0	4	19	4.52	654/1486	4.38	4.33		4.26	4.52
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	2	3	18	4.40	813/1489	4.30	4.35	4.32	4.22	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	13	2	2	2	1	5	3.42	1061/1277	3.39	3.82	4.03	3.91	3.42
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	1	3	3	7	3.75	962/1279	3.67	3.94	4.17	3.96	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	2	5	3	6		1030/1270	3.78	4.00	4.35	4.09	3.81
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	5	4	8	4.18	864/1269	3.93	4.16	4.35	4.09	4.18
4. Were special techniques successful	12	7	1	2	2	0	-	3.44	728/ 878				3.91	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	0	0	1	0	0	Λ	2 00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	1	0	0	0	n	1.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.29	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	27	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	1	0	0	0	8	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.17	4.11		4.15	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.52	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 79	***	****	4.72	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.69	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	1	0	4	0	0		****/ 375			4.04	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made crear	23	U	1	U	4	U	U	2.00	/ 3/3	3.14	3.44	4.01	3.70	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52		****	4.48	4.20	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	4	2	0	3.33	****/ 326	3.00	3.09	4.03	3.64	****
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	8	2	1	3.36	243/ 382	3.18	3.20	4.08	3.86	3.36

Frequency	Distribution

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	1	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	 А	 5	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	В	9	-				-	
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	2	С	9	General	5	Under-grad	28	Non-major	28
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be sid	nificant	
				I	0	Other	12	-	-	•	

? 0

Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I

Instructor: MCBRIDE, CHUCK

Enrollment: 41
Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 525 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean	Sect
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 1 0 1 1 2 12 5 3.90 1241/1576 4.28 4.24 4.30 4.11 32 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 1 2 3 6 9 3.95 1187/1576 4.34 4.28 4.27 4.18 3 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 0 1 0 2 7 11 4.29 812/1342 4.46 4.28 4.32 4.19 4 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 7 2 1 2 5 4 3.57 1339/1520 4.14 4.12 4.25 4.09 3 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 2 2 6 11 4.24 668/1465 4.50 4.08 4.12 4.02 4 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 12 1 1 4 0 3 3.33 1289/1434 3.94 4.05 4.14 3.94 3 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 10 0 1 6 4 10 4.10 978/1547 4.41 4.34 4.19 4.10 4 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 1 6 4 10 4.10 978/1547 4.41 4.34 4.19 4.10 4 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0 0 0 0 4 5 6 4.13 838/1554 4.11 4.04 4.10 4.01 4.01 4 2. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 4 0 0 1 4 5 8 4.11 1197/1488 4.57 4.59 4.47 4.41 4 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3 0 1 0 1 5 12 4.42 1270/1493 4.75 4.72 4.73 4.65 4 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3 0 1 2 3 7 6 3.79 1241/1486 4.33 4.33 4.32 4.26 3 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 3 0 2 2 1 8 6 3.74 1262/1489 4.33 4.35 4.32 4.26 3 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 8 3 1 3 1 3 3.00 1149/1277 3.40 3.82 4.03 3.91 3 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13 0 1 1 4 1 2 3.22 1150/1279 3.75 3.94 4.17 3.96 3 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13 0 1 1 1 2 4 3.78 1045/1270 3.90 4.00 4.35 4.09 3 3. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 13 0 1 1 1 2 4 3.78 1045/1270 3.90 4.00 4.35 4.09 3 3. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 13 0 1 1 1 2 4 3.78 1045/1270 3.90 4.00 4.35 4.09 3 3. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 13 0 1 1 1 2 4 3.78 1045/1270 3.90 4.00 4.35 4.09 3 3. Did the lect	Mean
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 1 0 1 1 2 12 5 3.90 1241/1576 4.28 4.24 4.30 4.11 32 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 1 2 3 6 9 3.95 1187/1576 4.34 4.28 4.27 4.18 3 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 0 1 0 2 7 11 4.29 812/1342 4.46 4.28 4.32 4.19 4 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 7 2 1 2 5 4 3.57 1339/1520 4.14 4.12 4.25 4.09 3 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 2 2 6 11 4.24 668/1465 4.50 4.08 4.12 4.02 4 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 12 1 1 4 0 3 3.33 1289/1434 3.94 4.05 4.14 3.94 3 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 10 0 1 6 4 10 4.10 978/1547 4.41 4.34 4.19 4.10 4 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 1 6 4 10 4.10 978/1547 4.41 4.34 4.19 4.10 4 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0 0 0 0 4 5 6 4.13 838/1554 4.11 4.04 4.10 4.01 4.01 4 2. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 4 0 0 1 4 5 8 4.11 1197/1488 4.57 4.59 4.47 4.41 4 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3 0 1 0 1 5 12 4.42 1270/1493 4.75 4.72 4.73 4.65 4 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3 0 1 2 3 7 6 3.79 1241/1486 4.33 4.33 4.32 4.26 3 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 3 0 2 2 1 8 6 3.74 1262/1489 4.33 4.35 4.32 4.26 3 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 8 3 1 3 1 3 3.00 1149/1277 3.40 3.82 4.03 3.91 3 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13 0 1 1 4 1 2 3.22 1150/1279 3.75 3.94 4.17 3.96 3 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13 0 1 1 1 2 4 3.78 1045/1270 3.90 4.00 4.35 4.09 3 3. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 13 0 1 1 1 2 4 3.78 1045/1270 3.90 4.00 4.35 4.09 3 3. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 13 0 1 1 1 2 4 3.78 1045/1270 3.90 4.00 4.35 4.09 3 3. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 13 0 1 1 1 2 4 3.78 1045/1270 3.90 4.00 4.35 4.09 3 3. Did the lect	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 1 2 3 6 9 3.95 1187/1576 4.34 4.28 4.27 4.18 3 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 0 1 0 2 7 11 4.29 812/1342 4.46 4.28 4.32 4.19 4 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 7 2 1 2 5 4 3.57 1339/1520 4.14 4.12 4.25 4.09 3 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 2 2 6 11 4.24 668/1465 4.50 4.08 4.12 4.02 4 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 12 1 1 4 0 3 3.33 1289/1434 3.94 4.05 4.14 3.94 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 1 6 4 10 4.10 978/1547 4.41 4.34 4.19 4.10 4.10 4.10 978/1547 4.41 4.34 4.19 4.10 4.10 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0 0 0 0 1 8 3 4.14 1389/1574 4.64 4.54 4.64 4.59 4.99 4.90 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0 0 0 0 4 5 6 4.13 838/1554 4.11 4.04 4.10 4.01 4.01 4.01 4.01 4.0	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 0 1 0 2 7 11 4.29 812/1342 4.46 4.28 4.32 4.19 4 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 7 2 1 2 5 4 3.57 1339/1520 4.14 4.12 4.25 4.09 3 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 2 2 6 11 4.24 668/1465 4.50 4.08 4.12 4.02 4 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 12 1 1 4 0 3 3.33 1289/1434 3.94 4.05 4.14 3.94 3 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 1 6 4 10 4.10 978/1547 4.41 4.34 4.19 4.10 4.8 How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 1 6 4 10 4.10 978/1547 4.41 4.34 4.19 4.10 4.10 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0 0 0 0 4 5 6 4.13 838/1554 4.11 4.04 4.10 4.01 4.01 4.01 4.01 4.0	3.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 7 2 1 2 5 4 3.57 1339/1520 4.14 4.12 4.25 4.09 3 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 2 2 6 6 11 4.24 668/1465 4.50 4.08 4.12 4.02 4 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 12 1 1 4 0 3 3.33 1289/1434 3.94 4.05 4.14 3.94 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 1 6 4 10 4.10 978/1547 4.41 4.34 4.19 4.10 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 0 18 3 4.14 1398/1574 4.64 4.54 4.64 4.59 4 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0 0 0 0 4 5 6 4.13 838/1554 4.11 4.04 4.10 4.01 4.01 4.01 4.01 4.0	3.95
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 2 2 6 11 4.24 668/1465 4.50 4.08 4.12 4.02 4 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 12 1 1 4 0 3 3.33 1289/1434 3.94 4.05 4.14 3.94 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 1 6 4 10 4.10 978/1547 4.41 4.34 4.19 4.10 4 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 18 3 4.14 1398/1574 4.64 4.54 4.64 4.59 4 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0 0 0 0 4 5 6 4.13 838/1554 4.11 4.04 4.10 4.01 4.01 4.01 4.01 4.0	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 12 1 1 4 0 3 3.33 1289/1434 3.94 4.05 4.14 3.94 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 1 6 4 10 4.10 978/1547 4.41 4.34 4.19 4.10 4.8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 18 3 4.14 1398/1574 4.64 4.54 4.64 4.59 4.9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0 0 0 0 4 5 6 4.13 838/1554 4.11 4.04 4.10 4.01 4.01 4.01 4.01 4.0	3.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 1 6 4 10 4.10 978/1547 4.41 4.34 4.19 4.10 4.8 How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 18 3 4.14 1398/1574 4.64 4.54 4.64 4.59 4 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0 0 0 0 4 5 6 4.13 838/1554 4.11 4.04 4.10 4.01 4.01 4.01 4.01 4.0	4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 18 3 4.14 1398/1574 4.64 4.54 4.64 4.59 4 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0 0 0 4 5 6 4.13 838/1554 4.11 4.04 4.10 4.01 4 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 4 0 0 1 4 5 8 4.11 1197/1488 4.57 4.59 4.47 4.41 4 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3 0 1 0 1 5 12 4.42 1270/1493 4.75 4.72 4.73 4.65 4 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3 0 1 2 3 7 6 3.79 1241/1486 4.33 4.33 4.32 4.26 3 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 3 0 2 2 1 8 6 3.74 1262/1489 4.33 4.35 4.32 4.22 3 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 8 3 1 3 1 3 3.00 1149/1277 3.40 3.82 4.03 3.91 3 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13 0 1 1 4 1 2 3.22 1150/1279 3.75 3.94 4.17 3.96 3 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13 0 1 1 1 2 4 3.78 1045/1270 3.90 4.00 4.35 4.09 3 3 2 2 2 1 3 2 4 3.78 1045/1270 3.90 4.00 4.35 4.09 3 3 2 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3	3.33
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 3. Discussion Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Discussion 9. Discussion 9. Discussion 9. Discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Discussion 9. Discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Discussion 9.	4.10
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4.14
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 4 0 0 1 4 5 8 4.11 1197/1488 4.57 4.59 4.47 4.41 4 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3 0 1 0 1 5 12 4.42 1270/1493 4.75 4.72 4.73 4.65 4 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3 0 1 2 3 7 6 3.79 1241/1486 4.33 4.33 4.32 4.26 3 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 3 0 2 2 1 8 6 3.74 1262/1489 4.33 4.35 4.32 4.22 3 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 8 3 1 3 1 3 3.00 1149/1277 3.40 3.82 4.03 3.91 3 Discussion Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13 0 1 1 4 1 2 3.22 1150/1279 3.75 3.94 4.17 3.96 3 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13 0 1 1 1 2 4 3.78 1045/1270 3.90 4.00 4.35 4.09 3	1.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3 0 1 0 1 5 12 4.42 1270/1493 4.75 4.72 4.73 4.65 4 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3 0 1 2 3 7 6 3.79 1241/1486 4.33 4.33 4.32 4.26 3 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 3 0 2 2 1 8 6 3.74 1262/1489 4.33 4.35 4.32 4.22 3 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 8 3 1 3 1 3 3.00 1149/1277 3.40 3.82 4.03 3.91 3 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13 0 1 1 4 1 2 3.22 1150/1279 3.75 3.94 4.17 3.96 3 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13 0 1 1 1 2 4 3.78 1045/1270 3.90 4.00 4.35 4.09 3	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3 0 1 2 3 7 6 3.79 1241/1486 4.33 4.33 4.32 4.26 3 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 3 0 2 2 1 8 6 3.74 1262/1489 4.33 4.35 4.32 4.22 3 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 8 3 1 3 1 3 3.00 1149/1277 3.40 3.82 4.03 3.91 3 5 5 5 5 5 6 6 7 6 7 7 8 7 8 7 8 7 8 7 8 7 8 7 8 7	4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 3 0 2 2 1 8 6 3.74 1262/1489 4.33 4.35 4.32 4.22 3 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 8 3 1 3 1 3 3.00 1149/1277 3.40 3.82 4.03 3.91 3 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13 0 1 1 4 1 2 3.22 1150/1279 3.75 3.94 4.17 3.96 3 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13 0 1 1 1 2 4 3.78 1045/1270 3.90 4.00 4.35 4.09 3	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 3 0 2 2 1 8 6 3.74 1262/1489 4.33 4.35 4.32 4.22 3 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 8 3 1 3 1 3 3.00 1149/1277 3.40 3.82 4.03 3.91 3 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13 0 1 1 4 1 2 3.22 1150/1279 3.75 3.94 4.17 3.96 3 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13 0 1 1 1 2 4 3.78 1045/1270 3.90 4.00 4.35 4.09 3	3.79
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged 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 2. Were all students actively encouraged 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 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1. Did class discussions contribute 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4.	3.74
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13 0 1 1 4 1 2 3.22 1150/1279 3.75 3.94 4.17 3.96 3 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13 0 1 1 1 2 4 3.78 1045/1270 3.90 4.00 4.35 4.09	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13 0 1 1 1 2 4 3.78 1045/1270 3.90 4.00 4.35 4.09 3	
	3.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 14 0 1 1 1 1 4 3.75 1036/1269 4.19 4.16 4.35 4.09 3	3.78
	3.75
4. Were special techniques successful 14 6 1 0 0 0 1 3.00 ****/ 878 4.25 3.53 4.05 3.91 *	***
Laboratory	

4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 21 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 232 **** **** 4.29 4.27 *	***
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 21 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 379 4.02 4.11 4.20 4.15 *	***
Seminar	
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 20 1 1 0 0 0 1.00 ***/ 85 *** *** 4.72 4.52 *	***
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 21 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 ***/ 79 **** **** 4.69 4.52 *	***
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 21 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 72 **** **** 4.64 4.43 *	***
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 21 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 80 **** **** 4.61 4.55 *	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear 18 0 1 0 3 0 0 2.50 ****/ 375 3.10 3.22 4.01 3.78 *	****
Field Work	
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 20 0 1 0 0 1 0 2.50 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.48 4.20 *	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 20 0 1 0 0 0 1 3.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.40 4.11 *	***
3. Was the instructor available for consultation 20 0 1 0 0 0 1 3.00 ****/ 44 **** **** 4.73 4.71 *	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 20 0 1 0 0 0 1 3.00 ****/ 45 **** **** 4.57 4.72 *	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 15 1 1 0 5 0 0 2.67 325/326 2.99 3.09 4.03 3.64 2	2.67
Self Paced	
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 20 0 1 0 0 1 0 2.50 ***/ 40 **** **** 4.60 4.44 *	****

3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 20 0 1 0 0 0 1 3.00 ****/ 35 **** **** 4.67 4.68 *	***
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 20 0 1 0 0 0 1 3.00 ****/ 28 **** **** 4.78 4.65 *	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 12 1 1 0 7 1 0 2.89 377/382 2.99 3.20 4.08 3.86 2	2.89

Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I

Instructor: MCBRIDE, CHUCK

Enrollment: 41
Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 525 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	А	10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12	-		_	
				?	0						

Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I

Instructor:

Enrollment:

MCBRIDE, CHUCK

36 Ouestionnaires: 25

Spring 2009

Page 526 JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Ouestions 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 3 5 9 8 3.88 1257/1576 4.28 4.24 4.30 4.11 3.88 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 2 5 11 7 3.92 1217/1576 4.34 4.28 4.27 4.18 3.92 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 3 9 13 4.40 709/1342 4.46 4.28 4.32 4.19 4.40 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 8 1 1 4 6 5 3.76 1251/1520 4.14 4.12 4.25 4.09 3.76 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 4 6 14 4.42 498/1465 4.50 4.08 4.12 4.02 4.42 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 15 1 1 2 3 2 3.44 1239/1434 3.94 4.05 4.14 3.94 3.44 7. Was the grading system clearly explained
8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 5 6 14 4.36 727/1547 4.41 4.34 4.19 4.10 4.36 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 16 9 4.36 1236/1574 4.64 4.54 4.64 4.59 4.36 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 1 1 2 4 7 3 3.53 1295/1554 4.11 4.04 4.10 4.01 3.53 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 3 0 0 0 4 5 13 4.41 995/1488 4.57 4.59 4.47 4.41 4.41 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3 0 0 0 0 2 20 4.91 557/1493 4.75 4.72 4.73 4.65 4.91 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3 0 0 2 4 11 5 3.86 1211/1486 4.33 4.33 4.32 4.26 3.86 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 1 6 6 8 4.00 1118/1489 4.33 4.35 4.32 4.22 4.00 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 11 2 2 3 1 2 2.90 1194/1277 3.40 3.82 4.03 3.91 2.90 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 12 0 1 3 3 4 2 3.23 1148/1279 3.75 3.94 4.17 3.96 3.23 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 12 0 0 0 4 2 7 4.23 836/1270 3.90 4.00 4.35 4.09 4.23 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 12 0 0 0 3 7 3 4.00 928/1269 4.19 4.16 4.35 4.09 4.00 4. Were special techniques successful 13 8 2 0 0 1 1 2.75 **** 878 4.25 3.53 4.05 3.91 **** Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 24 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 234 **** **** 4.23 4.08 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 24 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 **** / 240 **** 4.35 4.29 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 21 0 0 0 0 4 0 4.00 ****/ 379 4.02 4.11 4.20 4.15 **** Seminar 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 0 8 0 0 3.00 287/375 3.10 3.22 4.01 3.78 3.00 Field Work 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 18 1 0 0 6 0 0 3.00 ****/ 326 2.99 3.09 4.03 3.64 **** Self Paced 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 12 0 0 0 12 1 0 3.08 309/382 2.99 3.20 4.08 3.86 3.08 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Reasons Cum. GPA Expected Grades Majors 00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 6 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0.00-0.55 1.00-1.99 0 В 5 28-55 4 56-83 4 C 4 General 3 Under-grad 25 Non-major 25 D 0 84-150 0 3.00-3.49 2 F 0 Electives #### - Means there are not enough Grad. 3.50-4.00 2 0 P 0 responses to be significant Ι 0 Other 10 ?

Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I

Instructor: COLE, RICHARD

Enrollment: 34
Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 527 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies

Instructor

		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did you	u gain ne	w insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	3	4	17	4.58	527/1576	4.28	4.24	4.30	4.11	4.58
		tor make clear			0	0	0	1	2	6	15	4.46	683/1576	4.34	4.28	4.27	4.18	4.46
3. Did the	e exam que	estions reflec	t the e	expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	9	12	4.33	770/1342	4.46	4.28	4.32	4.19	4.33
		ations reflect			0	7	0	0	2	8	7	4.29	815/1520	4.14	4.12	4.25	4.09	4.29
				what you learned	0	3	0	0	2	5		4.57		4.50	4.08		4.02	
				o what you learned	0	9	1	0	2	6		4.07	, -	3.94			3.94	
		system clearly		ined	0	0	0	2	0	2			339/1547		4.34			4.67
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	1			235/1574					4.96
9. How wo	uld you g	rade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	8	0	0	0	4	9	3	3.94	1019/1554	4.11	4.04	4.10	4.01	3.94
		Lecture	е															
1. Were th	he instru	ctor's lecture	s well	prepared	2	0	0	0	0	6	16	4.73	568/1488	4.57	4.59	4.47	4.41	4.73
2. Did the	e instruc	tor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	2	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	1029/1493	4.75	4.72	4.73	4.65	4.68
				explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	7	14	4.59	572/1486	4.33	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.59
4. Did the	e lecture	you learned	2	0	0	2	0	6	14	4.45	754/1489	4.33	4.35	4.32	4.22	4.45		
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques en	hance y	our understanding	2	12	1	1	1	2	5	3.90	802/1277	3.40	3.82	4.03	3.91	3.90
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu		what you learned	14	0	0	2	2	0	6	4.00	802/1279	3.75	3.94	4.17	3.96	4.00	
		d to participate	14	0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	928/1270	3.90	4.00	4.35	4.09	4.00		
			d open discussion	14	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	644/1269	4.19	4.16	4.35	4.09	4.50	
4. Were s	pecial te	chniques succe		14	5	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	****/ 878	4.25	3.53	4.05	3.91	****	
		Labora	torv															
5. Were r	equirement			early specified	20	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	****/ 379	4.02	4.11	4.20	4.15	****
Г Шагаа г		Semina: or grading mad	_		19	0	0	0	5	0	0	2 00	****/ 375	2 10	2 22	4 01	2 70	++++
5. were c.	riceria i	or grading made	e clear		19	U	U	U	5	U	U	3.00	***/ 3/5	3.10	3.22	4.01	3.78	
		Field	Work															
5. Did co	nferences	help you carry	y out f	ield activities	15	0	0	0	9	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	2.99	3.09	4.03	3.64	3.00
		Self	Paced															
5. Were t	here enoug	gh proctors for		he students	17	0	0	0	7	0	0	3.00	313/ 382	2.99	3.20	4.08	3.86	3.00
				_														
				Frequ	iency	DIST	crib	utioi	า									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Тур	e			Majors	\$
00-27	00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 4							ed fo	or Ma	 aior	 s	4	Graduate	·	0	Majo		0
28-55							2411	- A - L	J_ 110	101	~	-	Gradate	-	•	114.50	-	J
56-83								1				2	Under-gr	ad 2	4	Non-	major	24
84-150																	5	
Grad.								ves				1	#### - M	leans t	here a	re not	enoug	ıh
	P 0												response				_	
				I 0		Otl	ner				1	4	_		_			
				? 1														

Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I

Instructor: COLE, RICHARD

Enrollment: 39
Questionnaires: 22

Baltimore County Spring 2009

University of Maryland

Page 528 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

			Questions			NR	NA	Fre	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructo: Rai		Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
			General																	
1. Did	d you	gain ne	w insights,skil		this course	0	0	1	0	3	11	7	4.05	1124/	1576	4.28	4.24	4.30	4.11	4.05
	_	_	tor make clear			0	0	0	0	3	6	13	4.45	683/	1576	4.34	4.28	4.27	4.18	4.45
3. Dic	d the	exam qu	estions reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	14	4.50	583/	1342	4.46	4.28	4.32	4.19	4.50
4. Dic	d othe	er evalu	ations reflect	the exp	ected goals	0	10	0	2	2	3	5	3.92	1153/	1520	4.14	4.12	4.25	4.09	3.92
5. Did	d assi	gned re	adings contribu	te to w	hat you learned	0	1	0	0	2	7	12	4.48	410/	1465	4.50	4.08	4.12	4.02	4.48
					what you learned	0	11	2	1	2	3	3	3.36	1278/	1434	3.94	4.05	4.14	3.94	3.36
			system clearly	_	ned	0	0	1	0	5	5	11	4.14	947/		4.41	4.34	4.19	4.10	4.14
	_		was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	8	14	4.64	957/		4.64	4.54	4.64	4.59	4.64
9. Hov	w woul	.d you g	rade the overal	l teach	ing effectiveness	4	2	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	649/	1554	4.11	4.04	4.10	4.01	4.31
			Lecture																	
1. Wer	re the	instru	ctor's lectures	well p	repared	0	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	385/	1488	4.57	4.59	4.47	4.41	4.82
2. Dic	d the	instruc	tor seem intere	sted in	the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	810/	1493	4.75	4.72	4.73	4.65	4.81
			erial presented			0	0	0	0	2	5	15	4.59	572/		4.33	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.59
			es contribute to			0	0	0	1	2	4	15	4.50	696/		4.33	4.35	4.32	4.22	4.50
5. Did	d audi	ovisual	techniques enh	ance yo	ur understanding	3	11	1	0	4	0	3	3.50	1020/	1277	3.40	3.82	4.03	3.91	3.50
			Discuss	ion																
1. Dic	d clas	s discu	ssions contribu	te to w	hat you learned	14	0	0	0	3	4	1	3.75	962/	1279	3.75	3.94	4.17	3.96	3.75
2. Wer	re all	studen	its actively enc	ouraged	to participate	14	0	1	0	3	2	2	3.50	1135/	1270	3.90	4.00	4.35	4.09	3.50
	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discuss Were special techniques successful						0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	644/	1269	4.19	4.16	4.35	4.09	4.50
4. Wer	re spe	cial te		15	4	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	****/	878	4.25	3.53	4.05	3.91	****		
1. Did	d the	lab inc	rease understan	ding of	the material	18	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	234	****	****	4.23	4.08	****
2. Wer	re you	provid	led with adequat	e backg	round information	19	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/	240	****	****	4.35	4.29	****
3. Wer	re nec	essary	materials avail	able fo	r lab activities	19	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	229	****	****	4.51	4.43	****
5. Wer	re reg	uiremen	its for lab repo	rts cle	arly specified	6	2	0	0	0	14	0	4.00	229/	379	4.02	4.11	4.20	4.15	4.00
			Seminar																	
1. Wer	re ass	igned t	opics relevant	to the	announced theme	20	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	85	****	****	4.72	4.52	****
5. Wer	re cri	teria f	or grading made	clear		3	1	0	0	18	0	0	3.00	287/	375	3.10	3.22	4.01	3.78	3.00
			Field W	ork																
1. Dic	d fiel	d exper	ience contribut	e to wh	at you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	52	****	***	4.48	4.20	****
2. Dic	d you	clearly	understand you	r evalu	ation criteria	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	48	***	****	4.40	4.11	****
5. Did	d conf	erences	help you carry	out fi	eld activities	3	1	0	0	18	0	0	3.00	251/	326	2.99	3.09	4.03	3.64	3.00
			Self P	aced																
1. Dic	d self	-paced	system contribu		hat you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****
			ions make clear			21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	24	****	***	4.83	4.71	****
5. Wer	. Were there enough proctors for all the students						1	0	0	10	0	0	3.00	313/	382	2.99	3.20	4.08	3.86	3.00
	Fr								utio	n										
Crodit	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad								D.O.	agon	a				Тъл	no			Majoro	
										ason					Ту]	 hc			Majors 	,
00-27 28-55	00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 1 28-55 2 1.00-1.99 0 B 11						Red	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s	2	Grad	duat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55 56-83		3	1.00-1.99 2.00-2.99	5	C 8		Co	nera	1				4	וזאק.	ar~	rad C	22	Non	ma ior	22
84-15		5	3.00-3.49	5 7	D 0		Gel	ıcıd.	1				7	ona	er-g	rau 2	. 4	14011-	-major	44
Grad.		0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		E14	ecti	ves				0	###:	# - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enoue	rh
or aa.	-	•	3.33 1.00	-	- 0				. 25				-	0.0.00					- CIICUS	,

I 0 Other 15 ? 1

Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I

Instructor: DAVIS, ALEXIS C

Enrollment: 39 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 529 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eque	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	0	3	8	14	4.44	727/1576	4.28	4.24	4.30	4.11	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	15	4.52	581/1576	4.34	4.28	4.27	4.18	4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	7	13	4.32	779/1342	4.46	4.28	4.32	4.19	4.32
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	3	3	11	4.47	562/1520	4.14	4.12	4.25	4.09	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	22	4.84	153/1465	4.50	4.08	4.12	4.02	4.84
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	1	1	1	14	4.65	287/1434	3.94	4.05	4.14	3.94	4.65
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	7	15	4.48	559/1547	4.41	4.34	4.19	4.10	4.48
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	18	4.75	758/1574	4.64	4.54	4.64	4.59	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	3	12	3	4.00	924/1554	4.11	4.04	4.10	4.01	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	9	13	4.46	932/1488	4.57	4.59	4.47	4.41	4.46
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4	19	4.75	908/1493	4.75	4.72	4.73	4.65	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	6		4.58	584/1486		4.33	4.32	4.26	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4			4.50	696/1489	4.33	4.35	4.32	4.22	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	2	2	4	3	4		1086/1277		3.82	4.03	3.91	
5. Fix and over the first	_		_	_	-		-	3.33	1000,127,	3.10	3.02	1.05	3.71	3.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	2	1	5	10	4.28	649/1279	3.75	3.94	4.17	3.96	4.28
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	636/1270	3.90	4.00	4.35	4.09	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	5	2	11	4.33	773/1269	4.19	4.16	4.35	4.09	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	7	6	0	2	1	1	8	4.25	367/ 878	4.25	3.53	4.05	3.91	4.25
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.29	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	2	0	0	0	13	1	4.07	214/ 379	4.02	4.11	4.20	4.15	4.07
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	2	0	4 00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.52	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	2	0		****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	13	1	2		235/ 375		3.22	4.01	3.78	
5. Were criteria for grading made crear	J	U	U	U	13	1	2	3.31	233/ 3/3	3.10	3.22	4.01	3.70	3.31
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	13	0	2	3.27	211/ 326	2.99	3.09	4.03		3.27
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	2	0	0	11	0	0	3.00	313/ 382	2.99	3.20	4.08	3.86	3.00

Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I

Instructor: DAVIS, ALEXIS C

Enrollment: 39
Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 529 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	6	C	5	General	5	Under-grad	25	Non-major	25
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	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	13	-		-	
				?	3						

Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I

Instructor: CROTEAU, MARCIA

Enrollment: 33
Questionnaires: 21

Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 530 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies

Instructor

University of Maryland

						Fre	equer	ncies			Insi	tructor	Course	рерт	OMBC	телет	Sect
	Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	Genera	1															
1. Did you g	ain new insights,ski	lls from	this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	243/1576	4.28	4.24	4.30	4.11	4.81
2. Did the in	nstructor make clear	the expe	ected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	324/1576	4.34	4.28	4.27	4.18	4.71
	xam questions reflec			0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	179/1342	4.46	4.28	4.32	4.19	4.90
	evaluations reflect			0	8	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	173/1520	4.14	4.12	4.25	4.09	4.85
5. Did assign	ned readings contrib	ute to wl	nat you learned	0	1	0	0	3	5	12	4.45	454/1465	4.50	4.08	4.12	4.02	4.45
6. Did writte	en assignments contr	ibute to	what you learned	0	7	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	167/1434	3.94	4.05	4.14	3.94	4.79
7. Was the g	rading system clearl	y explair	ned	0	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	280/1547	4.41	4.34	4.19	4.10	4.71
8. How many	times was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1574	4.64	4.54	4.64	4.59	5.00
_	you grade the overa		ing effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	208/1554			4.10	4.01	4.73
	Lectur	e															
1. Were the	instructor's lecture	s well p	repared	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	248/1488	4.57	4.59	4.47	4.41	4.90
	nstructor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90			4.72	4.73		4.90
	re material presente			0	0	0	0	1	7			596/1486					4.57
	ectures contribute t			0	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81					4.22	
	visual techniques en			0	7	1	2	2	3		3.79						
J. Dia addio	vibuai ecciniiques en	nance you	ar unacrocanarng	U	,	_	2	2	J	O	3.75	005/12//	3.10	3.02	1.05	3.71	3.75
	Discus																
	discussions contrib		9	0	0	0	5	2	5		802/1279	3.75	3.94	4.17	3.96	4.00	
2. Were all	students actively en	to participate	9	0	1	0	6	3	2	3.42	1153/1270	3.90	4.00	4.35	4.09	3.42	
	nstructor encourage	open discussion	9	0	0	0	5	1	6	4.08	911/1269	4.19	4.16	4.35	4.09	4.08	
4. Were spec	ial techniques succe		9	9	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 878	4.25	3.53	4.05	3.91	****	
	Labora	torv															
5. Were requ	irements for lab rep	-	arly specified	15	0	0	0	0	6	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.02	4.11	4.20	4.15	4.00
0.7												,					
	Semina																
5. Were crit	eria for grading mad	e clear		18	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 375	3.10	3.22	4.01	3.78	****
	Field																
5. Did confe	rences help you carr	y out fie	eld activities	15	0	0	0	6	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	2.99	3.09	4.03	3.64	3.00
	Self	Paced															
5. Were there	e enough proctors for		e students	19	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	2.99	3.20	4.08	3.86	***
			Flag a seri		- D:			_									
			Frequ	iency	DIS	LTIDU	ıcıoı	1									
Credits Earn	ed Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27	5 0.00-0.99	A 17		Red	 quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	 s	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r r	1	
28-55	В 2			- '													
	56-83 1 2.00-2.99 3 C 1										1	Under-g	rad 2	1	Non-	major	20
84-150	D 0			neral						5	_			3	-		
	1 3.00-3.49 0 3.50-4.00	5 5	F 0		Ele	ectiv	zes.				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h
3244.	2.20 1.00	2	P 0								_	respons					
	I O									1	8	100FOIID					
			? 0		Oth					_	-						

Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING II

Questions

Instructor: MCBRIDE, CHUCK

Enrollment: 35
Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 531 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Mean Mean Mean Mean

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies

NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean

Instructor

Rank

General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course						0	1	0	2	5	1.2	1 25	840/1576	1 22	1 21	1 20	1 11	1 25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals						0	1	0	2				891/1576					
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals						0	1	0	1				753/1342					
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals						11	1	1					1300/1520					
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned						1	1	0					824/1465					
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned						12	0	1					1021/1434					
7. Was the grading system clearly explained							1						690/1547					
8. How many times was class cancelled						0	1	0					1424/1574					
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness							1	1					1274/1554					
Lecture																		
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared							0	1	3	5	10	4.26	1103/1488	4.46	4.59	4.47	4.41	4.26
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject							0	0	1				947/1493					
	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly						0	2					1218/1486					
						0							1196/1489					
	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding												1226/1277					
						11	-	Ü	_	_	_	2.05	1220, 127,	3.75	3.02	1.05	3.71	2.03
1 Did (alaaa diaa	Discuss		hat you learned	1.2	0	0	0	2	1	1	1 12	758/1279	2 01	3.94	1 17	2 06	1 12
				_		0												
	2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion														4.00			
		_		open discussion		0	0	0					894/1269 ****/ 878		4.16			
4. Were special techniques successful					12	/	T	U	U	U	U	1.00	^^^^/ 8/8	3.94	3.53	4.05	3.91	^ ^ ^ ^
Laboratory																		
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified					16	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	****/ 379	4.00	4.11	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar																		
5. Were criteria for grading made clear					13	0	0	0	7	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.22	3.22	4.01	3.78	3.00
Field Work																		
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities					15	0	0	0	5	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.00	3.09	4.03	3.64	3.00
		Self F	Paced															
5. Were	there enou	ugh proctors for	all the	e students	14	0	0	0	6	0	0	3.00	313/ 382	3.21	3.20	4.08	3.86	3.00
				Freq	uency	Dis	tribu	ıtioı	n									
Guidha Ramad						Reasons									Mr			
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades							Rea	easons 			Туре 					Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 8		Red	quire	ed fo	or M	ajor	s	0	Graduate	:	1	Majo	r	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 6		-												
56-83	1	2.00-2.99		C 4		General						0	Under-grad 19			Non-	major	16
84-150		3.00-3.49	3	D 0														
Grad. 1 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 P 0						Ele	ectiv	res				0	#### - Means there are not end				enoug	h
													response	ifican	ıt			
I 0						Other						19						
? 0																		

Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING II

Instructor: MEDICUS, SUZANN

Enrollment: 40 Questionnaires: 35 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 532 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			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	0	3	10	14	8	3.77	1337/1576	4.22	4.24	4.30	4.11	3.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	13	12	10	3.91	1227/1576	4.25	4.28	4.27	4.18	3.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	8	11	15	4.14	912/1342	4.16	4.28	4.32	4.19	4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	1	8	10	9	3.86	1192/1520	3.81	4.12	4.25	4.09	3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	3	7	7	15	4.06	818/1465	4.21	4.08	4.12	4.02	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	3	7	8	9	3.85	1033/1434	3.91	4.05	4.14	3.94	3.85
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	6	12	17	4.31	774/1547	4.47	4.34	4.19	4.10	4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	9	11	15	4.17	1379/1574	4.35	4.54	4.64	4.59	4.17
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	0	0	2	7	11	1	3.52	1295/1554	3.94	4.04	4.10	4.01	3.52
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	6	12	15	4.27	1095/1488	4.46	4.59	4.47	4.41	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	4	7	22		1176/1493	4.64	4.72	4.73	4.65	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	9	10	13		1081/1486	4.21	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.06
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	6	8			1070/1489	4.21	4.35	4.32	4.22	4.09
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	3	3	4	8	10	3.68	938/1277	3.75	3.82	4.03	3.91	3.68
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	3	3	4	3.82	934/1279	3.91	3.94	4.17	3.96	3.82
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	860/1270	4.09	4.00	4.35	4.09	4.18
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	25	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	793/1269	4.38	4.16	4.35	4.09	4.30
4. Were special techniques successful	25	0	0	1	3	2	-	3.90	557/ 878		3.53		3.91	
4. Were special techniques successful	23	U	U		3	2	-	3.90	3317 010	3.74	3.33	4.05	3.71	3.90
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	33	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.29	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	33	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	33	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	26	1	0	0	0	7	1	4.13	****/ 379	4.00	4.11	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.52	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	7	0	2	3.44	217/ 375	3.22	3.22	4.01	3.78	3.44
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	33	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	29	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	****/ 326	3.00	3.09	4.03	3.64	****
Cale David														
Self Paced	22	0	0	0	0	0	2	E 00	****/ 40	****	****	1 60	1 11	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33		0		0	0	2	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.60 4.83	$4.44 \\ 4.71$	****
<ol> <li>Did study questions make clear the expected goal</li> <li>Were your contacts with the instructor helpful</li> </ol>	33 33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.83	4.71	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.67	4.65	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	1	0	0	8	2	2	3.50	219/ 382			4.78	3.86	3.50
J. WELE CHELE ENOUGH PLOCEOUS TOL ALL CHE SCUGENES	22	Τ.	U	U	O	_	۷	5.50	Z19/ 30Z	J. 41	J. 4U	T.00	5.00	5.50

Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING II

Instructor: MEDICUS, SUZANN

Enrollment: 40
Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 532 JUL 2, 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	0	 А	13	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	6	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	35	Non-major	32
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	23	_		_	
				?	0						

Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING II

Instructor:

