

Course-Section: ECON 101 01  
 Title Prin Of Microeconomics  
 Instructor: Mutter,Ryan  
 Enrollment: 42  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 453  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	6	21	4.68	397/1447	3.98	4.17	4.31	4.18	4.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	24	4.79	217/1447	3.98	4.17	4.27	4.30	4.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	22	4.71	323/1241	3.94	4.17	4.33	4.25	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	3	3	17	4.61	380/1402	3.75	4.09	4.24	4.15	4.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	9	2	13	3.85	952/1358	3.77	3.97	4.11	4.03	3.85
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	0	4	4	10	4.33	549/1316	3.71	4.03	4.14	3.99	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	3	21	4.57	373/1427	4.03	4.31	4.19	4.24	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	27	4.96	194/1447	4.45	4.61	4.69	4.68	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	12	8	4.40	454/1434	3.76	3.92	4.10	4.10	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	27	4.96	80/1387	4.38	4.46	4.46	4.46	4.96
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	27	4.96	211/1387	4.57	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	23	4.79	278/1386	4.09	4.15	4.32	4.32	4.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	24	4.86	216/1380	4.06	4.22	4.32	4.31	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	14	2	1	0	1	7	3.91	759/1193	3.83	3.76	4.02	3.99	3.91
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	580/1172	3.60	3.71	4.15	3.95	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	691/1182	3.93	3.98	4.35	4.18	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	648/1170	4.01	4.16	4.38	4.17	4.42
4. Were special techniques successful	16	8	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/ 800	3.38	4.05	4.06	3.95	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required for Majors 8	Graduate 0	Major 2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 8			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C 4	General 10	Under-grad 28	Non-major 26
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Electives 6	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 4			

Course-Section: ECON 101 01  
 Title Prin Of Microecon-Hono  
 Instructor: Carroll,Kathlee  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 454  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	998/1447	3.98	4.17	4.31	4.18	4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	5	1	3.56	1304/1447	3.98	4.17	4.27	4.30	3.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	2	3.89	1002/1241	3.94	4.17	4.33	4.25	3.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	1	5	0	3.22	1337/1402	3.75	4.09	4.24	4.15	3.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	635/1358	3.77	3.97	4.11	4.03	4.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	1	5	0	3.00	1257/1316	3.71	4.03	4.14	3.99	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	811/1427	4.03	4.31	4.19	4.24	4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	1079/1447	4.45	4.61	4.69	4.68	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	0	5	0	3.67	1150/1434	3.76	3.92	4.10	4.10	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	626/1387	4.38	4.46	4.46	4.46	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	604/1387	4.57	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	1	2	3	3.63	1231/1386	4.09	4.15	4.32	4.32	3.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	1	3	2	3.38	1276/1380	4.06	4.22	4.32	4.31	3.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	420/1193	3.83	3.76	4.02	3.99	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1058/1172	3.60	3.71	4.15	3.95	3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	737/1182	3.93	3.98	4.35	4.18	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	988/1170	4.01	4.16	4.38	4.17	3.75
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 800	3.38	4.05	4.06	3.95	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ECON 101 02  
 Title Prin Of Microeconomics  
 Instructor: Thomas,Mark  
 Enrollment: 82  
 Questionnaires: 40

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 455  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	2	2	10	7	15	3.86	1190/1447	3.98	4.17	4.31	4.18	3.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	3	4	5	11	13	3.75	1228/1447	3.98	4.17	4.27	4.30	3.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	4	6	12	6	9	3.27	1184/1241	3.94	4.17	4.33	4.25	3.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	21	2	5	1	3	5	3.25	1330/1402	3.75	4.09	4.24	4.15	3.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	16	3	3	7	4	4	3.14	1274/1358	3.77	3.97	4.11	4.03	3.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	25	1	2	3	2	4	3.50	1134/1316	3.71	4.03	4.14	3.99	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	2	5	13	9	8	3.43	1281/1427	4.03	4.31	4.19	4.24	3.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	1	0	27	9	4.19	1291/1447	4.45	4.61	4.69	4.68	4.19
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	1	0	5	7	13	1	3.38	1281/1434	3.76	3.92	4.10	4.10	3.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	3	6	4	23	4.31	1000/1387	4.38	4.46	4.46	4.46	4.31
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	2	5	7	22	4.36	1218/1387	4.57	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.36
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	4	9	7	14	3.91	1119/1386	4.09	4.15	4.32	4.32	3.91