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 21

MEDICUS, SUZANN

40

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland Page 533 Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009 Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equen 2	cies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	2	3	5	9	1 11	1089/1576	4.22	4.24	4.30	4.11	4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	0	3	4	11	4.11	929/1576	4.25	4.24	4.27	4.18	4.26
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	1	3	3	11	4.16		4.16	4.28	4.32		4.16
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	6	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	665/1520		4.12	4.25		4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	0	7	10	4.26	637/1465	4.21	4.12	4.12	4.02	4.26
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned		4	1	1	1	4	8	4.13		3.91	4.05		3.94	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	3	1	14	4.61	,	4.47	4.34	4.19	4.10	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	1	1	2	10	4		1532/1574	4.47	4.54	4.19	4.10	3.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness		2	0	2	3	3	_		1247/1554		4.04		4.01	
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	1	2	1	11	4.25	1111/1488	4.46	4.59	4.47	4.41	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	2	1	1	12	4.44	1263/1493	4.64	4.72	4.73	4.65	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	2	0	2	2	10	4.13	1054/1486	4.21	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	2	0	3	9	3.94	1169/1489	4.21	4.35	4.32	4.22	3.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	1	1	0	0	5	8	4.36	446/1277	3.75	3.82	4.03	3.91	4.36
Discussion	1 /	0	2	0	1	1	2	2 42	1007/1070	2 01	2 04	A 15	2 06	3.43
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	1	1 1	2	3	4.00	1097/1279 928/1270	3.91 4.09	3.94 4.00	4.17	3.96 4.09	4.00
	14 14	0	0	1	2	1	3		1005/1269	4.09	4.00	4.35		3.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	1	0	0	2	1	3			3.94			4.09	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	Τ	U	U	۷	1	3	4.17	415/ 878	3.94	3.53	4.05	3.91	4.1/
Laboratory  5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 379	4.00	4.11	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.52	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 79	****	****	4.72	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 80	****	****			****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	1	1	0	0		****/ 375		3.22		3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	U	U	1	1	U	U	2.50	****/ 3/5	3.22	3.22	4.01	3.78	
Field Work  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 326	3.00	3.09	4.03	3.64	****
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	5	1	0	3.17	291/ 382	3.21	3.20	4.08	3.86	3.17
Freq	uency	Dist	tribu	ution	1									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	sons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	l
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 10				 ed fo				0	Graduat		0	Majo		2
28-55 3 1.00-1.99 0 B 7			_		,⊤ 1,1¢	בטעב						,		
56-83 1 2.00-2.99 2 C 1 84-150 5 3.00-3.49 3 D 0		Gei	neral	Τ				0	Under-g	rad 2	1	Non-	-major	19
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 4 F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				0	#### - : respons				_	h
5 0 I 0		Otl	her				1	5	1000110		- 5191			

Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING II

Instructor: HARDY, TIMOTHY

Enrollment:

29 Questionnaires: 8

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2009

Page 534 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

							Fre	equer	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 Did vo	u gain n	Genera ew insights,ski		m this source	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	471/1576	4.22	4.24	4 30	4.11	4.63
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	0	3		4.25			4.28		4.18	4.25
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	1	2	1		4.00					4.19	4.00
		uations reflect			0	0	2	1	1	1			1438/1520		4.12		4.09	3.25
				what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2		4.43			4.08	4.12		4.43
				o what you learned	0	1		1					878/1434		4.05	4.14	3.94	4.00
		g system clearly			1	0	0	0	1	0			280/1547			4.19	4.10	4.71
		was class canc		IIIca	0	0	0	0	_	1			527/1574					4.88
	-			hing effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1			160/1554					
J. 110W WO	ara you	grade the overa	II ccac	illing cliccelveness	5	O	O	O	O	_	1	1.00	100/1331	3.71	1.01	1.10	1.01	1.00
		Lecture	е															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	505/1488	4.46	4.59	4.47	4.41	4.75
2. Did the	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	1	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	1150/1493	4.64	4.72	4.73	4.65	4.57
3. Was le	ecture material presented and explained one lectures contribute to what you learn		xplained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	596/1486	4.21	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.57	
4. Did the	ne lectures contribute to what you learne			you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	614/1489	4.21	4.35	4.32	4.22	4.57
5. Did au	audiovisual techniques enhance your underst				1	1	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	692/1277	3.75	3.82	4.03	3.91	4.00
	- Discussion																	
1 5 1					-	•	0	•	•	_	_	4 00	000/1050	2 01	2 04	4 1 1	2 06	4 00
I. Dia ci	class discussions contribute to what you lea				1	0	0	0	2	3		4.00			3.94			4.00
	d class discussions contribute to what you leader all students actively encouraged to particing the instructor encourage fair and open discu				1	0	0	0	3	1		4.00			4.00	4.35		4.00
				d open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1		4.83	,			4.35	4.09	4.83
4. Were s	pecial to	echniques succe	ssiul		1	3	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	631/ 878	3.94	3.53	4.05	3.91	3.75
		Labora	torv															
5. Were r	equireme		-	early specified	6	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.00	4.11	4.20	4.15	4.00
				1 11 11														
		Field '																
5. Did co	nference	s help you carr	y out f	ield activities	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	3.00	3.09	4.03	3.64	****
		Self	Daged															
5. Were t	here eno	ugh proctors fo		he students	6	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	313/ 382	3.21	3.20	4.08	3.86	3.00
					-		-		_				,					
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	5
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	\$	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 3		~		,				0	1	,	0			-
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 1		Ger	nera:	L				0	Under-g	rad	8	Non-	-major	7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0								0			,			,
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				0	#### - 1				_	gn
				P 0		Q. 1						_	respons	es to b	e sign	ııııcar	1T	
				I 0		Oth	ner					6						
				3 0														

Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING II

Questions

Instructor: HARDY, TIMOTHY

Enrollment: 26

Questionnaires: 13

Spring 2009

Page 535 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Mean Mean Mean Mean

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies

NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean

Instructor

Rank

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

		General	l															
		ew insights,skil				0			3	4			976/1576					
2. Did the	e instru	ctor make clear	the expe	ected goals pected goals ected goals pat you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	568/1576	4.25	4.28	4.27	4.18	4.54
3. Did the	e exam q	uestions reflect	t the exp	pected goals	1	0	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	899/1342	4.16	4.28	4.32	4.19	4.17
4. Did oth	her evalı	uations reflect	the expe	ected goals	0	1	0	0	3	8	1	3.83	1212/1520	3.81	4.12	4.25	4.09	3.83
J. DIG GD	0 - 5 - 1 - 0			iac jou rearised	•	•	•	•	_	•	_	1.20	000, 1100		1.00			
6. Did wri	itten as:	signments contri	ibute to	what you learned	0	3	1	0	2	5	2	3.70	1123/1434	3.91	4.05	4.14	3.94	3.70
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearly	y explaim	ned	0	0	0	2	1	1	9	4.31	784/1547	4.47	4.34	4.19	4.10	4.31
8. How mar	ny times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	739/1574	4.35	4.54	4.64	4.59	4.77
9. How wor	uld you	grade the overal	ll teach:	ing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	805/1554	3.94	4.04	4.10	4.01	4.17
		Lecture	9															
1. Were th	he instr	uctor's lectures	s well p	repared	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	484/1488	4.46	4.59	4.47	4.41	4.77
		ctor seem intere											445/1493					
				plained clearly									735/1486					
		es contribute to			0	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	660/1489	4.21	4.35	4.32	4.22	4.54
				ur understanding	0	0	0	2	1	4	6	4.08	664/1277	3.75	3.82	4.03	3.91	4.08
J. Dia au	arovibua.	r cccimitdaep em	idilee you	ar understanding	J	Ü	Ü	_	_	-	Ü	1.00	001/12//	3.73	3.02	1.05	3.71	1.00
1 5'1 1		Discuss			0	0	0	0	-	•	0	4 00	E10 /10E0	2 01	2 04	4 15	2 06	4 00
				nat you learned									712/1279					
				to participate									928/1270					
				open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	386/1269	4.38	4.16	4.35	4.09	4.80
4. Were sp	pecial te		8	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 878	3.94	3.53	4.05	3.91	****		
		Laborat	cory															
5. Were re	equireme	nts for lab repo	orts clea	arly specified	10	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 379	4.00	4.11	4.20	4.15	****
		Semina	r															
5. Were co	riteria :	for grading made	e clear		11	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	3.22	3.22	4.01	3.78	****
		Field V	Nork															
5. Did cor	nference			eld activities	9	0	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.00	3.09	4.03	3.64	3.00
		0-15																
5. Were th	here eno	Self I ugh proctors foi		e students	8	0	0	0	4	0	1	3.40	235/ 382	3.21	3.20	4.08	3.86	3.40
				Frequ	lency	Dist	ribu	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades									Тур				Majors	
00-27	0	0 00-0 99	0									0	Graduate					0
28-55	2	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99 2.00-2.99 3.00-3.49 3.50-4.00	0	B 6		ve.	1411	-u 1	J. 1110	۱۰۲ د م	2	•	Graduate	•	5	ı-ıa j0	_	U
56-83	n	2 00-2 99	4	C 5		Cer	nera	1				0	Under-gr	ad 1	3	Non-	maior	13
84-150	3	3 00-3 49	1	D 0		GCI	.C. a.	-				0	onaci gi	1	- 5	14011		10
Grad.	0	3 50-4 00	0	F O		ਸੀ∠	ectiv	765				0	#### - N	leanc +	here =	re not	enoua	rh
Si aa.	J	3.30 1.00	J	P 0		1110	C I \	v CD				0	response					
				I O		Otł	ner				1	2	response		,c 5191.	ıııcan		
			? 1		001						_							
				. ±														

Title INTERMED ACCOUNTING I

Instructor: ST MARTIN, JEAN

Enrollment: 31
Questionnaires: 16

Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 536 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

			NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean		
		General	 1															
1. Did vou	gain new	insights, skil		this course	1	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	500/1576	4.70	4.24	4.30	4.30	4.60
		or make clear			1	0	0	0	2	0	13	4.73	301/1576	4.77	4.28	4.27	4.28	4.73
		stions reflect			1	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	480/1342	4.68	4.28	4.32	4.30	4.60
		cions reflect			1	2	0	0	2	2	9	4.54		4.66	4.12	4.25	4.25	4.54
				nat you learned	1	1	1	1	0	5	7	4.14	758/1465	4.47	4.08	4.12	4.09	4.14
	-	-		what you learned	1	1	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	574/1434	4.55	4.05	4.14	4.15	4.36
7. Was the	grading s	system clearly	y explair	ned	1	0	0	0	2	1	12	4.67	339/1547	4.83	4.34	4.19	4.21	4.67
8. How man	ny times wa	as class cance	elled		1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.54	4.64	4.61	5.00
9. How wou	ıld you gra	ade the overa	ll teachi	ng effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	237/1554	4.82	4.04	4.10	4.09	4.70
		Lecture	e															
1. Were th	ne instruct	tor's lectures	s well pr	repared	3	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	484/1488	4.86	4.59	4.47	4.47	4.77
2. Did the	e instructo	or seem intere	ested in	the subject	3	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	888/1493	4.86	4.72	4.73	4.70	4.77
				olained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	231/1486	4.86	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.85
		contribute to	_		3	0	0	0	2	0		4.69	461/1489	4.79	4.35		4.34	
5. Did aud	liovisual t	techniques enl	nance you	ır understanding	3	4	1	1	0	1	6	4.11	645/1277	4.26	3.82	4.03	4.11	4.11
	Discussion Did class discussions contribute to what you learn																	
	Discussion Did class discussions contribute to what you learn Were all students actively encouraged to participa						1	0	0	1		4.17	732/1279	4.01		4.17		4.17
		_	_	1 1	9	0	0	0	1	2		4.43	716/1270	4.30	4.00	4.35	4.42	4.43
				open discussion	9	0	1	0	1	1		4.00	928/1269	4.00	4.16	4.35	4.41	4.00
4. Were sp	ecial tech	nniques succes	sstul		9	4	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 878	****	3.53	4.05	4.09	****
- ···		Laborat	_	1	1.0	0	0	0	0	_	0	4 00	000/ 250	4 06	4 11	4 00	4 15	4 00
5. Were re	equirements	s for lab repo	orts clea	arly specified	10	0	0	0	0	6	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.06	4.11	4.20	4.17	4.00
		Semina	r															
5. Were cr	riteria for	r grading made	e clear		8	0	0	0	8	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.14	3.22	4.01	4.12	3.00
		Field V																
5. Did con	nferences h	nelp you carry	y out fie	eld activities	11	0	0	0	4	1	0	3.20	223/ 326	3.20	3.09	4.03	4.23	3.20
		Self I							_	_								
5. Were th	iere enough	n proctors for	r all the	e students	10	0	0	0	5	1	0	3.17	291/ 382	3.17	3.20	4.08	4.24	3.17
				Frequ	lency	Dist	tribu	utior	1									
Credits Ea	ırned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Туј	pe			Majors	
00-27								ed fo	or Ma	ior	 s	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55	B-55 2 1.00-1.99 0 B 5									J						3 -		
56-83	-83 4 2.00-2.99 2 C 1						nera:	L				2	Under-g	rad 1	6	Non-	major	16
84-150													3				-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0		Ele	ectiv	res				0	#### - I					h
				P 0 I 0		O+1	ner				-	1	response	es to D	e sign	ııııcar	lL	
				3. 0 T 0		Utl	.ier				T	Τ						

Title INTERMED ACCOUNTING I

Instructor: ST MARTIN, JEAN

Enrollment: 30
Questionnaires: 20

Spring 2009

Page 537 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

			Fre	equer	cies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	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	0	1	2	17	4.80	243/1576	4.70	4.24	4.30	4.30	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	222/1576	4.77	4.28	4.27	4.28	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	1	18	4.75	298/1342	4.68	4.28	4.32	4.30	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	218/1520	4.66	4.12	4.25	4.25	4.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	175/1465	4.47	4.08	4.12	4.09	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	209/1434	4.55	4.05	4.14	4.15	4.74
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1547	4.83	4.34	4.19	4.21	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.54	4.64	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	81/1554	4.82	4.04	4.10	4.09	4.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	149/1488	4.86	4.59	4.47	4.47	4.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	334/1493	4.86	4.72	4.73	4.70	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	191/1486	4.86	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	205/1489	4.79	4.35	4.32	4.34	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	12	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	404/1277	4.26	3.82	4.03	4.11	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	918/1279	4.01	3.94	4.17	4.20	3.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	871/1270	4.30	4.00	4.35	4.42	4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	928/1269	4.00	4.16	4.35	4.41	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	14	3	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 878	****	3.53	4.05	4.09	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.32	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	1	0	0	0	7	1	4.13	200/ 379	4.06	4.11	4.20	4.17	4.13
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	6	0	1	3.29	240/ 375	3.14	3.22	4.01	4.12	3.29
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 48	****	****	4.40	3.92	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.63	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	1	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	****/ 326	3.20	3.09	4.03	4.23	****
Self Paced		_		_		_	_							
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.83	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.89	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	1	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	****/ 382	3.17	3.20	4.08	4.24	***

Title INTERMED ACCOUNTING I

Instructor: ST MARTIN, JEAN

Enrollment: 30
Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 537 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	20	Non-major	19
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				Р	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	17	-		_	
				?	0						

INTERMED ACCOUNTING II

Title Instructor: CROTEAU, MARCIA

Enrollment: 38 Questionnaires: 19 Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 538 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

		Questions		NR	NA	Fr 1	_	ncies 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General															
1. Did y	ou gain ne	ew insights,skil	ls from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	387/1576	4.68	4.24	4.30	4.30	4.68
			the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	11	4.42	728/1576		4.28	4.27	4.28	4.42
3. Did t	he exam qu	estions reflect	the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	510/1342	4.58	4.28	4.32	4.30	4.58
4. Did o	ther evalu	uations reflect	the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	8	7	4.11	994/1520	4.11	4.12	4.25	4.25	4.11
5. Did a	ssigned re	eadings contribu	te to what you learned	0 E	3	0	1	2	7	6	4.13	778/1465	4.13	4.08	4.12	4.09	4.13
6. Did w	ritten ass	signments contri	bute to what you learr	ned 1	2	1	2	5	2	6	3.63	1162/1434	3.63	4.05	4.14	4.15	3.63
7. Was t	he grading	g system clearly	explained	2	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	434/1547	4.59	4.34	4.19	4.21	4.59
8. How ma	any times	was class cance	lled	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	281/1574	4.95	4.54	4.64	4.61	4.95
9. How we	ould you g	grade the overal	l teaching effectivene	ess 2	0	0	1	3	8	5	4.00	924/1554	4.00	4.04	4.10	4.09	4.00
		Lecture															
1. Were	the instru	actor's lectures	well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	463/1488	4.78	4.59	4.47	4.47	4.78
2. Did t	he instruc	ctor seem intere	sted in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	607/1493	4.89	4.72	4.73	4.70	4.89
3. Was 1	ecture mat	terial presented	and explained clearly	, 2	0	0	1	1	3	12	4.53	654/1486	4.53	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.53
4. Did t	he lecture	es contribute to	what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	5	11	4.39	834/1489	4.39	4.35	4.32	4.34	4.39
5. Did a	audiovisual techniques enhance your understa				4	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	692/1277	4.00	3.82	4.03	4.11	4.00
	Discussion																
1. Did c	lass discu	ussions contribu	te to what you learned	1 9	0	1	1	1	4	3	3.70	986/1279	3.70	3.94	4.17	4.20	3.70
	d class discussions contribute to what you lear re all students actively encouraged to particip				0	1	0	2	3	3		1045/1270		4.00	4.35	4.42	3.78
			air and open discussion			0	0	1	4	5	4.40	728/1269		4.16	4.35	4.41	4.40
		echniques succes		9		0	0	0	1	3		****/ 878		3.53	4.05	4.09	****
		Laborat	ory														
5. Were	requiremer	nts for lab repo	rts clearly specified	14	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	175/ 379	4.20	4.11	4.20	4.17	4.20
		Seminar															
5. Were	criteria f	for grading made	clear	15	0	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	3.22	4.01	4.12	****
		Field W	ork														
1. Did f	ield exper	rience contribut	e to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****
5. Did c	onferences	s help you carry	out field activities	16	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	3.09	4.03	4.23	****
		Self P	aced														
			te to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.83	****
5. Were	there enou	ugh proctors for	all the students	9	0	0	0	8	2	0	3.20	281/ 382	3.20	3.20	4.08	4.24	3.20
			Fr	requenc	y Dis	strib	utio	n									
Credits	Earned	Expected Grad	des			Re	asons	S			Ту	pe			Majors	5	
00 07	·										1			·			
00-27 28-55	0	0 A 5		Re	equir	ea I	Or. Mg	ajor	B	1	Graduat	e	0	Majo	ΣĽ	0	
	4	* - *		α.	~~~~	1				2	IIndon	20 d 1	0	More	ma i a	1.0	
56-83 84-150	4 5	2.00-2.99 3.00-3.49	3 C 4 6 D 0		G	enera	.1				4	Under-g	rau l	.9	non-	-major	19
84-150 Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5 F 0		ъ.	lecti	TTO G				0	#### -	Moana +	horo	vo not	ono	rh
GLau.	U	3.50-4.00	P 0		Ľ.	recri	ves				U	#### - respons				_	ìTT
			I 0		Ot	ther				1	.5	-					
			? 1														

Title INTERM MICROECON ANALY

Instructor: VIAUROUX, CHRIS

Enrollment: 39
Questionnaires: 26

84-150

Grad.