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	6	5	6	16	3.80	1153/1380	4.06	4.22	4.32	4.31	3.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	5	0	3	10	9	7	3.69	884/1193	3.83	3.76	4.02	3.99	3.69
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	28	0	1	2	2	3	4	3.58	966/1172	3.60	3.71	4.15	3.95	3.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	28	0	0	1	3	5	3	3.83	979/1182	3.93	3.98	4.35	4.18	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	28	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	648/1170	4.01	4.16	4.38	4.17	4.42
4. Were special techniques successful	28	8	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	****/ 800	3.38	4.05	4.06	3.95	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	A 10	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	B 11						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 7	General	8	Under-grad	40	Non-major	39
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	7	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	4	3	8	10	14	3.69	1280/1447	3.98	4.17	4.31	4.18	3.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	6	7	14	10	3.68	1254/1447	3.98	4.17	4.27	4.30	3.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	4	6	14	12	3.86	1015/1241	3.94	4.17	4.33	4.25	3.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	3	3	5	8	9	3.61	1227/1402	3.75	4.09	4.24	4.15	3.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	1	4	10	19	4.19	663/1358	3.77	3.97	4.11	4.03	4.19
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	17	1	3	4	8	4	3.55	1111/1316	3.71	4.03	4.14	3.99	3.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	3	4	14	15	3.97	1002/1427	4.03	4.31	4.19	4.24	3.97
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	2	0	0	1	4	31	4.83	673/1447	4.45	4.61	4.69	4.68	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	0	2	7	16	2	3.67	1150/1434	3.76	3.92	4.10	4.10	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	8	14	13	4.14	1118/1387	4.38	4.46	4.46	4.46	4.14
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	3	10	21	4.46	1173/1387	4.57	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.46
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	5	5	13	11	3.88	1137/1386	4.09	4.15	4.32	4.32	3.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	2	1	2	6	11	11	3.94	1081/1380	4.06	4.22	4.32	4.31	3.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	14	6	3	1	5	5	3.00	1087/1193	3.83	3.76	4.02	3.99	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	3	4	7	6	2	3.00	1090/1172	3.60	3.71	4.15	3.95	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	2	3	5	6	5	3.43	1100/1182	3.93	3.98	4.35	4.18	3.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	1	3	7	6	4	3.43	1094/1170	4.01	4.16	4.38	4.17	3.43
4. Were special techniques successful	18	9	2	4	2	2	2	2.83	769/ 800	3.38	4.05	4.06	3.95	2.83
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	36	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	37	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	37	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	37	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	37	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	37	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	37	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	37	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	37	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	37	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	37	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	37	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	36	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	36	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	36	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	36	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: ECON 101 03  
 Title Prin Of Microeconomics  
 Instructor: McConnell, Virgi  
 Enrollment: 81  
 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 456  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	11	General	7	Under-grad	39	Non-major	39
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	10	8	18	4.14	980/1447	3.98	4.17	4.31	4.18	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	8	8	19	4.19	920/1447	3.98	4.17	4.27	4.30	4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	8	21	4.30	750/1241	3.94	4.17	4.33	4.25	4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	15	2	1	4	3	12	4.00	976/1402	3.75	4.09	4.24	4.15	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	1	12	6	12	3.94	881/1358	3.77	3.97	4.11	4.03	3.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	19	2	1	4	1	9	3.82	956/1316	3.71	4.03	4.14	3.99	3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	4	4	9	20	4.22	823/1427	4.03	4.31	4.19	4.24	4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	3	31	2	3.92	1400/1447	4.45	4.61	4.69	4.68	3.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	2	10	8	8	3.79	1066/1434	3.76	3.92	4.10	4.10	3.79
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	6	10	21	4.41	902/1387	4.38	4.46	4.46	4.46	4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	5	7	25	4.54	1107/1387	4.57	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.54