1

0

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

3

6

D F

Ρ

Ι

0

0

0

1

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 539 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

							Fr	eanei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_	Mean		Mean
1 Did 110	~~!~ ~	Genera ew insights,ski		om this source	0	0	3	1	3	6	1 2	2 06	1185/1576	3.99	1 21	4.30	4.30	3.96
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	0	2	8	6	10		1217/1576		4.24	4.27	4.28	3.90
		uestions reflec		_	1	0	1	2	4	5			944/1342		4.28			4.08
	_	uations reflect			0	5	1	2	6	6			1300/1520			4.25	4.25	3.67
				what you learned	0	2	7	2	7	4	4		1423/1465		4.08	4.12	4.09	2.83
	_	-		to what you learned	0	5	1	1	7	3	9		1033/1434			4.14	4.15	3.86
		g system clearl		_	0	0	1	2	4				1033/1434			4.14	4.15	
	_	was class cand		ained	0	0	1	0	0	4			866/1574				4.61	
	-			ching effectiveness	6	0	2	0	4	8			1132/1554					
9. HOW WC	ouia you	grade the overa	II teat	diling effectiveness	O	U	4	U	4	0	0	3.00	1132/1554	3.31	4.04	4.10	4.09	3.00
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	the instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	1	0	0	0	1	7	17	4.64	694/1488	4.56	4.59	4.47	4.47	4.64
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	6	18	4.68	1041/1493	4.77	4.72	4.73	4.70	4.68
3. Was le	ecture ma	terial presente	d and e	explained clearly	1	0	1	1	3	7	13	4.20	1003/1486	4.09	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.20
4. Did th	ne lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	1	0	1	2	2	7	13	4.16	1020/1489	4.21	4.35	4.32	4.34	4.16
5. Did au	ıdiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	your understanding	3	6	1	1	3	3	9	4.06	672/1277	3.79	3.82	4.03	4.11	4.06
	Discussion																	
1 Did al	Discussion class discussions contribute to what you learn				12	0	1	0	2	3	8	4.21	697/1279	3.87	3.94	4.17	4.20	4.21
			ns contribute to what you learne ctively encouraged to participat				0	0	3	5	5	4.15			4.00	4.35		4.15
				nd open discussion	13 13	0	1	0	2	2		4.23	,		4.16		4.41	
		echniques succe		id open discussion	13	3	2	0	2	1	-	3.70	,				4.09	
		- 1																
5 Were r	remui reme	Labora nts for lab rep	_	learly specified	21	0	0	0	0	5	0	4 00	****/ 379	4 00	4 11	4 20	4 17	****
J. Were I	-cquireme	nes for tas rep	0100 0	rearry specifica	21	Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	3	Ü	1.00	, 313	1.00	1.11	1.20	1.17	
1		Semina		1 . 1	0.5	0	0	•	0	0	-	F 00	***** 05	****	als als als als	4 50	4 60	****
				e announced theme	25	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 85		****	4.72	4.67	
				dividual attention	25	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 79		****	4.69	4.69	****
	_	-		what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 72		****		4.53	
5. Were c	criteria	for grading mad	e clear	C	22	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 375	3.27	3.22	4.01	4.12	****
		Field	Work															
5. Did co	onference	s help you carr	y out f	field activities	18	0	0	0	8	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.10	3.09	4.03	4.23	3.00
		Self	Paced															
5. Were t	Self Paced ere there enough proctors for all the students				17	0	0	0	7	1	1	3.33	250/ 382	3.14	3.20	4.08	4.24	3.33
						- Di	i lo-		_									
		Frequ	ченсу	ומות	rt ID.	uLIOI	11											
Credits E	Earned	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors			
00-27						Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	. jor	`s	0	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r r	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	в 4			-			-						,		
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	3	C 8		Ger	nera	1				2	Under-g	rad 2	16	Non-	major	26
04 150	1	2.00 2.33	2	D 0		001	a	_				_	011001 9		-	2.011		

Electives

Other

1

19

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

INTERM MICROECON ANALY

Title Instructor: BRADLEY, MICHAE

Enrollment:

41 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 540 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	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	1	2	6	3	3.92	1231/1576	3.99	4.24	4.30	4.30	3.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	3	3	3.75	1311/1576	3.93	4.28	4.27	4.28	3.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	5	0	5	3.73	1146/1342	4.08	4.28	4.32	4.30	3.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	1	3	1	2	3.25	1438/1520	3.78	4.12	4.25	4.25	3.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	4	3	3.50	1242/1465	3.40	4.08	4.12	4.09	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	1432/1434	3.42	4.05	4.14	4.15	2.00
 Was the grading system clearly explained 	0	0	0	1	5	2	4		1239/1547		4.34	4.19	4.21	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	2	9		645/1574				4.61	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	2	0	3	6	0	3.18	1410/1554	3.51	4.04	4.10	4.09	3.18
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	822/1488	4.56	4.59	4.47	4.47	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	557/1493	4.77	4.72	4.73	4.70	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	0	6			1197/1486	4.09	4.33	4.32	4.32	3.91
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	5	4		1005/1489	4.21	4.35	4.32	4.34	4.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	692/1277				4.11	
5. Più addiovibadi occimitates cimanes four anacistanding	_	•	Ŭ	Ü	_	Ū	_	1.00	0,2,12,,	3.75	3.02	1.05		1.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	0	0	1	3	3.50	1064/1279	3.87	3.94	4.17	4.20	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	1	2	1	1		1208/1270	3.72	4.00	4.35	4.42	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	1	0	2	2		1116/1269	3.81	4.16	4.35	4.41	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	1	1	0	1	0		858/ 878	3.01			4.09	2.33
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.32	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	1	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.00	4.11	4.20	4.17	4.00
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	1	0	0	4	1	0	3.20	254/ 375	3.27	3.22	4.01	4.12	3.20
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	3.92	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	1	0	0	8	1	0		244/ 326	3.10	3.09	4.03		3.11
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.83	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.89	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	0	0	1	7	0	0	2.88	377/ 382	3.14	3.20	4.08	4.24	2.88
_														

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	1	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	6	-				-	
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	С	4	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	9
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0			_		-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	L
				P	0			responses to		_	
				I	0	Other	10	-	_	,	

? 0

Title INTERM MICROECON ANALY

Instructor: LORD, WILLIAM

Enrollment: 39
Questionnaires: 20

Baltimore County Spring 2009

University of Maryland

Page 541 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	5	4	9	4.11	1089/1576	3.99	4.24	4.30	4.30	4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	9	6	4.11	1076/1576	3.93	4.28	4.27	4.28	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	5	12	4.42	683/1342	4.08	4.28	4.32	4.30	4.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	12	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	648/1520	3.78	4.12	4.25	4.25	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	0	2	9	3	3.87	1020/1465	3.40	4.08	4.12	4.09	3.87
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	14	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	524/1434	3.42	4.05	4.14	4.15	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	1	5	10	4.05	1006/1547	3.95	4.34	4.19	4.21	4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	11	8	4.42	1177/1574	4.64	4.54	4.64	4.61	4.42
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	2	5	7	2	3.56	1281/1554	3.51	4.04	4.10	4.09	3.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	3	12	4.50	870/1488	4.56	4.59	4.47	4.47	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	966/1493	4.77	4.72	4.73	4.70	4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	2	5	9	4.17	1025/1486	4.09	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	5	10	4.28	941/1489	4.21	4.35	4.32	4.34	4.28
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	4	1	1	6	4	3.31	1092/1277	3.79	3.82	4.03	4.11	3.31
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	3	2	4	3.90	899/1279	3.87	3.94	4.17	4.20	3.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	4	2	4	4.00	928/1270	3.72	4.00	4.35	4.42	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	5	0	4	3.70	1055/1269	3.81	4.16	4.35	4.41	3.70
4. Were special techniques successful	11	4	2	0	1	0	2	3.00	799/ 878	3.01	3.53	4.05	4.09	3.00
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	8	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.00	4.11	4.20	4.17	4.00
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	5	0	1	3.33	232/ 375	3.27	3.22	4.01	4.12	3.33
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	4	1	0	3.20	223/ 326	3.10	3.09	4.03	4.23	3.20
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.83	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	***	****	4.83	4.89	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	1	0	0	4	1	0	3.20	281/ 382	3.14	3.20	4.08	4.24	3.20
Frequ	ency	Dist	cribu	ıtioı	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Pe.	asons	2			Туј	20			Majors	
Expected Grades														
00-27		Rec	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	3
28-55 2 1.00-1.99 0 B 9			_					•		, .				
56-83 2 2.00-2.99 2 C 5		Ger	neral	L				0	Under-g	rad 2	10	Non-	major	17
84-150 2 3.00-3.49 2 D 0								0	0.0.0.0					,
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0		Ele	ectiv	res				0	#### - 1				_	n
P 0		0+1					-	_	response	es to b	e sign	ııııcan	ιτ	
I 0 ? 1		Oth	ıer				1	о						

INTERM MACROECON ANALY

Title Instructor:

Enrollment: 22

CINYABUGUMA, MA Spring 2009

Page 542 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires:	19	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
				T	

			Fre	_	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 you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	1	5	3	8	3.89	1257/1576	4.38	4.24	4.30	4.30	3.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	8	9	4.21	978/1576	4.46	4.28	4.27	4.28	4.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	6	10	4.21	865/1342	4.51	4.28	4.32	4.30	4.21
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	2	5	4	5	3.59	1336/1520	4.21	4.12	4.25	4.25	3.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	5	6	4	3.56	1225/1465	4.20	4.08	4.12	4.09	3.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	4	6	5	3.67	1142/1434	4.43	4.05	4.14	4.15	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	2	4	9	3.89	1152/1547	4.34	4.34	4.19	4.21	3.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	702/1574	4.91	4.54	4.64	4.61	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	924/1554	4.31	4.04	4.10	4.09	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	0	2	4	8	4.20	1155/1488	4.64	4.59	4.47	4.47	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	0	2	2	11	4.38	1301/1493	4.73	4.72	4.73	4.70	4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	0	3	4	7		1081/1486		4.33	4.32	4.32	4.07
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	3	3	8		1042/1489	4.52	4.35	4.32		4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	4	1	2	0	2	5	3.80	856/1277	3.60	3.82	4.03	4.11	3.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	2	1	3	4		1011/1279	4.29	3.94	4.17	4.20	3.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	1	3	2	4		1103/1270	4.25	4.00	4.35	4.42	3.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	2	1	1	1	6		1047/1269	4.41	4.16	4.35		3.73
4. Were special techniques successful	9	5	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	742/ 878	3.40	3.53	4.05	4.09	3.40
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.24	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.32	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.16	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/ 379	4.25	4.11	4.20	4.17	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	7	0	1	3.25	245/ 375	3.22	3.22	4.01	4.12	3.25
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	3.92	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.50	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	6	1	1	3.38	196/ 326	3.38	3.09	4.03	4.23	3.38
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.83	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.89	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	****/ 382	3.10	3.20	4.08	4.24	****

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Title INTERM MACROECON ANALY

Instructor: CINYABUGUMA, MA

Enrollment: 22
Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 542 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11	_			
				?	2						

Title INTERM MACROECON ANALY

Questions

ROSE, MORGAN Instructor:

Enrollment: 33 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 543 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

reflect reflect contribu s contri clearly ss cance e overal Lectures intere resented ibute to ques enh Discuss contribu vely enc	the expet the expet the expet the expet to which the expet to which the expet the expet the expet to what you hance you sion the to who couraged fair and expet to what you have to what you have to who couraged fair and expet to who couraged fair an	ing effec	ls als ls earned learned tiveness ect learly d tanding earned cipate	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 1 1 1 0 2	0 0 0 2 3 5 0 0 0 1	1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 1 1 2 1 1 0 0 0 0 0	3 3 3 4 2 3 7 1 4 0 3 3 3 2	6 7 14 7 14 11 11 11 1	4.40	476/1 366/1 398/1 690/1 328/1 395/1 1/1 849/1 298/1 336/1 1149/1	576 342 520 465 434 547 574 554 488 493 486 489 277	4.21 4.20 4.43 4.34 4.91 4.31 4.64 4.73 4.55 4.52 3.60	4.08 4.05 4.34 4.54 4.04 4.59 4.72 4.33 4.35 3.82	4.17 4.35	4.30 4.28 4.30 4.25 4.09 4.15 4.21 4.61 4.09 4.47 4.70 4.32 4.34 4.11	5.00 4.79 4.79 4.79
reflect reflect contribu s contri clearly ss cance e overal Lecture lectures m intere resented ibute to ques enh Discuss contribu vely enc burage f s succes Laborat	the expette to which the to who had and exponente to what you are to who had a seful to you are to you are to who had a seful to you are to you are to who had a seful to you are to	pected goal nat you lo what you ned ing effect repared the subject plained cour unders	als ls earned learned tiveness ect learly d tanding earned cipate	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 1 1 1 0 2	0 2 3 5 0 0 1	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	1 2 1 0 0 1	3 4 2 3 7 1 4 0 3 3 3 2	10 8 8 6 7 14 7 14 11 11 11 11	4.47 4.54 4.50 4.40 4.40 4.79 4.79 4.79 3.00	633/1 476/1 366/1 398/1 690/1 328/1 395/1 1/1 849/1 298/1 336/1 1149/1	342 520 465 434 547 554 488 493 486 489 277	4.51 4.20 4.43 4.34 4.91 4.31 4.64 4.73 4.55 4.52 3.60	4.28 4.12 4.08 4.05 4.34 4.54 4.04 4.59 4.72 4.33 4.35 3.82	4.32 4.25 4.12 4.14 4.19 4.64 4.10 4.47 4.73 4.32 4.03	4.30 4.25 4.09 4.15 4.21 4.61 4.70 4.32 4.34 4.11	4.47 4.54 4.50 4.50 4.40 4.93 4.50 5.00 4.79 4.79 4.79 3.00
reflect contribus contri clearly ss cance e overal Lectures lectures mintere resented ibute to ques enh Discuss contribu vely enc burage f s succes Laborat	the experted to which the control of the couraged carry.	repared the subjection learned the subjection learned ur unders that you learned the subjection learned the subjection learned the subjection learned that you learned the subjection learned that you learned the subjection learned that you learned the subjection learned the subjection learned that you learned the subjection learned the subject	ls earned learned tiveness ect learly d tanding earned cipate	0 0 0 0 0 2 1 1 1 0 2	2 3 5 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 8	0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	1 2 1 0 0 1	4 2 3 7 1 4 0 3 3 3 2	8 8 6 7 14 7 11 11 11 11	4.54 4.50 4.50 4.40 4.93 4.50 5.00 4.79 4.79 4.79 3.00	476/1 366/1 398/1 690/1 328/1 395/1 1/1 849/1 298/1 336/1 1149/1	520 465 434 547 574 554 488 493 486 489 277	4.21 4.20 4.43 4.34 4.91 4.31 4.64 4.73 4.55 4.52 3.60	4.12 4.08 4.05 4.34 4.54 4.04 4.59 4.72 4.33 4.35 3.82	4.25 4.12 4.14 4.19 4.64 4.10 4.47 4.73 4.32 4.03	4.25 4.09 4.15 4.21 4.61 4.09 4.47 4.70 4.32 4.34 4.11	4.54 4.50 4.50 4.40 4.93 4.50 5.00 4.79 4.79 4.79 3.00
contribus contribus contribus cances cances overal Lectures in interest contribus con	ate to what to what the to what you wante to what you are to w	mat you le what you ned ing effect repared the subject ou learned ur understant you le to partie	earned tiveness ect learly d tanding earned cipate	0 0 0 0 2 1 1 1 0 2	3 5 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 8	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	2 1 0 1 0 0 0 0 0	2 3 7 1 4 0 3 3 3 2	8 6 7 14 7 14 11 11 11 11	4.50 4.40 4.93 4.50 5.00 4.79 4.79 4.79 3.00	366/1 398/1 690/1 328/1 395/1 1/1 849/1 298/1 336/1 1149/1	465 434 547 574 554 488 493 486 489 277	4.20 4.43 4.34 4.91 4.64 4.73 4.55 4.52 3.60	4.08 4.05 4.34 4.54 4.04 4.59 4.72 4.33 4.35 3.82	4.12 4.14 4.19 4.64 4.10 4.47 4.73 4.32 4.32 4.03	4.09 4.15 4.21 4.61 4.09 4.47 4.70 4.32 4.34 4.11	4.50 4.40 4.93 4.50 5.00 4.79 4.79 3.00 4.40 4.60
s contri clearly ss cance e overal Lectures n intere resented ibute to ques enh Discuss contribu vely enc burage f s succes Laborat	bute to y explain elled ll teaching what you hance you sion the to who couraged fair and exful tory	what you ned ing effect repared the subject ou learned ur understand to particular to	learned tiveness ect learly d tanding earned cipate	0 0 0 2 1 1 1 0 2	5 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 8	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	1 0 1 0 0 0 0 0	3 7 1 4 0 3 3 3 2	6 7 14 7 14 11 11 11 11	4.50 4.40 4.93 4.50 5.00 4.79 4.79 3.00	398/1 690/1 328/1 395/1 1/1 849/1 298/1 336/1 1149/1	434 547 574 554 488 493 486 489 277	4.43 4.91 4.31 4.64 4.73 4.55 4.52 3.60	4.05 4.34 4.54 4.04 4.59 4.72 4.33 4.35 3.82	4.14 4.19 4.64 4.10 4.47 4.73 4.32 4.32 4.03	4.15 4.21 4.61 4.09 4.47 4.70 4.32 4.34 4.11	4.50 4.40 4.93 4.50 5.00 4.79 4.79 3.00 4.40 4.60
clearly ss cance e overal Lecture lectures m intere resented ibute to ques enh Discuss contribu vely enc burage f s succes Laborat	y explained let teaching the second of the s	repared the subject of the subject o	tiveness ect learly d tanding earned cipate	1 1 1 0 2	0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 8	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0	7 1 4 0 3 3 3 2	7 14 7 14 11 11 11 1	4.40 4.93 4.50 5.00 4.79 4.79 3.00	690/1 328/1 395/1 1/1 849/1 298/1 336/1 1149/1	547 574 554 488 493 486 489 277	4.34 4.91 4.31 4.64 4.73 4.55 4.52 3.60	4.34 4.54 4.04 4.59 4.72 4.33 4.35 3.82	4.19 4.64 4.10 4.47 4.73 4.32 4.03 4.17 4.35	4.21 4.61 4.09 4.47 4.70 4.32 4.34 4.11	4.40 4.93 4.50 5.00 4.79 4.79 3.00 4.40 4.60
clearly ss cance e overal Lecture lectures m intere resented ibute to ques enh Discuss contribu vely enc burage f s succes Laborat	y explained let teaching the second of the s	repared the subject of the subject o	tiveness ect learly d tanding earned cipate	1 1 1 0 2	0 1 0 0 0 0 1 8	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0	1 4 0 3 3 3 2	14 7 14 11 11 11 1	4.93 4.50 5.00 4.79 4.79 3.00	328/1 395/1 1/1 849/1 298/1 336/1 1149/1	574 554 488 493 486 489 277	4.91 4.31 4.64 4.73 4.55 4.52 3.60	4.54 4.04 4.59 4.72 4.33 4.35 3.82	4.64 4.10 4.47 4.73 4.32 4.32 4.03	4.61 4.09 4.47 4.70 4.32 4.34 4.11	4.93 4.50 5.00 4.79 4.79 4.79 3.00 4.40 4.60
Lecture lectures mintere resented ibute to ques enh Discuss contribu vely enc burage f s succes Laborat	es well presented in dand expo what you hance you sion the to who couraged fair and ssful	repared the subjection of the	ect learly d tanding earned cipate	1 1 1 0 2	0 0 0 1 8	0 0 0 0 0 2	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0	0 3 3 2	7 14 11 11 11 1	4.50 5.00 4.79 4.79 4.79 3.00	395/1 1/1 849/1 298/1 336/1 1149/1	488 493 486 489 277	4.31 4.64 4.73 4.55 4.52 3.60 4.29 4.25	4.04 4.59 4.72 4.33 4.35 3.82	4.10 4.47 4.73 4.32 4.32 4.03	4.47 4.70 4.32 4.34 4.11	4.50 5.00 4.79 4.79 3.00 4.40 4.60
Lecture lectures mintere resented ibute to ques enh Discuss contribu vely enc burage f s succes Laborat	es well presented in dand expo what you hance you sion the to who couraged fair and ssful	repared the subjection of the	ect learly d tanding earned cipate	1 1 1 0 2	0 0 0 1 8	0 0 0 0 2	0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0	0 3 3 3 2	14 11 11 11 1	5.00 4.79 4.79 4.79 3.00	1/1 849/1 298/1 336/1 1149/1	488 493 486 489 277	4.64 4.73 4.55 4.52 3.60 4.29 4.25	4.59 4.72 4.33 4.35 3.82	4.47 4.73 4.32 4.32 4.03	4.47 4.70 4.32 4.34 4.11	5.00 4.79 4.79 4.79 3.00
lectures m intere resented ibute to ques enh Discuss contribu vely enc burage f s succes Laborat	s well prested in and expowhat you ance you sion attento who couraged fair and ssful	the subjectations the subject of the	learly d tanding earned cipate	1 0 2 10 10	0 0 1 8	0 0 0 2	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	3 3 3 2	11 11 11 1	4.79 4.79 4.79 3.00	849/1 298/1 336/1 1149/1 554/1	493 486 489 277	4.73 4.55 4.52 3.60 4.29 4.25	4.72 4.33 4.35 3.82 3.94 4.00	4.73 4.32 4.32 4.03 4.17 4.35	4.70 4.32 4.34 4.11	4.79 4.79 4.79 3.00 4.40 4.60
m intere resented ibute to ques enh Discuss contribu vely enc burage for succes	ested in and expo what you ance you sion the to who couraged fair and ssful	the subjectations the subject of the	learly d tanding earned cipate	1 0 2 10 10	0 0 1 8	0 0 0 2	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	3 3 3 2	11 11 11 1	4.79 4.79 4.79 3.00	849/1 298/1 336/1 1149/1 554/1	493 486 489 277	4.73 4.55 4.52 3.60 4.29 4.25	4.72 4.33 4.35 3.82 3.94 4.00	4.73 4.32 4.32 4.03 4.17 4.35	4.70 4.32 4.34 4.11	4.79 4.79 4.79 3.00 4.40 4.60
resented ibute to ques enh Discuss contribu vely enc burage f s succes Laborat	d and exponent your ance you sion the to who couraged fair and seful cory	plained control pour learned ur unders that you learned to partic	learly d tanding earned cipate	1 0 2 10 10 11	0 1 8	0 0 2 2	0 0 0	0 0 0	3 3 2	11 11 1 3	4.79 4.79 3.00	298/1 336/1 1149/1 554/1	486 489 277 279	4.55 4.52 3.60 4.29 4.25	4.33 4.35 3.82 3.94 4.00	4.32 4.32 4.03 4.17 4.35	4.32 4.34 4.11	4.79 4.79 3.00 4.40 4.60
ibute to ques enh Discuss contribu vely enc curage f s succes Laborat	o what you mance you sion ute to wh couraged fair and ssful	ou learnedur underschat you le to partic	d tanding earned cipate	0 2 10 10 11	1 8 0 0	0 2	0 0	0 0	3 2	11 1	4.79 3.00 4.40	336/1 1149/1 554/1	489 277 279	4.52 3.60 4.29 4.25	4.35 3.82 3.94 4.00	4.32 4.03 4.17 4.35	4.34 4.11 4.20	4.79 3.00 4.40 4.60
ibute to ques enh Discuss contribu vely enc curage f s succes Laborat	o what you mance you sion ute to wh couraged fair and ssful	ou learnedur underschat you le to partic	d tanding earned cipate	10 10 11	8 0 0 0	0 0	0 0 0	0	2	3	3.00	1149/1 554/1	277 279	3.60 4.29 4.25	3.82 3.94 4.00	4.17 4.35	4.11	3.00 4.40 4.60
Discuss contribu vely enc curage f s succes Laborat	sion ute to wh couraged Eair and ssful	hat you lo	earned cipate	10 10 11	0 0 0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	1149/1 554/1	277 279	4.29 4.25	3.94 4.00	4.17 4.35	4.20	4.40 4.60
contribu vely enc ourage f s succes Laborat	ite to who couraged Eair and ssful	to parti	cipate	10 11	0	0	0							4.25	4.00	4.35		4.60
contribu vely enc ourage f s succes Laborat	ite to who couraged Eair and ssful	to parti	cipate	10 11	0	0	0							4.25	4.00	4.35		4.60
vely encourage for succes	couraged Tair and ssful	to parti	cipate	10 11	0	0	0							4.25	4.00	4.35		4.60
ourage f s succes Laborat	air and ssful	_	_	11	0								2/0				4.42	
s succes Laborat	ssful	open dis	cussion			U		_	0	4	4.60	559/1	~ - ~					
Laborat	cory			11			0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1		4.41		4.35	4.41	
	-				2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/	878	3.40	3.53	4.05	4.09	****
lab repo	orts clea	_																
		arly spec	ified	9	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	186/	379	4.25	4.11	4.20	4.17	4.17
Seminar				0	0	0	0	_	-	0	2 14	050/	255	2 00	2 00	4 01	4 10	2 14
ing made	clear			8	0	0	0	6	1	U	3.14	270/	375	3.22	3.22	4.01	4.12	3.14
Field W																		
ou carry	out fie	eld activ	ities	12	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/	326	3.38	3.09	4.03	4.23	****
Self P		_																
ors for	all the	e student:	S	10	0	0	0	5	0	0	3.00	313/	382	3.10	3.20	4.08	4.24	3.00
			Frequ	ıency	Dist	tribu	ıtior	ı										
um. GPA		Expected	d Grades				Rea	asons	5				Тур	e			Majors	
 -0.99	0	A	3		Red	 quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	3	 0	Grad	 uate		0	Majo	 r	2
-1.99	0	В	9			-			_							3 -		
-2.99	1	С	1		Ger	neral					2	Unde:	r-gr	ad 1	.5	Non-	major	13
-3.49	3	D	0										5				J -	
-4.00	3	F	0		Ele	ectiv	res				0	####	- M	eans t	here a	re not	enoua	h
.	-	P	0															
			0		Oti	her				1	1	-cop		_ 00 20			-	
			-		0.01						-							
_	0.99 1.99 2.99 3.49	0.99 0 1.99 0 2.99 1 3.49 3	0.99 0 A 1.99 0 B 2.99 1 C 3.49 3 D 4.00 3 F	m. GPA Expected Grades 0.99 0 A 3 1.99 0 B 9 2.99 1 C 1 3.49 3 D 0 4.00 3 F 0 P 0 I 0	m. GPA Expected Grades 0.99	m. GPA Expected Grades 0.99	m. GPA Expected Grades 0.99	m. GPA Expected Grades Real Sequired for Seq	0.99	m. GPA Expected Grades Reasons 0.99	m. GPA Expected Grades Reasons 0.99	m. GPA Expected Grades Reasons 0.99	m. GPA Expected Grades Reasons 0.99	m. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Typ 0.99	m. GPA	m. GPA	m. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type 0.99	m. GPA

Title INTERM MACROECON ANALY

Questions

Instructor: CINYABUGUMA, MA

Enrollment: 32
Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 544 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Mean Mean Mean Mean

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

Frequencies

NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean

Instructor

Rank

2. Did the	e instru	ew insights,skil ctor make clear	the exp	ected goal	S	1	0	0	0	2	4 5	8	4.43	757/1 608/1	576	4.46	4.24	4.27	4.30	4.50
	_	uestions reflect					0	0	0	1				263/1			4.28		4.30	
		uations reflect				1	1	0	1	2	3			880/1			4.12		4.25	
		eadings contribu				1		0	0	3	4			616/1				4.12		4.29
		signments contri			Learned		4	0	0	0	2			151/1				4.14		4.80
		g system clearly	_	.nea		1	0	1	0	2	3			882/1			4.34		4.21	
	-	was class cance grade the overal		ning effect	iveness	1 5	0	0	0	1	4			375/1 532/1				4.64 4.10		
		Lecture	<u>.</u>																	
1. Were th	ne instri	actor's lectures		repared		2	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	920/1	488	4.64	4.59	4.47	4.47	4.46
		ctor seem intere			at.	2	0	0	0	0				445/1					4.70	
		terial presented		_		2	0	0	0	1	3			545/1					4.32	
		es contribute to		_	_	2	0	0	1	1				660/1						
		l techniques enh				2	8	1	0	0	1			692/1						
		Discuss	sion																	
1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contribu	ite to w	hat you le	arned	9	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	204/1	279	4.29	3.94	4.17	4.20	4.83
2. Were a	ll stude	nts actively end	ouraged	l to partic	ipate	9	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	636/1	270	4.25	4.00	4.35	4.42	4.50
		ctor encourage f		l open disc	ussion	9	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	644/1	269	4.41	4.16	4.35	4.41	4.50
4. Were sp	pecial to	echniques succes	sful			10	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/	878	3.40	3.53	4.05	4.09	****
5 Were re	anui remei	Laborat nts for lab repo	_	arly speci	fied	13	0	0	0	0	2	Ο	4 00	****/	379	4 25	4 11	4 20	4 17	****
J. WEIC I	equit eller	_		arry speci	LICU	13	U	U	U	O	2	O	1.00	,	313	1.23	1.11	1.20	1.17	
5. Were c	riteria :	Seminar for grading made				9	0	0	0	4	1	1	3.50	209/	375	3.22	3.22	4.01	4.12	3.50
		Field W	lork																	
5. Did com	nference	s help you carry	out fi	eld activi	ties	12	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/	326	3.38	3.09	4.03	4.23	****
		Self I																		
5. Were th	nere eno	ugh proctors for	all th	ne students		10	0	0	0	4	1	0	3.20	281/	382	3.10	3.20	4.08	4.24	3.20
					Freq	uency	Dist	tribu	ution	ı										
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades				Rea	asons	S				Тур	e			Majors	5
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	4		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	 3	0	Grad	uate		0	Majo	 or	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6															
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	С	0		Ger	nera.	1				1	Unde	r-gr	ad 1	.5	Non-	-major	13
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0															
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0		Ele	ectiv	ves				2	####	- M	leans t	here a	are not	enoug	gh
				P	0									resp	onse	s to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
				I	0		Oth	ner					7							
				?	2															

INTERM MACROECON ANALY

Title Instructor: ROSE, MORGAN

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 12

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 545

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Student Cours	e Evaluation	Questionnaire
---------------	--------------	---------------

University of Maryland

							Fre	_	ncies	5		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	u gain ne	w insights,skil	ls from	this course	0	0	0	0	2	0	10	4.67	415/1576	4.38	4.24	4.30	4.30	4.67
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	392/1576	4.46	4.28	4.27	4.28	4.67
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflect	the exp	ected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	500/1342	4.51	4.28	4.32	4.30	4.58
4. Did oth	her evalu	ations reflect	the expe	cted goals	0	4	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	511/1520	4.21	4.12	4.25	4.25	4.50
5. Did ass	signed re	adings contribu	te to wh	at you learned	0	1	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	439/1465	4.20	4.08	4.12	4.09	4.45
6. Did wri	itten ass	signments contri	bute to	what you learned	0	8	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	193/1434	4.43	4.05	4.14	4.15	4.75
7. Was the	e grading	system clearly	explain	ed	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	167/1547	4.34	4.34	4.19	4.21	4.83
8. How mar	ny times	was class cance	lled		0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1574	4.91	4.54	4.64	4.61	5.00
9. How wou	uld you g	grade the overal	l teachi	ng effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	8	4	4.33	623/1554	4.31	4.04	4.10	4.09	4.33
		Lecture																
1. Were th	he instru	ctor's lectures	well pr	epared	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	248/1488	4.64	4.59	4.47	4.47	4.91
		tor seem intere			1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82			4.72	4.73	4.70	4.82
		erial presented			1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	379/1486		4.33	4.32	4.32	
		es contribute to	_	_	1	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	,		4.35	4.32	4.34	4.64
		techniques enh	_		1	9	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1277		3.82	4.03	4.11	****
		T - 1 +																
5 Were re	amiiraman	Laborat nts for lab repo	-	rly enegified	9	0	0	0	0	2	1	4 33	128/ 379	4 25	<i>A</i> 11	4 20	4 17	4 33
J. WEIE I	equiremen	ics for lab repo	its ciea	ily specified	,	U	U	U	U	2		1.33	120/ 3/3	4.23	7.11	1.20	1.1/	1.55
Γ Μομο σο		Seminar For grading made			9	0	0	0	3	0	0	2 00	287/ 375	2 00	2 22	4 01	4 10	2 00
o. were ci	illeila i	or grading made	Clear		9	U	U	U	3	U	U	3.00	201/ 3/3	3.22	3.22	4.01	4.12	3.00
		Field W																
5. Did cor	nferences	s help you carry	out fie	ld activities	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	3.38	3.09	4.03	4.23	****
		Self P																
5. Were th	here enou	igh proctors for	all the	students	10	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	3.10	3.20	4.08	4.24	****
				Frequ	iency	/ Dist	trib	utio:	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	.
																		·
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A 1		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 9		~		,				0	77	3 - 3	0			^
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 1		Gei	nera	L				0	Under-g	raa 1	.2	Non-	major	9
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D 0								_						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1				_	ıh
				P 0								•	respons	es to b	e sign	ufican	it	
				I 0		Ot1	her					9						
				? 0														

Title QUANT MTHDS: MANAGEMENT

Instructor: PALMATEER, JASO

Enrollment: 39
Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 546 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	7	14	4.36	829/1576	4.36	4.24	4.30	4.30	4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	15	4.52	581/1576	4.52	4.28	4.27	4.28	4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	4	14	4.24	850/1342	4.24	4.28	4.32	4.30	4.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	1	3	5	13	4.22	902/1520	4.22	4.12	4.25	4.25	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	1	1	5	4	6	3.76	1095/1465	3.76	4.08	4.12	4.09	3.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	0	3	8	7	4.05	857/1434	4.05	4.05	4.14	4.15	4.05
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	6	16	4.48	559/1547	4.48	4.34	4.19	4.21	4.48
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	9	15	4.63	972/1574	4.63	4.54	4.64	4.61	4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	16	3	4.00	924/1554	4.00	4.04	4.10	4.09	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	2	19	4.67		4.67	4.59	4.47	4.47	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	6			1210/1493	4.50	4.72	4.73	4.70	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	4	17	4.54	,	4.54	4.33	4.32	4.32	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	5		4.33	,	4.33	4.35	4.32		4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	0	1	4	4	8	4.12	645/1277	4.12	3.82	4.03	4.11	4.12
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	2	0	2	0			1141/1279	3.29	3.94			3.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	1	2	0	4			4.00	4.00	4.35	4.42	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	1	4	0			1079/1269	3.63	4.16	4.35	4.41	3.63
4. Were special techniques successful	17	4	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 878	****	3.53	4.05	4.09	****
Laboratory	1.0	0	•	0	0	0	0	4 00	000/ 250	4 00	4 11	4 00	4 10	4 00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	0	8	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.00	4.11	4.20	4.17	4.00
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	5	1	0	3.17	****/ 375	****	3.22	4.01	4.12	***
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	16	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.00	3.09	4.03	4.23	3.00
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	7	0	0	3.00	313/ 382	3.00	3.20	4.08	4.24	3.00
Frequ	ıency	Dist	cribu	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	asons	\$			Туј	pe			Majors	;
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 10			nnire	 -d f	or Ma	ior	 s	 1	Graduat		0	Majo	 r	4
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 1 B 13		2000		- S - L	J_ 110	- ,	_	_	22 4444	-	-	.10.)	-	-
56-83 1 2.00-2.99 1 C 1		Ger	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad 2	5	Non-	major	21
84-150 16 3.00-3.49 6 D 0									5-	_			3	
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 7 F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				0	#### - 1					ıh
P 0		O+1					^	1	response	es to b	e sign	ııııcan	1T	
3 0 I 0		Oth	ner				2	1						

Title FUND FINANCIAL MGMT

Instructor: LAMDIN, DOUGLAS

Enrollment:

72 Questionnaires: 45

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 547 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level 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 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 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1 1 1 1 1 2 1 1 1	0 0 0 3 8 8 0 1	1 1 1 0 0 1 0	0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0	4 4 3 3 8 6 5 0 2	10 8 9 8 9 10 5 20	29 31 31 30 18 18 34 23	4.50 4.55 4.57 4.66 4.22 4.26 4.66 4.53 4.29	637/1576 555/1576 521/1342 348/1520 678/1465 682/1434 351/1547 1056/1574 672/1554	4.50 4.55 4.57 4.66 4.22 4.26 4.66 4.53 4.29	4.24 4.28 4.28 4.12 4.08 4.05 4.34 4.54 4.04	4.30 4.27 4.32 4.25 4.12 4.14 4.19 4.64 4.10	4.21 4.61	4.50 4.55 4.57 4.66 4.22 4.26 4.66 4.53 4.29
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 2 2 2 5	0 0 0 2 6	1 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 1 0	1 1 3 1 5	6 3 7 7 5		4.72 4.88 4.70 4.71 4.56	568/1488 607/1493 422/1486 448/1489 283/1277	4.72 4.88 4.70 4.71 4.56	4.59 4.72 4.33 4.35 3.82	4.47 4.73 4.32 4.32 4.03	4.34 4.11 4.20	4.72 4.88 4.70 4.71 4.56
 Were all students actively encouraged to participate Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion Were special techniques successful 	28 28 28	0 0 5	1 1 0	0 0 1	3 4 3	5 3 2	8 9 6	4.12 4.12 4.08	897/1270 900/1269 449/ 878	4.12 4.12 4.08	4.00 4.16 3.53	4.35 4.35 4.05		4.12 4.12 4.08
Laboratory 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified Seminar 5. Were criteria for grading made clear	40 39	0	0	0	0	5	0		****/ 379 ****/ 375			4.20	4.17	****
Field Work 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	36	0	0	0	9	0	0		****/ 326		3.09		4.23	***
Self Paced 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	37	0	0	0	7	1	0	3.13	****/ 382	****	3.20	4.08	4.24	****
Frequ	.ency	Dist	ribu											
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	sons	5 			Туј	pe 			Majors	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 18 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 15		Rec	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	S	0	Graduate	е	0	Majo	r	2
56-83 7 2.00-2.99 4 C 3 84-150 13 3.00-3.49 12 D 0		Ger	neral	_				0	Under-g	rad 4	:5	Non-	major	43
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 6 F 0 P 0 I 0 ? 0		Ele Oth	ectiv ner	res				0 7	#### - I respons				_	h

Title ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Instructor: GINDLING, THOMA

Enrollment: 39 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 548 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Student Course Evaluation Questionna	aire
--------------------------------------	------