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	8	10	17	4.14	979/1386	4.09	4.15	4.32	4.32	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	4	9	21	4.30	849/1380	4.06	4.22	4.32	4.31	4.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	19	3	1	3	3	8	3.67	895/1193	3.83	3.76	4.02	3.99	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	1	2	2	9	4.36	504/1172	3.60	3.71	4.15	3.95	4.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	0	1	2	2	9	4.36	676/1182	3.93	3.98	4.35	4.18	4.36
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	440/1170	4.01	4.16	4.38	4.17	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	23	8	0	1	2	0	3	3.83	****/ 800	3.38	4.05	4.06	3.95	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	34	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	35	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	35	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	35	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	35	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	34	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	35	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	35	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	35	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	35	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	35	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	35	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	35	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	35	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	35	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	35	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: ECON 101 04  
 Title Prin Of Microeconomics  
 Instructor: Kaikai,Alpha  
 Enrollment: 45  
 Questionnaires: 37

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 457  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	19	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	4	Under-grad	37	Non-major	37
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	7	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	1	6	10	12	3.94	1128/1447	3.98	4.17	4.31	4.18	3.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	7	8	14	4.06	1017/1447	3.98	4.17	4.27	4.30	4.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	6	19	4.32	726/1241	3.94	4.17	4.33	4.25	4.32
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	3	7	13	4.43	579/1402	3.75	4.09	4.24	4.15	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	4	8	16	4.27	599/1358	3.77	3.97	4.11	4.03	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	1	0	1	7	14	4.43	465/1316	3.71	4.03	4.14	3.99	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	8	22	4.68	274/1427	4.03	4.31	4.19	4.24	4.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	27	4.87	565/1447	4.45	4.61	4.69	4.68	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	1	4	15	6	4.00	849/1434	3.76	3.92	4.10	4.10	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	8	20	4.52	783/1387	4.38	4.46	4.46	4.46	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	1	1	5	23	4.55	1107/1387	4.57	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	7	7	16	4.19	927/1386	4.09	4.15	4.32	4.32	4.19
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	6	21	4.45	709/1380	4.06	4.22	4.32	4.31	4.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	2	2	1	9	16	4.17	555/1193	3.83	3.76	4.02	3.99	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	2	6	2	7	3.67	925/1172	3.60	3.71	4.15	3.95	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	1	4	7	7	4.05	844/1182	3.93	3.98	4.35	4.18	4.05
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	4	5	10	4.32	725/1170	4.01	4.16	4.38	4.17	4.32
4. Were special techniques successful	12	4	2	0	3	2	8	3.93	485/ 800	3.38	4.05	4.06	3.95	3.93
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	28	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	29	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	28	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	28	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	29	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	29	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	29	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****



Course-Section: ECON 101 05  
 Title Prin Of Microeconomics  
 Instructor: Viauroux,Christ  
 Enrollment: 79  
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 458  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	1	A	13	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5	C	6	General	5	Under-grad	31	Non-major	31
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	6	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	5	6	8	3.90	1159/1447	3.98	4.17	4.31	4.18	3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	6	9	4.05	1029/1447	3.98	4.17	4.27	4.30	4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	7	9	4.05	905/1241	3.94	4.17	4.33	4.25	4.05	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	2	4	5	7	3.79	1148/1402	3.75	4.09	4.24	4.15	3.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	5	4	10	4.10	746/1358	3.77	3.97	4.11	4.03	4.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	2	4	4	6	3.71	1026/1316	3.71	4.03	4.14	3.99	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	5	7	5	3.65	1206/1427	4.03	4.31	4.19	4.24	3.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	12	7	4.30	1223/1447	4.45	4.61	4.69	4.68	4.30
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	1	6	7	4	3.78	1073/1434	3.76	3.92	4.10	4.10	3.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	3	8	7	4.11	1144/1387	4.38	4.46	4.46	4.46	4.11
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	5	13	4.58	1081/1387	4.57	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	4	9	6	4.00	1047/1386	4.09	4.15	4.32	4.32	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	6	8	4	3.70	1185/1380	4.06	4.22	4.32	4.31	3.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	5	9	4	3.94	716/1193	3.83	3.76	4.02	3.99	3.94
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	559/1172	3.60	3.71	4.15	3.95	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	737/1182	3.93	3.98	4.35	4.18	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	679/1170	4.01	4.16	4.38	4.17	4.38
4. Were special techniques successful	14	2	1	1	0	2	1	3.20	****/ 800	3.38	4.05	4.06	3.95	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 65	****	****	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: ECON 101 06  
 Title Prin Of Microeconomics  
 Instructor: Coomber, William  
 Enrollment: 43  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 459  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	13	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	6	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 101 07  
 Title Prin Of Microeconomics  
 Instructor: Thomas,Mark  
 Enrollment: 42  
 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 460  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	22	0	0	0	5	7	5	4.00	1058/1447	3.98	4.17	4.31	4.18	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	23	0	0	0	4	8	4	4.00	1053/1447	3.98	4.17	4.27	4.30	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	23	0	1	0	4	9	2	3.69	1089/1241	3.94	4.17	4.33	4.25	3.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	23	2	0	3	3	5	3	3.57	1238/1402	3.75	4.09	4.24	4.15	3.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	22	4	1	3	3	5	1	3.15	1272/1358	3.77	3.97	4.11	4.03	3.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	23	7	0	1	2	5	1	3.67	****/1316	3.71	4.03	4.14	3.99	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	23	0	0	1	0	12	3	4.06	936/1427	4.03	4.31	4.19	4.24	4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	23	0	0	0	0	9	7	4.44	1132/1447	4.45	4.61	4.69	4.68	4.44
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	24	1	0	0	3	10	1	3.86	1017/1434	3.76	3.92	4.10	4.10	3.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	23	0	0	0	0	9	7	4.44	870/1387	4.38	4.46	4.46	4.46	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	23	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	1143/1387	4.57	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	24	0	0	0	0	10	5	4.33	811/1386	4.09	4.15	4.32	4.32	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	2	8	5	4.20	940/1380	4.06	4.22	4.32	4.31	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	23	1	1	0	1	5	8	4.27	470/1193	3.83	3.76	4.02	3.99	4.27
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	29	0	1	0	5	3	1	3.30	1050/1172	3.60	3.71	4.15	3.95	3.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	29	0	0	3	2	3	2	3.40	1106/1182	3.93	3.98	4.35	4.18	3.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	29	0	0	1	4	4	1	3.50	1070/1170	4.01	4.16	4.38	4.17	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	29	4	1	0	3	2	0	3.00	****/ 800	3.38	4.05	4.06	3.95	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
-----												
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors		5	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	8							
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General		4	Under-grad	39	Non-major	38
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives		0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		0				
				?	1							

Course-Section: ECON 101 08  
 Title Prin Of Microeconomics  
 Instructor: Thomas,Mark  
 Enrollment: 42  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 461  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	4	4	6	5	3.50	1339/1447	3.98	4.17	4.31	4.18	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	9	5	3.75	1228/1447	3.98	4.17	4.27	4.30	3.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	4	3	7	4	3.35	1172/1241	3.94	4.17	4.33	4.25	3.35
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	1	1	4	4	1	3.27	1324/1402	3.75	4.09	4.24	4.15	3.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	1	2	3	3	1	3.10	1282/1358	3.77	3.97	4.11	4.03	3.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	0	0	5	0	1	3.33	1200/1316	3.71	4.03	4.14	3.99	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	6	8	3	3.50	1259/1427	4.03	4.31	4.19	4.24	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	16	3	4.05	1346/1447	4.45	4.61	4.69	4.68	4.05
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	2	6	4	2	3.27	1310/1434	3.76	3.92	4.10	4.10	3.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	5	9	5	3.90	1228/1387	4.38	4.46	4.46	4.46	3.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	2	0	8	10	4.30	1241/1387	4.57	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.30
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	7	5	7	3.90	1128/1386	4.09	4.15	4.32	4.32	3.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	6	6	7	3.95	1067/1380	4.06	4.22	4.32	4.31	3.95
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	2	5	9	2	3.47	971/1193	3.83	3.76	4.02	3.99	3.47
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	1	3	1	0	2.67	1150/1172	3.60	3.71	4.15	3.95	2.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1078/1182	3.93	3.98	4.35	4.18	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	1	1	2	1	3.17	1128/1170	4.01	4.16	4.38	4.17	3.17