Frequencies

Instructor

		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	. — — — — -															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	w insights,skil	.ls from	n this course	0	0	0	1	2	6	19	4.54	595/1576	4.54	4.24	4.30	4.30	4.54
2. Did th	e instruc	tor make clear	the exp	pected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	18	4.54	568/1576	4.54	4.28	4.27	4.28	4.54
		estions reflect			0	0	0	0	2	7	19	4.61	480/1342	4.61	4.28	4.32	4.30	4.61
4. Did ot	her evalu	ations reflect	the exp	pected goals	0	3	0	0	7	5	13	4.24	880/1520	4.24	4.12	4.25	4.25	4.24
				what you learned	0	0	1	1	5	4	17	4.25	647/1465	4.25	4.08	4.12	4.09	4.25
				what you learned	0	1	1	1	0	9	16	4.41	524/1434	4.41	4.05	4.14	4.15	4.41
7. Was th	e grading	system clearly	explai	ined	1	0	0	0	3	5	19	4.59	422/1547	4.59	4.34	4.19	4.21	4.59
8. How ma	ny times	was class cance	elled		1	0	0	0	0	2	25	4.93	375/1574	4.93	4.54	4.64	4.61	4.93
9. How wo	ould you g	rade the overal	l teach	ning effectiveness	5	0	0	0	4	12	7	4.13	838/1554	4.13	4.04	4.10	4.09	4.13
		Lecture	2															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lectures	well r	prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.59	4.47	4.47	5.00
		tor seem intere	_	_	3	0	0	0	1	2	22	4.84				4.73	4.70	4.84
				cplained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	4		4.76			4.33		4.32	
		s contribute to			4	0	0	0	2	1		4.79			4.35		4.34	
				our understanding	5	16	0	1	2	1			829/1277					
													,					
1 5433		3	17	0	0	0	0	4	_	4 07	C 4 0 / 1 0 7 0	4 07	2 04	4 1 7	4 00	4 07		
	Did class discussions contribute to what you lear Were all students actively encouraged to particip						0	0	2	4		4.27		4.27		4.17	4.20	4.27
					18 18	0	0	1	0	1			559/1270	4.60	4.00	4.35	4.42	4.60
	oid the instructor encourage fair and open discuss Were special techniques successful					0 9	0	1	0	2			644/1269	4.50 ****	4.16	4.35	4.41	4.50 ****
4. were s	special te	cimiques succes	SSIUI		18	9	U	U	U	U	Τ	5.00	****/ 878		3.53	4.05	4.09	
		Laborat																
5. Were r	requiremen	ts for lab repo	orts cle	early specified	23	0	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	****/ 379	****	4.11	4.20	4.17	****
		Seminar	-															
5. Were c	riteria f	or grading made	e clear		23	0	0	0	5	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	3.22	4.01	4.12	****
		Field W	Jork															
5. Did co	nferences			ield activities	25	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 326	****	3.09	4.03	4.23	****
		Self E	baced															
5. Were t	here enou	gh proctors for		ne students	20	0	0	0	6	2	0	3.25	269/ 382	3.25	3.20	4.08	4.24	3.25
				Fire 2 are					_									
				Frequ	lency	DIS	LIID	ucioi	.1									
Credits E	Carned	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	S			Тур	pe			Majors	;		
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 12						 guire	ed fo	or M	 ajor	 s	1	Graduate	 e	0	Majo	 or	12
28-55										J						5		
56-83							nera:	1				6	Under-gr	rad 2	28	Non-	-major	16
84-150													5-				3	-
Grad.								ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enous	ıh
	-	P 0									response				_	•		
				I O		Otl	ner				1	7			5-			
				? 0														

Course-Section: ECON 405 0101

Title BENEFIT-COST EVALUATIO

FARROW, ROBERT

Instructor:

Enrollment: 41 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 549 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level 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 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	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 3	1 0 0 0 1 2 3	0 2 1 1 6 0 3	7 7 4 6 4 6 5	7 5 7 6 5 7	6 7 9 8 5 5	3.81 4.14 4.00 3.33 3.61 3.19	1325/1576 1292/1576 912/1342 1041/1520 1317/1465 1167/1434 1424/1547	3.81 4.14 4.00 3.33 3.61 3.19	4.24 4.28 4.28 4.12 4.08 4.05 4.34	4.30 4.27 4.32 4.25 4.12 4.14 4.19	4.46 4.35 4.46 4.38 4.22 4.30 4.24	3.81 3.81 4.14 4.00 3.33 3.61 3.19
8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0 5	0	0	0 1	0 8	3 5	18 2		567/1574 1303/1554	4.86 3.50	4.54	4.64 4.10	4.69 4.24	4.86 3.50
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	2 3 2 2 2	0 0 0 0 4	0 0 0 0	1 0 1 0 1	2 2 7 5 5	5 5 4 6 5		4.50 3.89 4.16	1025/1488 1210/1493 1200/1486 1027/1489 1006/1277	4.37 4.50 3.89 4.16 3.53	4.59 4.72 4.33 4.35 3.82	4.47 4.73 4.32 4.32 4.03	4.55 4.80 4.41 4.38 4.04	4.37 4.50 3.89 4.16 3.53
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	13 13 13 13	0 0 0 2	0 0 0 3	2 0 0 2	2 1 0 0	3 3 5 1	4 3	4.38 4.38	1115/1279 756/1270 747/1269 874/ 878	3.38 4.38 4.38 1.83	3.94 4.00 4.16 3.53	4.17 4.35 4.35 4.05	4.31 4.53 4.55 4.33	4.38 4.38
Laboratory 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	7	1	4.13	200/ 379	4.13	4.11	4.20	4.19	4.13
Seminar 5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	9	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.00	3.22	4.01	3.90	3.00
Field Work 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	9	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.00	3.09	4.03	3.97	3.00
Self Paced 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	10	0	0	3.00	313/ 382	3.00	3.20	4.08	3.88	3.00
Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	asons				Туј	pe 			Majors	
00-27 2 0.00-0.99 1 A 8 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 6 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 1 C 3			quir nera		or Ma	jor		2 4	Graduate Under-g		3	Majo Non-	or major	7 14
84-150 5 3.00-3.49 5 D 0 Grad. 3 3.50-4.00 5 F 0 P 0 I 0 ? 1			ecti her	ves				0	#### - I respons				_	h

Course-Section: ECON 408 0101

MANAGERIAL ECONOMICS

Title Instructor: DASGUPTA, NANDI

Enrollment: 46 Questionnaires: 16

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2009

Page 550 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

	Questions General d you gain new insights, skills from this cour d the instructor make clear the expected goal				NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did you	u qain new		_	this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	637/1576	4.50	4.24	4.30	4.46	4.50
					0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	279/1576	4.75	4.28	4.27	4.35	4.75
3. Did the	e exam que	stions reflect	t the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	455/1342	4.63	4.28	4.32	4.46	4.63
4. Did oth	her evaluat	tions reflect	the exp	ected goals	1	1	1	1	0	5	7	4.14	961/1520	4.14	4.12	4.25	4.38	4.14
5. Did ass	signed read	dings contrib	ite to w	hat you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	328/1465	4.56	4.08	4.12	4.22	4.56
6. Did wri	itten assi	gnments contri	ibute to	what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	524/1434	4.40	4.05	4.14	4.30	4.40
7. Was the	e grading s	system clearly	y explai:	ned	0	0	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	527/1547	4.50	4.34	4.19	4.24	4.50
8. How mar	ny times wa	as class cance	elled		1	0	0	0	1	9	5	4.27	1317/1574	4.27	4.54	4.64	4.69	4.27
9. How wor	uld you gra	ade the overa	ll teach	ing effectiveness	7	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	742/1554	4.22	4.04	4.10	4.24	4.22
		Lecture	e															
1. Were th	he instruct	tor's lectures	s well p	repared	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	309/1488	4.87	4.59	4.47	4.55	4.87
		or seem inter			1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	390/1493	4.93	4.72	4.73	4.80	4.93
				plained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	271/1486	4.80	4.33	4.32	4.41	4.80
	. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned . Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi				1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	309/1489	4.80	4.35	4.32	4.38	4.80
5. Did aud						6	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	533/1277	4.25	3.82	4.03	4.04	4.25
	Discussion Did class discussions contribute to what you learn																	
1 Did cla	Did class discussions contribute to what you learn						0	0	0	1	2	4 67	****/1279	****	3.94	4.17	4.31	****
	Did class discussions contribute to what you learne. Were all students actively encouraged to participat					0	0	0	0	1	2		****/1270		4.00	4.35	4.53	****
	Were all students actively encouraged to participat				13 13	0	0	0	0	1	2		****/1269		4.16	4.35	4.55	****
	Were all students actively encouraged to participat Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussi Were special techniques successful			open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 878		3.53	4.05	4.33	****
I. More of	200141 000	.mrques succe	32242			Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	_	_	1.07	, 0,0		3.33	1.05	1.55	
E Moro ro	ogui romont	Laborat	-	arly specified	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4 50	****/ 379	****	A 11	4.20	4.19	****
5. Were is	equirements	s for tab repo	orts cre	arry specified	14	U	U	U	U	T	Τ	4.50	/ 3/9		4.11	4.20	4.19	
		Semina	<u>c</u>															
5. Were cr	riteria fo	r grading made	e clear		13	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 375	****	3.22	4.01	3.90	****
		Field W	Work															
5. Did cor	nferences l	nelp you carr	y out fi	eld activities	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	3.09	4.03	3.97	***
		Self 1	Daged															
5. Were th	here enougl	n proctors for		e students	9	0	0	0	6	1	0	3.14	297/ 382	3.14	3.20	4.08	3.88	3.14
				Frequ	onas	. Diat	- wib:	ı+i or										
	rrequ	iency	DIS	LIDU	10101	1												
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad								Rea	asons				Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 1 A 8					Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	5 5	1	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	1
28-55	28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 3			В 3														
56-83					Ger	neral	_				2	Under-g	rad 1	6	Non-	major	15	
84-150																		
Grad.						Ele	ectiv	res				0	#### - 1				_	h
	P 0												respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Oth	ner				1	0						
				? 2														

Course-Section: ECON 410 0101
Title TOPICS IN FIN ECON

TOPICS IN FIN ECON Baltimore County CARPENTER, ROBE Spring 2009

Instructor: CARPEN Enrollment: 40

Enrollment: 40
Questionnaires: 25

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Page 551 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questions	1	NR	NA	Fre 1	quen 2	cie:	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		_		Level Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course		0	0	0	0	1	6	18	4.68	401/1576	4.68	4.24	4.30	4.46	4.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals		0	0	0	1	1	7	16	4.52	581/1576	4.52	4.28	4.27	4.35	4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals		0	0	0	1	1	3	20	4.68	393/1342	4.68	4.28	4.32	4.46	4.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals			15	1	0	1	0	8	4.40	683/1520		4.12	4.25	4.38	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned		0	4	0	1	5	4	11	4.19	708/1465		4.08	4.12	4.22	4.19
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you lear	rned		18	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	878/1434		4.05	4.14	4.30	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled		1	0	0	0	2	4 16	18 6	4.67	339/1547 1411/1574		4.34	4.19 4.64	4.24 4.69	4.67 4.12
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectives	ness	5	1	0	0	1	5		4.12					4.24	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared		0	0	0	0	0	4	21	4.84	339/1488	4.84	4.59	4.47	4.55	4.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject		0	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	445/1493		4.72	4.73	4.80	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clear	ly	0	0	0	0	2	4	19	4.68	453/1486		4.33	4.32	4.41	4.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned		0	0	0	0	0	4	21	4.84			4.35	4.32	4.38	4.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand:	ing	1	0	1	0	1	6	16	4.50	309/1277	4.50	3.82	4.03	4.04	4.50
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	ed 1	13	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	335/1279	4.67	3.94	4.17	4.31	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participat		13	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	574/1270	4.58	4.00	4.35	4.53	4.58
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discuss:		13	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	444/1269	4.75	4.16	4.35	4.55	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful		13	8	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 878	****	3.53	4.05	4.33	***
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background informat			0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 240		****	1.00	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	a 1	17	1	0	0	0	7	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.00	4.11	4.20	4.19	4.00
Seminar 5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	18	1	0	0	6	0	0	3 00	****/ 375	****	3 22	4.01	3 90	***
	١	T.O	1	U	U	0	U	U	3.00	/ 3/3		3.22	4.01	3.90	
Field Work			•					_					4 40	4 = 0	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned		24	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 52 ****/ 48	****	****	4.48	4.70	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities		24 18	0 1	0	0	6	0	0		****/ 326	****	3.09	4.40	4.30 3.97	****
	ا م	10	_	U	U	U	U	U	3.00	/ 320		3.00	4.03	3.91	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned		24	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 40	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	_	19	1	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	****/ 382	****	3.20	4.08	3.88	***
1	Frequer	псу	Dist	ribu	tion										
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra	ades				Rea	son	S			Туј	pe			Majors	
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 1 A 11			Req	uire	d fo	r Ma	ajor	 s	1	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	6
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 11 56-83 4 2.00-2.99 3 C 1			Gen	eral					3	Under-g	rad 2	5	Non-	major	19
84-150 8 3.00-3.49 5 D 0														-	
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 6 F 0 P 0			Ele	ctiv	es				1	#### - 1 respons				_	n
I 0			Oth	er				1	8			3			
? 0															

Title ECON OF ANTITRUST & RE

Instructor: CARROLL, KATHLE

Enrollment: 33
Questionnaires: 12

Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 552 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies

Instructor

University of Maryland

		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	w insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	1	0	0	1	3	0	7	4.18	1027/1576	4.18	4.24	4.30	4.46	4.18
		tor make clear			1	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	811/1576	4.36	4.28	4.27	4.35	4.36
		estions reflect			2	0	0	1	3	3			1110/1342				4.46	3.80
		ations reflect			1	1	0	3	2	1			1330/1520	3.60				3.60
				what you learned	2	0	1	2		1			1138/1465	3.70			4.22	
				o what you learned	1	3	0	1	2	2			1021/1434				4.30	
		system clearly		ined	2	0	0	0	0	3			303/1547				4.24	
	-	was class cance		1. i	1	0	0	0 1	0	0		5.00	1/1574					
9. How wo	ula you g	rade the overa.	II teac	hing effectiveness	3	U	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	860/1554	4.11	4.04	4.10	4.24	4.11
		Lecture	е															
		ctor's lectures			1	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	708/1488	4.64	4.59	4.47	4.55	4.64
		tor seem inter		_	2	0	0	0	1	1			1017/1493	4.70		4.73	4.80	4.70
				xplained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	1			1003/1486	4.20	4.33	4.32	4.41	4.20
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand						0	1	_	1			813/1489	4.40			4.38	
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques enl	nance y	our understanding	3	7	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1277	****	3.82	4.03	4.04	****
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	802/1279	4.00	3.94	4.17	4.31	4.00
				d to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	412/1270	4.75			4.53	
					8	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	444/1269	4.75	4.16	4.35	4.55	4.75
4. Were s	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discuss. Were special techniques successful					1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	164/ 878	4.67	3.53	4.05	4.33	4.67
		Labora	torv															
5. Were r	equiremen		_	early specified	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	***	4.11	4.20	4.19	****
		Semina																
5. Were c	riteria f	or grading made			11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	3.22	4.01	3.90	****
1 3	-	Field N				•	•		_	_	•					4 00		
5. Did co	nferences	help you carry	y out f	ield activities	10	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 326	****	3.09	4.03	3.97	****
		Self 1	Paced															
5. Were t	here enou	gh proctors for	r all t	he students	9	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	313/ 382	3.00	3.20	4.08	3.88	3.00
				Frequ	ency	/ Dist	ribu	ution	ı									
	,					_					_							
Credits E	arned 	Expected Grades				Rea	sons	; 			Ty]	oe 			Majors	; 		
00-27							quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s	1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 2														
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 2		Ger	neral	L				4	Under-g	rad 1	.2	Non-	major	8
84-150																		
Grad.							ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - 1				_	jh
	P 0												respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				I 0		Otł	ner					5						
				? 1														

INTRO TO ECONOMETRICS

Title

Instructor: YUAN, CHUNMING

Enrollment: 43 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 553 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		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	3	1	6	14	4	3.54	1434/1576	3.54	4.24	4.30	4.46	3.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	6	9	8		1341/1576	3.68	4.28	4.27	4.35	3.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	6	2	8	11		1119/1342	3.79	4.28	4.32	4.46	3.79
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	1	2	3	9	5		1256/1520	3.75	4.12	4.25	4.38	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	2	3	2	8	6		1201/1465	3.62	4.08	4.12	4.22	3.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	3	0	4	7	3		1257/1434	3.41	4.05	4.14	4.30	3.41
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	7	4	15	4.11	971/1547	4.11	4.34	4.19	4.24	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	0	0	3	23	4.88	508/1574	4.88	4.54	4.64	4.69	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	4	1	6	13	0	3.17	1415/1554	3.17	4.04	4.10	4.24	3.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	1	5	4	14	4.04	1224/1488	4.04	4.59	4.47	4.55	4.04
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	2	7	16		1270/1493	4.42	4.72	4.73	4.80	4.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	4	1	7	8	6	3.42	1355/1486	3.42	4.33	4.32	4.41	3.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	4	2	1	8	11	3.77	1251/1489	3.77	4.35	4.32	4.38	3.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	16	3	2	5	1	0	2.36	1250/1277	2.36	3.82	4.03	4.04	2.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	4	0	2	2	3	3.00	1186/1279	3.00	3.94	4.17	4.31	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	3	2	4	2	0	2.45	1251/1270	2.45	4.00	4.35	4.53	2.45
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	5	2	1	2	1	2.27	1254/1269	2.27	4.16	4.35	4.55	2.27
4. Were special techniques successful	17	9	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 878	***	3.53	4.05	4.33	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.28	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.45	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.70	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.56	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	2	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 379	****	4.11	4.20	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.77	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.64	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.52	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	1	0	0	4	1	2	3.71	201/ 375	3.71	3.22	4.01	3.90	3.71
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	1	0	0	1	0		****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.70	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.30	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.34	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	1	0	0	5	1	0	3.17	****/ 326	****	3.09	4.03	3.97	****
Self Paced		_			_	_	_							
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 24	***	****	4.83	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 35	***	***	4.67	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	1	0	0	7	2	0	3.22	276/ 382	3.22	3.20	4.08	3.88	3.22

Title INTRO TO ECONOMETRICS

Instructor: YUAN, CHUNMING

Enrollment: 43
Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 553 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	8	General	4	Under-grad	28	Non-major	22
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	10	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	19	_			
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 444 0101

Title HIST OF ECON THOUGHT I

Instructor: BRADLEY, MICHAE

Enrollment: 28
Questionnaires: 15

ADLEY, MICHAE Spring 2009

P

I

0

0

Page 554 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

	Questions						Fre	equer	ncies			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	ı dəin ne	General w insights,skil		n this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	697/1576	4.47	4.24	4.30	4.46	4.47
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	668/1576	4.47	4.24	4.27	4.35	4.47
		lestions reflect			0	6	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	857/1342	4.22	4.28	4.32	4.46	4.22
		uations reflect			0	1	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	429/1520	4.57	4.12	4.25	4.38	4.57
				what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	5	8	4.33	571/1465	4.33	4.08	4.12	4.22	4.33
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	209/1434	4.73	4.05	4.14	4.30	4.73
		g system clearly			0	0	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	900/1547	4.20	4.34	4.19	4.24	4.20
		was class cance		Lifed	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	702/1574	4.79	4.54	4.64		4.79
	-			ning effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	289/1554	4.64	4.04	4.10	4.24	
J. 110W WOO	ara you s	grade the overal	.i ceaci	iiig effectiveness	-	U	U	U	U	-	,	1.01	209/1334	1.01	1.01	4.10	1.21	1.01
		Lecture	:															
1. Were th	he instru	actor's lectures	well p	prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	736/1488	4.62	4.59	4.47	4.55	4.62
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor seem intere	sted in	n the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	445/1493	4.92	4.72	4.73	4.80	4.92
3. Was led	cture mat	terial presented	l and ex	xplained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	642/1486	4.54	4.33	4.32	4.41	4.54
4. Did the	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand					0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	364/1489	4.77	4.35	4.32	4.38	4.77
5. Did aud	. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand:						0	0	0	1	3	4.75	159/1277	4.75	3.82	4.03	4.04	4.75
	- Discussion																	
1 Did al-	Discussion . Did class discussions contribute to what you learne				5	0	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	771/1279	4.10	3.94	4.17	4.31	4.10
				d to participate	5	0	0	1	3	1	5	4.00	928/1270	4.00	4.00	4.35	4.53	4.00
				d open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	644/1269	4.50	4.16	4.35	4.55	4.50
		echniques succes		open discussion	5	5	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	400/878	4.20	3.53	4.05	4.33	4.20
i. Were br	peciai ce	sciniiques succes	stut		J	J	U	U	2	U	J	1.20	400/ 0/0	4.20	3.33	1.05	1.33	1.20
		Seminar																
5. Were cr	riteria 1	for grading made	clear		13	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	3.22	4.01	3.90	****
		Field W	lork															
5. Did cor	nferences	s help you carry	out fi	ield activities	13	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	***	3.09	4.03	3.97	***
		~ 16 -																
5 Ware th	here enoi	Self F agh proctors for		ne students	12	0	0	0	3	0	Λ	3 00	****/ 382	****	3 20	4.08	3.88	****
J. WEIE CI	nere enoc	agii proceors roi	aii ti	ie scudelics	12	U	U	U	J	U	U	3.00	/ 302		3.20	1.00	3.00	
	Frequ	iency	Dist	tribu	ution	ı												
Credits Ea	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade							Rea	asons				Туј	pe			Majors	
	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 5														^			1.0
	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 5 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 7					кес	4urre	eu ro	or Ma	.jor	Þ	0	Graduat	=	0	Majo)T	12
						Cor	neral	1				4	Under-g	rad 1	.5	Non	-major	3
	56-83 4 2.00-2.99 1 C 1 84-150 2 3.00-3.49 3 D 0					Gel	пста	L				7	onder-g.	Lau I		INOI1-	iiia jul	3
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		₽1∠	ectiv	700				0	#### - I	Meane +	here =	re not	enous	rh
Grau.	U	3.30-4.00	4	r o		11.1	L I I	<i>(</i> C D				U	#### - I	·icaiib t	cr c	T C 1100	. erroug	11

Other

Course-Section: ECON 451 0101 University of Mary
Title LABOR ECONOMICS Baltimore Count
Instructor: GOLDFARB, MARSH Spring 2009

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 18

24

University of Maryland Page 555
Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009
Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

Ctudont	Conrac	Production	Ouestionnaire
bludent	COULSE	Evaluation	Ouescionnaire

		Question	5		NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did you	u gain new	insights, ski		this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	485/1576	4.61	4.24	4.30	4.46	4.61
-	_	or make clear			0	0	0	0	2	5		4.50	608/1576		4.28	4.27		4.50
		stions reflect			0	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	531/1342	4.56	4.28	4.32	4.46	4.56
4. Did otl	her evalua	tions reflect	the expe	ected goals	0	6	1	0	1	4	6	4.17	945/1520	4.17	4.12	4.25	4.38	4.17
5. Did as	signed rea	dings contrib	ite to wl	nat you learned	0	1	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	353/1465	4.53	4.08	4.12	4.22	4.53
6. Did wr	itten assi	gnments contri	ibute to	what you learned	0	9	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	878/1434	4.00	4.05	4.14	4.30	4.00
7. Was the	e grading	system clearly	y explair	ned	0	0	0	2	1	4	11	4.33	755/1547	4.33	4.34	4.19	4.24	4.33
		as class cance			0	0	0	0		11	4	4.06	1441/1574	4.06	4.54	4.64	4.69	4.06
9. How wor	uld you gr	ade the overa	ll teach:	ing effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	8	7	4.47	449/1554	4.47	4.04	4.10	4.24	4.47
		Lecture	9															
1. Were th	he instruc	tor's lectures	s well p	repared	2	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	505/1488	4.75	4.59	4.47	4.55	4.75
2. Did the	e instruct	or seem inter	ested in	the subject	2	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	1029/1493	4.69	4.72	4.73	4.80	4.69
3. Was led	cture mate	rial presented	d and exp	plained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	530/1486	4.63	4.33	4.32	4.41	4.63
4. Did the	e lectures	contribute to	o what yo	ou learned	2	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	625/1489	4.56	4.35	4.32	4.38	4.56
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques enl	nance you	ur understanding	4	6	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	692/1277	4.00	3.82	4.03	4.04	4.00
1. Did cla	Discussion Did class discussions contribute to what you learn Work all students actively engaged to portions						0	0	1	3	1	4.00	802/1279	4.00	3.94	4.17	4.31	4.00
2. Were a	. Were all students actively encouraged to participat					0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1116/1270	3.60	4.00	4.35	4.53	3.60
3. Did the	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussi				13	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	852/1269	4.20	4.16	4.35	4.55	4.20
4. Were sp	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion. Were special techniques successful				13	3	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 878	****	3.53	4.05	4.33	****
		Labora	cory															
5. Were re	equirement		-	arly specified	10	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	115/ 379	4.38	4.11	4.20	4.19	4.38
		Semina	r															
5. Were c	riteria fo	r grading made	e clear		8	0	0	0	9	1	0	3.10	282/ 375	3.10	3.22	4.01	3.90	3.10
		Field V	Nork															
5. Did co	nferences			eld activities	13	0	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	193/ 326	3.40	3.09	4.03	3.97	3.40
		Self	Daged															
5. Were tl	here enoug	h proctors for		e students	11	0	0	0	5	1	1	3.43	231/ 382	3.43	3.20	4.08	3.88	3.43
								utior	,									
	rrequ	terrey	DISC		101	1												
Credits Ea	Expected Grades				Rea	sons	; 			Ту]	pe 			Majors	:			
00-27						Rec	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s	2	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	10
28-55																		
56-83						Ger	neral	L				1	Under-g	rad 1	8	Non-	-major	8
84-150																		
Grad.						Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - 1				_	ŗh
	P 0										_		respons	es to b	e sign	ıfican	ıt	
				I 0		Oth	ner				1	4						
		? 1																

Title HOUSEHOLD ECONOMICS

Instructor: LORD, WILLIAM

Enrollment: 40

Spring 2009 Questionnaires: 26 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 556 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

	Questions			Fre	equei 2	ncie:	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	General														
1. Did you gain new	w insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	2	7	7	7	3.60	1410/1576	3.60	4.24	4.30	4.46	3.60
2. Did the instruct	tor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	5	8	9	3.92	1217/1576	3.92	4.28	4.27	4.35	3.92
3. Did the exam que	estions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	4	5	5	11	3.92	1048/1342	3.92	4.28	4.32	4.46	3.92
4. Did other evalua	ations reflect the expected goals	1	14	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	998/1520	4.09	4.12	4.25	4.38	4.09
5. Did assigned rea	adings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	4	2	7	9	3.83	1051/1465	3.83	4.08	4.12	4.22	3.83
6. Did written ass	ignments contribute to what you learned	1	16	0	2	0	3	4	4.00	878/1434	4.00	4.05	4.14	4.30	4.00
7. Was the grading	system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	2	19	4.56	457/1547	4.56	4.34	4.19	4.24	4.56
8. How many times	was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	12	12	4.50	1079/1574	4.50	4.54	4.64	4.69	4.50
9. How would you g	rade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	1	7	8	2	3.47	1317/1554	3.47	4.04	4.10	4.24	3.47
	Lecture														
1. Were the instru	ctor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	5	17	4.56	798/1488	4.56	4.59	4.47	4.55	4.56
2. Did the instruct	tor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4	20	4.76	888/1493	4.76	4.72	4.73	4.80	4.76
3. Was lecture mate	erial presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	5	5	13	4.16	1025/1486	4.16	4.33	4.32	4.41	4.16
4. Did the lectures	s contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	4	8	10	3.96	1147/1489	3.96	4.35	4.32	4.38	3.96
5. Did audiovisual	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandir				0	4	3	9	4.12	645/1277	4.12	3.82	4.03	4.04	4.12
	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding														
	Discussion														
1. Did class discus	ssions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	3	3	2	7	3.69	993/1279	3.69	3.94	4.17	4.31	3.69
2. Were all student	ts actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	2	6	7	4.19	860/1270	4.19	4.00	4.35	4.53	4.19
3. Did the instruct	tor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	2	2	3	9	4.19	858/1269	4.19	4.16	4.35	4.55	4.19
4. Were special te	chniques successful	10	10	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	****/ 878	****	3.53	4.05	4.33	****
	Laboratory														
5. Were requirement	ts for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	193/ 379	4.14	4.11	4.20	4.19	4.14
	Seminar														
5. Were criteria fo	or grading made clear	19	0	0	0	7	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.00	3.22	4.01	3.90	3.00
	Field Work														
5. Did conferences	help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	4	2	0	3.33	****/ 326	****	3.09	4.03	3.97	****
	Self Paced														
5. Were there enough	gh proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	4	1	1	3.50	****/ 382	****	3.20	4.08	3.88	****
	From			,											
	Frequ	ıency	DIS	trib	utioi	n									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA Expected Grades				P.C.	ason	-			Ty	ne			Majors	
Credits Failled	Expected Grades				Rea	asull	5			1У.	ρe			ma jors	•

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Credits E	edits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad			d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	6	General	4	Under-grad	26	Non-major	20
84-150	10	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	15	_			
				?	1						

Title THEORY OF PUBLIC FINAN

Instructor: COATES, DENNIS

Enrollment: 38
Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 557 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
G1														
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	637/1576	4.50	4.24	4.30	4.46	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	476/1576	4.60	4.24	4.27	4.35	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	369/1342	4.70	4.28	4.32	4.46	4.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	4	5	8	4.11	985/1520	4.11	4.12	4.25	4.38	4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	6	4	7	3.94	933/1465	3.94	4.08	4.12	4.22	3.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	6	3	7		1172/1434	3.60	4.05	4.14	4.30	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	2	16	4.65	351/1547	4.65	4.34	4.19	4.24	4.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	15	3		1441/1574		4.54	4.64	4.69	4.05
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	436/1554		4.04	4.10	4.24	4.47
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	610/1488	4.71	4.59	4.47	4.55	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	607/1493	4.88	4.72	4.73	4.80	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	654/1486	4.53	4.33	4.32	4.41	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	364/1489	4.76	4.35	4.32	4.38	4.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	13	0	0	2	1	1		****/1277	****	3.82	4.03	4.04	****
1														
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/1279	****	3.94	4.17	4.31	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	****/1270	****	4.00	4.35	4.53	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	****/1269	****	4.16	4.35	4.55	****
4. Were special techniques successful	16	2	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 878	****	3.53	4.05	4.33	****
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	9	1	4.10	208/ 379	4.10	4.11	4.20	4.19	4.10
Seminar					_	•	•					4 = 0	4	
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.77	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79 ****/ 72	****	****	4.69	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0				0	0	3.00	,	****	****	4.64	4.64	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1 10	0	0	3.00	****/ 80 287/ 375	3.00		4.61	4.52	3.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	U	U	U	10	U	U	3.00	281/ 3/5	3.00	3.22	4.01	3.90	3.00
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	6	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.00	3.09	4.03	3.97	3.00
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	7	3	0	3.30	257/ 382	3.30	3.20	4.08	3.88	3.30
Freq	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	2	Under-grad	20	Non-major	13
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	15	=			
				2	1						

Course-Section: ECON 467 0101

Title HEALTH ECONOMICS

Instructor: MA, BING
Enrollment: 65
Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 558 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eane	ncie	3		Inst	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	2	0	0	1	4	5	20	4.47	697/1576	4.47	4.24	4.30	4.46	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	4	4	22	4.60	476/1576	4.60	4.28	4.27	4.35	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	2	26	4.71	357/1342	4.71	4.28	4.32	4.46	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	9	1	2	1	5	13	4.23	891/1520	4.23	4.12	4.25	4.38	4.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	1	6	9	11	4.00	850/1465	4.00	4.08	4.12	4.22	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	12	0	2	2	5	10	4.21	727/1434	4.21	4.05	4.14	4.30	4.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	3	6	21	4.60	411/1547	4.60	4.34	4.19	4.24	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	1	4	24	4.70	866/1574	4.70	4.54	4.64	4.69	4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	2	0	0	1	13	5	4.21	752/1554	4.21	4.04	4.10	4.24	4.21
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	6	23	4.73	547/1488	4.73	4.59	4.47	4.55	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	3	5	22	4.63	1089/1493	4.63	4.72	4.73	4.80	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	5	23	4.76	339/1486	4.76	4.33	4.32	4.41	4.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	4	23	4.72	420/1489	4.72	4.35	4.32	4.38	4.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	15	2	2	1	3	4	3.42	1061/1277	3.42	3.82	4.03	4.04	3.42
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	488/1279	4.47	3.94	4.17	4.31	4.47
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	798/1270	4.31	4.00	4.35	4.53	4.31
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	728/1269	4.40	4.16	4.35	4.55	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	17	6	0	1	2	4	2	3.78	620/ 878	3.78	3.53	4.05	4.33	3.78
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	30	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 234	***	****	4.23	4.28	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.45	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.70	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	30	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.56	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	0	0	0	0	7	3	4.30	139/ 379	4.30	4.11	4.20	4.19	4.30
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	***	****	4.72	4.77	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.64	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.52	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	9	1	1	3.27	242/ 375	3.27	3.22	4.01	3.90	3.27
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.70	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	***	****	4.40	4.30	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.34	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	1	0	0	13	2	1	3.25	213/ 326	3.25	3.09	4.03	3.97	3.25
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	9	0	2	3.36	243/ 382	3.36	3.20	4.08	3.88	3.36

Course-Section: ECON 467 0101
Title HEALTH ECONOMICS

Instructor: MA, BING

Enrollment: 65
Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 558 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	15	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	5	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	32	Non-major	25
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	20	-			
				?	1						

Title MONEY & CAPITAL MARKET

Instructor: CARPENTER, ROBE

Emailment: 27

Enrollment: 37
Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 559 JUL 2, 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	0	0	1	1	3	6	6	3.88	1257/1576	3.88	4.24	4.30	4.46	3.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	7	6	4.00	1138/1576	4.00	4.28	4.27	4.35	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	3	10	4.18	892/1342	4.18	4.28	4.32	4.46	4.18
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1520	****	4.12	4.25	4.38	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	5	4	5	4.00	850/1465	4.00	4.08	4.12	4.22	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	15	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1434	****	4.05	4.14	4.30	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	2	3	9	4.00	1041/1547	4.00	4.34	4.19	4.24	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	14	2	4.06	1441/1574	4.06	4.54	4.64	4.69	4.06
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	2	1	6	2	3.73	1187/1554	3.73	4.04	4.10	4.24	3.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	2	12	4.56	798/1488	4.56	4.59	4.47	4.55	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	908/1493	4.75	4.72	4.73	4.80	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	951/1486	4.27	4.33	4.32	4.41	4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	1	4	8	4.00	1118/1489	4.00	4.35	4.32	4.38	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	3	1	1	5	5	3.53	1006/1277	3.53	3.82	4.03	4.04	3.53
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	445/1279	4.50	3.94	4.17	4.31	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	784/1270	4.33	4.00	4.35	4.53	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	773/1269	4.33	4.16	4.35	4.55	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	11	4	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 878	***	3.53	4.05	4.33	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.28	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.45	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.70	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.56	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 379	***	4.11	4.20	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.77	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.64	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.52	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 375	***	3.22	4.01	3.90	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.70	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.30	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.34	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	5	0	1	3.33	200/ 326	3.33	3.09	4.03	3.97	3.33
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	1	0	0	4	1	2	3.71	199/ 382	3.71	3.20	4.08	3.88	3.71

Title MONEY & CAPITAL MARKET

Instructor:

CARPENTER, ROBE

Enrollment: 37 Questionnaires: 17 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 559 JUL 2, 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	5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	17	Non-major	16
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11	-		_	
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 475 0101

Title FINANCIAL INVSTMNT ANA

Instructor: LAMDIN, DOUGLAS

Enrollment: 40

40

Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 560 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	1	8	10	4.35	840/1576		4.24	4.30	4.46	4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	8	11	4.45	698/1576	4.45	4.28	4.27	4.35	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	531/1342	4.55	4.28	4.32	4.46	4.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	8	9	4.53	487/1520	4.53	4.12	4.25	4.38	4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	7 9	9	4.56	328/1465		4.08	4.12	4.22	4.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2 0	1	0	1	-	8	4.21	727/1434	4.21	4.05	4.14	4.30	4.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	0	0	4 13	17 6	4.81	186/1547 1279/1574	4.81 4.32	4.34 4.54	4.19 4.64	4.24	4.81 4.32
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	2	13 5	7	4.32	597/1554		4.54		4.69	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	,	U	U	U	۷	5	,	4.30	597/1554	4.30	4.04	4.10	4.24	4.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	278/1488	4.89	4.59	4.47	4.55	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	334/1493	4.94	4.72	4.73	4.80	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	468/1486	4.67	4.33	4.32	4.41	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	5	12	4.56	637/1489	4.56	4.35	4.32	4.38	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	1	0	1	5	8	4.27	524/1277	4.27	3.82	4.03	4.04	4.27
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	641/1279	4.29	3.94	4.17	4.31	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	716/1270	4.43	4.00	4.35	4.53	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	803/1269	4.29	4.16	4.35	4.55	4.29
4. Were special techniques successful	14	5	0	0	0	2	0		****/ 878	****	3.53	4.05	4.33	****
Laboratory		•		_	•		_					4 05		
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	1	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/ 379	* * * *	4.11	4.20	4.19	^ ^ ^ ^
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.77	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	1	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 375	****	3.22	4.01	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.70	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.30	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.34	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	2	1	1		****/ 326	****	3.09	4.03	3.97	***
0.15 5 1														
Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	2 00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 24	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 35	****	****	4.83	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20 14	1	0	0	3	3	0	3.50	219/ 382	3.50	3.20	4.67	3.88	3.50
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	Т	U	U	3	3	U	3.50	Z13/ 38Z	3.30	3.40	4.00	3.00	3.50

Course-Section: ECON 475 0101

Title FINANCIAL INVSTMNT ANA

Instructor: LAMDIN, DOUGLAS

Enrollment: 40
Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 560 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	2	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14	_			
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 476 0101

Title PORTFOLIO MANAGEMENT

Instructor: YUAN, CHUNMING

Enrollment: 42

Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 561 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

		Frequencies				Tnst	ructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect		
Ouestions	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	3	6	3	11	3.96	1194/1576	3.96	4.24	4.30	4.46	3.96
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	5	7	8	3.87	1259/1576	3.87	4.28	4.27	4.35	3.87
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	7	12	4.35	761/1342	4.35	4.28	4.32	4.46	4.35
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	3	8	10	4.23	891/1520	4.23	4.12	4.25	4.38	4.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	2	4	6	8	4.00	850/1465	4.00	4.08	4.12	4.22	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	2	8	8	4.33	594/1434	4.33	4.05	4.14	4.30	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	6	13	4.30	784/1547	4.30	4.34	4.19	4.24	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	235/1574	4.95	4.54	4.64	4.69	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	3	4	4	4	3.60	1267/1554	3.60	4.04	4.10	4.24	3.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	2	5	12	4.40	995/1488	4.40	4.59	4.47	4.55	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	0	1	18	4.80	810/1493	4.80	4.72	4.73	4.80	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	4	2	6	7	3.70	1273/1486	3.70	4.33	4.32	4.41	3.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	2	3	5	7	3.55	1305/1489	3.55	4.35	4.32	4.38	3.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	12	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	506/1277	4.29	3.82	4.03	4.04	4.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	1	2	1	4	3.67	1000/1279	3.67	3.94	4.17	4.31	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	2	2	1	4	3.78	1045/1270	3.78	4.00	4.35	4.53	3.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	928/1269	4.00	4.16	4.35	4.55	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	15	5	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 878	****	3.53	4.05	4.33	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.45	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.70	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.56	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	1	0	0	0	7	1	4.13	200/ 379	4.13	4.11	4.20	4.19	4.13
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.77	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	1	0	0	8	2	0	3.20	254/ 375	3.20	3.22	4.01	3.90	3.20
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.70	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.30	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.34	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	1	0	0	5	2	0	3.29	207/ 326	3.29	3.09	4.03	3.97	3.29
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 40	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	1	0	0	5	0	1	3.33	250/ 382	3.33	3.20	4.08	3.88	3.33

Course-Section: ECON 476 0101

Title PORTFOLIO MANAGEMENT

Instructor: YUAN, CHUNMING

Enrollment: 42
Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 561 JUL 2, 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	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	В	12						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General		Under-grad	23	Non-major	21
84-150	14	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	า
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13	_			
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 478 0101

Title REAL ESTATE ECON AND F

Instructor: GETTER, DARYL

Enrollment: 27
Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 562 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questions			F 1	_	encies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
oid you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	1	1	2	13	4.59	527/1576	4.59	4.24	4.30	4.46	4.59
oid the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	2	3	11	4.41	743/1576	4.41	4.28	4.27	4.35	4.41
oid the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1		2	4		4.29		4.29	4.28	4.32	4.46	4.29
oid other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	1		2	2	9		1041/1520	4.00		4.25	4.38	4.00
oid assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	8	1			2	5	4.11		4.11	4.08	4.12	4.22	4.11
oid written assignments contribute to what you learne		7	1	_	0	2			836/1434	4.10	4.05	4.14	4.30	4.10
Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	-	1	7	9	4.47		4.47	4.34	4.19	4.24	4.47
. How many times was class cancelled . How would you grade the overall teaching effectivenes			0	-	0 1	5 4	12 7	4.71	851/1574		4.54		4.69	4.71
now would you grade the overall teaching effectivenes	s 7	0	U	U	Τ	4	/	4.50	395/1554	4.50	4.04	4.10	4.24	4.50
Lecture	_	0	0	0	0	2	10	1 06	204/1400	1.06	4 50	4 47	4 55	4 06
Were the instructor's lectures well prepared Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5 5	0	0	-	0	2	12 14	4.86	324/1488 1/1493	4.86 5.00	4.59 4.72	4.47	4.55 4.80	4.86 5.00
Tas lecture material presented and explained clearly	5 5	0	0		1	1		4.79	298/1486	4.79	4.72	4.73 4.32	4.80	
. Was recture material presented and explained clearly . Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					1	0	12	4.57	614/1489	4.57	4.35	4.32	4.38	4.57
old audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5 5	0 4	1		1	1	7	4.40	404/1277	4.40		4.03	4.04	
-	3	-	Ū	_	_	_	,	1.10	101/12//	1.10	3.02	1.05	1.01	1.10
Discussion														
oid class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	-	1	1		4.50	445/1279	4.50		4.17		
Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	_	1	0	4	4.17	871/1270	4.17	4.00	4.35	4.53	4.17
oid the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0 1		1 1	1		4.50	. ,	4.50	4.16	4.35	4.55	4.50 ****
Were special techniques successful	13	2	1	U	Τ	U	2	3.50	****/ 878	****	3.53	4.05	4.33	^ ^ ^
Laboratory Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	8	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.00	4.11	4.20	4.19	4.00
									,					
Seminar	12	0	0	0	7	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	2 00	2 22	4 01	2 00	2 00
Were criteria for grading made clear	12	U	U	U	/	U	U	3.00	287/ 375	3.00	3.22	4.01	3.90	3.00
Field Work	1-	0	0	0	4	•	0	2 00	**** / 206	ate ate ate ate	2 00	4 00	2 0 17	ale ale ale ale
oid conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	4	0	U	3.00	****/ 326	^^^	3.09	4.03	3.97	****
Self Paced	11	0	0	0	_	_	0	2 50	010 / 200	2 50	2 00	4 00	2 00	2 50
Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	6	0	2	3.50	219/ 382	3.50	3.20	4.08	3.88	3.50
Fre	quency	7 Dis	stri	buti	on									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades			Reasons Ty				pe			Majors				
27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 7		 Re		red	for Ma	jor	s	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r or	2
55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 5		100												
· ·			- qu-											
84-150 10 3.00-3.49 5 D 0			_					4	Under-g	rad 1	L9	Non-	-major	17
		Ge	ener	al				_					-	
d. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0		Ge	ener					4 0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	
		Ge E	ener	al ives				_		Means t	here a	are not	enoug	

Course-Section	: ECON 493 0501	University of Maryland	Page
Title	INDIV RESEARCH IN ECON	Baltimore County	JUL 2,

563 2009

Instructor: CARROLL, KATHLE Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	1	
Questionnaires:	1	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies			Instructor		Course Dept		t 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	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.24	4.30	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.28	4.27	4.35	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.12	4.25	4.38	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.08	4.12	4.22	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.05	4.14	4.30	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.34	4.19	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled			0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.54	4.64	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness			0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.04	4.10	4.24	5.00

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General		Under-grad	Non-major	1	
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0	110001.05		responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: ECON 600 0101

Title POLICY CONSQ: ECON ANAL

BRENNAN, TIMOTH

Instructor:

Enrollment: 13 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 564 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies

Instructor

	riequencies				TIIS	LIUCLOI	Course	: Dept	UMPC	телет	Sect							
	Questions					NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 Did vo	u gain ne	General w insights,skil		m this source	0	0	1	2	2	1	6	3 75	1345/1576	3.75	4 24	4.30	4 43	3.75
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	6			851/1576		4.28		4.32	
		estions reflect			0	0	0	1	2	7			1097/1342				4.38	
	_	ations reflect		_	0	2	0	0	3	3			994/1520				4.36	
				what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	3			1043/1465			4.12		3.83
				o what you learned	0	4	0	1	2	2			1021/1434		4.05		4.35	
		system clearly			0	0	0	2	0	5			985/1547				4.24	
		was class cance	_	inea	0	0	0	0	0	-			606/1574				4.75	
				hing effectiveness	4	0	0	1	2	4			1253/1554					
		Lecture	<u> </u>															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lectures	well	prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	568/1488	4.73	4.59	4.47	4.52	4.73
		tor seem intere			1	0	0	0	0	1			557/1493					4.91
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly					0	0	1	2	4			1101/1486				4.37	
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	1	0	2	2			1070/1489				4.38	
				our understanding	0	9	0	0	1	1			692/1277					
		1000											77-7					
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ssions contribu	ite to	what you learned	1	0	2	0	2	3	4	3.64	1011/1279	3.64	3.94	4.17	4.34	3.64
				d to participate	1	0	0	1	1	2			763/1270		4.00			4.36
		-	_	d open discussion	1	0	0	1	1	2					4.16	4.35		4.36
		chniques succes			2	8	0	0	1	0			****/ 878			4.05		****
•	-	-																
		Laborat	ory															
5. Were r	equirement	ts for lab repo	rts cl	early specified	9	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.00	4.11	4.20	4.37	4.00
	-	-																
		Seminar	•															
5. Were c	riteria fo	or grading made	clear		8	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	209/ 375	3.50	3.22	4.01	4.10	3.50
		3 3																
		Field W	lork															
5. Did co	nferences	help you carry	out f	ield activities	9	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.00	3.09	4.03	4.10	3.00
		Self F	aced															
5. Were t	here enoug	gh proctors for	all t	he students	7	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	208/ 382	3.60	3.20	4.08	4.13	3.60
	ancie chough proceeds for all the seadenes , o o o s i i																	
				Frequ	ency	Dist	cribu	ıtior	1									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	sons				Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A 4		Red	quire	uired for Majors 0 Graduate 8 Major					0					
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 6														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	neral	_		1 Under-grad 4 Non-mag			-major	12				
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0														
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00	6	F 0		Ele	ectiv	res		0 #### - Means there are not en				enoug	h			
				P 0				responses to be significant				ıt						
				I 0		Oth	ner				1	0						
? 2																		

Title MACROECONOMIC ANALYSIS

Instructor: CINYABUGUMA, MA

Enrollment: 11 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 565 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions			Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank		e Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	187/157	6 4.88	4.24	4.30	4.43	4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	939/157	6 4.25	4.28	4.27	4.32	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	735/134	2 4.38	4.28	4.32	4.38	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	3	3	3.88	1185/152	0 3.88	4.12	4.25	4.36	3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	778/146	5 4.13	4.08	4.12	4.25	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	1	1			1063/143		4.05	4.14	4.35	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	0	0	4			1182/154		4.34	4.19	4.24	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	_	4.67	911/157			4.64	4.75	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	772/155	4 4.20	4.04	4.10	4.18	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	666/148	8 4.67	4.59	4.47	4.52	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	1053/149	3 4.67	4.72	4.73	4.80	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	678/148	6 4.50	4.33	4.32	4.37	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	888/148	9 4.33	4.35	4.32	4.38	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1149/127	7 3.00	3.82	4.03	4.08	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/127	9 ****	3.94	4.17	4.34	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/127		4.00	4.35	4.53	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/126	9 ****	4.16	4.35	4.55	****
Laboratory 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 37	9 ****	1 11	4 20	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports crearry specified	,	U	U	U	U	1	U	4.00	/ 3/	9	4.11	4.20	4.37	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 8	5 ****	****	4.72	4.79	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 7	9 ****	****	4.69	4.77	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 7		****	4.64	4.70	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 8		****	4.61	4.70	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	223/ 37	5 3.40	3.22	4.01	4.10	3.40
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	251/ 32	6 3.00	3.09	4.03	4.10	3.00
Self Paced	_	0	0	0	1	1	0	2 50	010 / 20	0 2 50	2 00	4 00	4 12	2 50
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	1	1	U	3.50	219/ 38	2 3.50	3.20	4.08	4.13	3.50
Freq	uency	, Dist	trib	ution	ı									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	sons				Т	ype 			Majors	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 5		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	3	0	Gradua	te	3	Majo	or	1
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 2												-		
				0	Under-	grad	5	Non-	-major	7				
84-150 3 3.00-3.49 2 D 0 Grad. 3 3.50-4.00 4 F 0		. רקו	~a+ -					0		Moone	thoma -		. ono	·h
Grad. 3 3.50-4.00 4 F 0		₽T6				_	11							
I 0		∩+1	responses to be significant her 7		10									
1 0		ULI	TET					1						

Course-Section: ECON 612 0101 Title ECONOMETRICS II Instructor:

Questions

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland Page 566 Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009 VIAUROUX, CHRIS Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029 15

Frequencies

NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean

Instructor

Rank

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Mean Mean Mean Mean

		General	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain n	ew insights,skil	lls fro	m this course	0	0	1	0	3	2	5	3.91	1241/1576	3.91	4.24	4.30	4.43	3.92
2. Did th	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	1	0	0	2	4	2	2	3.40	1438/1576	3.40	4.28	4.27	4.32	3.40
3. Did th	e exam q	questions reflect	t the e	xpected goals	0	0	1	3	3	2	2	3.09	1287/1342	3.09	4.28	4.32	4.38	3.0
		uations reflect				1	1	2	1	3	3	3.50	1362/1520	3.50	4.12	4.25	4.36	3.5
. Did as	signed r	eadings contribu	ute to	what you learned	0	5							1439/1465					
. Did wr	itten as	signments contri	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	2	0	1	3	5	3.82	1057/1434	3.82	4.05	4.14	4.35	3.8
		g system clearly											1259/1547					
		was class cance											469/1574					
				hing effectiveness		0							1448/1554					
		Lecture	e.															
. Were t	he instr	uctor's lectures		prepared	1	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	1072/1488	4.30	4.59	4.47	4.52	4.3
					1								810/1493		4.72			
. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject . Was lecture material presented and explained clearly													1458/1486					
. Was recture material presented and explained clearly . Did the lectures contribute to what you learned													1392/1489					
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandir													1086/1277					
. Did au	our understanding	1	/	U	Т	1	U	Τ	3.33	1086/12//	3.33	3.82	4.03	4.08	3.3			
D441		Discuss		- Jan 1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4 22	602/1070	4 22	2 04	4 1 7	4 24	4
				what you learned		0							603/1279					
		-	_	d to participate									928/1270		4.00			
				d open discussion									535/1269					
. Were s	pecial t	echniques succes	sstul		8	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 878	****	3.53	4.05	4.11	***
		Laborat	-															
. Were r	equireme	ents for lab repo	orts cl	early specified	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 379	****	4.11	4.20	4.37	***
		Semina	r															
. Were c	riteria	for grading made	e clear		9	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	3.22	4.01	4.10	***
		Field W	Work															
. Did co	nference	s help you carry	y out f	ield activities	8	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.00	3.09	4.03	4.10	3.0
		Self I																
. Were t	here eno	ough proctors for	r all t	he students	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.20	4.08	4.13	***
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Тур	e			Majors	}
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	 A 4									 Graduate			Majo		 0
			-			ke	4uir	ea I	or Ma	ıjor	5	U	Graduate	:	2	мајс	ıτ	U
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 2.00-2.99	0	B 4		~ -		1				0	TTm cl		0	37		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1		Gei	nera.	Т				0	Under-gr	rad	9	Non-	major	ΤŢ
84-150 2 3.00-3.49 2 D 0											_							
Grad. 2 3.50-4.00 5 F 0				Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### - M				_	ıh		
				P 0									response	es to b	oe sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	ner					9						
				? 0														

Course-Section: ECON 652 0101 University of Maryland Title ECONOMICS OF HEALTH

Instructor:

MA, BING

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 567

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	5		-
Questionnaires:	2	Student Course	Evaluation Questionnaire

							Frequencies		Inst	tructor	Course Dept		pt UMBC Level		Sect			
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1 Did vo	u gain ne	General w insights,skil		this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	Λ	3 50	1445/1576	3.50	4.24	4.30	4.43	3.50
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	608/1576	4.50	4.28	4.27	4.32	4.50
		estions reflect	_		0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00		4.00	4.28	4.32	4.38	4.00
		ations reflect			0	0	0	0	0	2	n		1041/1520	4.00	4.12	4.25	4.36	4.00
	d assigned readings contribute to what you learned					0	1	0	0	1	0		1448/1465	2.50	4.08	4.12	4.25	2.50
	id written assignments contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	1	1		398/1434	4.50	4.05	4.14	4.35	4.50
	Was the grading system clearly explained						0	0	1	0	1		1041/1547	4.00	4.34	4.19	4.24	4.00
	. How many times was class cancelled						0	0	0	1	1		1079/1574	4.50	4.54	4.64	4.75	4.50
	9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness						0	0	2	0	0		1448/1554	3.00		4.10	4.18	3.00
J. 110.11 110	. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness						Ü	Ü	_	Ü	Ü	3.00	1110, 1001	3.00	1.01	1.10	1.10	3.00
		Lecture	2															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lectures	well r	repared	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	870/1488	4.50	4.59	4.47	4.52	4.50
	. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1210/1493	4.50	4.72	4.73	4.80	4.50
3. Was le	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly						0	0	0	1	1	4.50	678/1486	4.50	4.33	4.32	4.37	4.50
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute to	what y	ou learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	696/1489	4.50	4.35	4.32	4.38	4.50
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques enl	nance yo	our understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	5.00	3.82	4.03	4.08	5.00
		Discuss																
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contribu	ite to v	hat you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	802/1279	4.00	3.94	4.17	4.34	4.00
				l to participate	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1261/1270	2.00	4.00	4.35	4.53	2.00
		_		l open discussion	1	0	0	1	0	0	0		1259/1269	2.00	4.16	4.35	4.55	2.00
4. Were s	pecial te	chniques succes	sful		1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	877/ 878	1.00	3.53	4.05	4.11	1.00
				Frequ	ency	r Dist	tribu	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Туј	pe			Majors	
00-27		0.00-0.99													0			
28-55	0 1	1.00-1.99	0 0	A 1 B 1		Rec	quire	ea r	or Ma	Jors	3	0	Graduat	3	0	Majo	or.	0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gor	neral	ı				0	Under-g	rad	2	Non	major	2
84-150	0	3.00-2.99	0	D 0		Gel	лета.	L				U	onder-g.	Lau	4	NOII-	ma joi	4
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	Б 0 F 0		r14	antia	700				0	#### _ 1	Meane t	here a	re not	enoud	h
Grau.	rad. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there P 0 responses to be significantly $P = 0$						_	11										
				I O		Otł	ner					2	T Capolla	-6 LO L	c sign	ıııcaı.		
				5 0		OCI	.101					4						
				. 0														

Course-Section: ECON 701 1301 University of Maryland
Title INDIVIDUAL STUDY IN EC Baltimore County
Instructor: MITCH, DAVID F Spring 2009

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 1

1

University of Maryland Page 568
Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009
Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

							Frequencies				Instructor		Course Dept		t UMBC Level		Sect	
	Questions			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
		 Genera	1															
1 Did vo	on gain n	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.24	4.30	4.43	5.00
	2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals				0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.28	4.27	4.32	5.00
		uestions reflec		_	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.28	4.32	4.38	5.00
	_	uations reflect		_	0	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1520	5.00	4.12	4.25	4.36	5.00
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1465	5.00	4.08	4.12	4.25	5.00
	_	-		o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.05	4.14	4.35	5.00
		g system clearl		-	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.34	4.19	4.24	5.00
	_	was class cand			0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.54	4.64	4.75	5.00
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll tead	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.04	4.10	4.18	5.00
		Lectur	_															
1 Were t	the instr	uctor's lecture		prepared	Λ	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.59	4.47	4.52	5.00
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.72	4.73	4.80	5.00
				explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1486	5.00	4.33	4.32	4.37	5.00
		es contribute t			0	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1489	5.00	4.35	4.32	4.38	5.00
				our understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1277			4.03	4.08	5.00
		- ·																
1 543		Discus			^	0	0	^	0	0	1	F 00	1 /1070	F 00	2 04	4 1 7	4 24	F 00
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1279	5.00	3.94	4.17	4.34	5.00
		_	_	d to participate d open discussion	0	0 0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1270 1/1269	5.00 5.00	4.00 4.16	4.35	4.53	5.00
		ctor encourage echniques succe		a open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	5.00	3.53		4.55	5.00
4. were s	special t	ecnniques succe	SSIUI		U	U	U	U	U	U	Τ	5.00	1/ 8/8	5.00	3.53	4.05	4.11	5.00
				Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 1 B 0		Red	quire	ea io	or Ma	ajors	3	0	Graduat	8	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0			a		1				1	TTrades		1	Mari		1
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera	L				1	Under-g	rad	1	non-	-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0 1	D 0 F 0		m1.	ectiv					0			.b			-lo
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	Τ	P 0		上上	=CL1	/es				U	#### - 1				_	ÌII
				I 0		O+1	hor					0	respons	es co L	e sign	ıııcaı	ıL	
				Ι 0		Other						U						

Course-Section: ECON 801 1901 University of Maryland Title INDIVIDUAL STUDY IN EC Baltimore County Instructor:

Spring 2009 YUAN, CHUNMING

Enrollment: 1

		-		
Questi	onn	aires:	1	

Page 569 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

	Questionnair	

			Fre	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	1	0	4.00	1148/1576	4.00	4.24	4.30	4.43	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1523/1576	3.00	4.28	4.27	4.32	3.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1294/1342	3.00	4.28	4.32	4.38	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1041/1520	4.00	4.12	4.25	4.36	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.08	4.12	4.25	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	878/1434	4.00	4.05	4.14	4.35	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.34	4.19	4.24	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1459/1574	4.00	4.54	4.64	4.75	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1448/1554	3.00	4.04	4.10	4.18	3.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1233/1488	4.00	4.59	4.47	4.52	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1490/1493	3.00	4.72	4.73	4.80	3.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1101/1486	4.00	4.33	4.32	4.37	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1118/1489	4.00	4.35	4.32	4.38	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	692/1277	4.00	3.82	4.03	4.08	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1279	5.00	3.94	4.17	4.34	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate			0	0	0	1	0	4.00	928/1270	4.00	4.00	4.35	4.53	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion			0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.16	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	464/ 878	4.00	3.53	4.05	4.11	4.00	

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