4. Were special techniques successful	13	5	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 800	3.38	4.05	4.06	3.95	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 10	Graduate 0	Major 2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 8			
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C 5	General 7	Under-grad 20	Non-major 18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	1	7	13	4.57	507/1447	4.11	4.17	4.31	4.18	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	5	15	4.59	436/1447	4.16	4.17	4.27	4.30	4.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	313/1241	4.18	4.17	4.33	4.25	4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	11	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	347/1402	4.25	4.09	4.24	4.15	4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	2	5	3	10	3.90	917/1358	3.93	3.97	4.11	4.03	3.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	16	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/1316	4.24	4.03	4.14	3.99	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	1	1	19	4.86	120/1427	4.36	4.31	4.19	4.24	4.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	6	11	4	3.90	1405/1447	4.46	4.61	4.69	4.68	3.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	0	0	1	7	4	4.25	634/1434	3.99	3.92	4.10	4.10	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	383/1387	4.48	4.46	4.46	4.46	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	317/1387	4.73	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	405/1386	4.21	4.15	4.32	4.32	4.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	170/1380	4.31	4.22	4.32	4.31	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	8	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	769/1193	3.83	3.76	4.02	3.99	3.89
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	818/1172	3.36	3.71	4.15	3.95	3.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	347/1182	3.65	3.98	4.35	4.18	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	576/1170	4.09	4.16	4.38	4.17	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	16	6	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 800	3.63	4.05	4.06	3.95	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: ECON 102 01  
 Title Prin Of Macroeconomics  
 Instructor: Dasgupta,Nandit  
 Enrollment: 42  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 462  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	24	Non-major	24
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	2	0	5	10	28	4.38	752/1447	4.11	4.17	4.31	4.18	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	1	1	5	9	29	4.42	648/1447	4.16	4.17	4.27	4.30	4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	1	4	9	30	4.47	587/1241	4.18	4.17	4.33	4.25	4.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	16	1	0	6	6	16	4.24	776/1402	4.25	4.09	4.24	4.15	4.24
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	4	0	2	8	11	18	4.15	700/1358	3.93	3.97	4.11	4.03	4.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	29	1	1	5	3	5	3.67	1050/1316	4.24	4.03	4.14	3.99	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	2	0	2	4	7	30	4.51	446/1427	4.36	4.31	4.19	4.24	4.51
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	1	2	15	23	3	3.57	1431/1447	4.46	4.61	4.69	4.68	3.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	1	0	7	14	15	4.14	765/1434	3.99	3.92	4.10	4.10	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	4	7	34	4.67	566/1387	4.48	4.46	4.46	4.46	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	2	6	35	4.70	934/1387	4.73	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	0	7	11	25	4.34	802/1386	4.21	4.15	4.32	4.32	4.34
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	4	4	34	4.57	593/1380	4.31	4.22	4.32	4.31	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	27	2	1	1	3	10	4.06	632/1193	3.83	3.76	4.02	3.99	4.06
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	29	0	1	0	2	8	8	4.16	643/1172	3.36	3.71	4.15	3.95	4.16
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	29	0	1	2	3	5	8	3.89	946/1182	3.65	3.98	4.35	4.18	3.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	28	0	0	0	3	6	11	4.40	657/1170	4.09	4.16	4.38	4.17	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	28	11	2	0	1	3	3	3.56	****/ 800	3.63	4.05	4.06	3.95	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	44	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	44	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	44	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	44	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	44	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	43	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	43	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	43	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	43	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 65	****	****	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	43	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	43	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	43	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	43	1	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	43	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	43	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	43	1	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	43	1	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	43	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****



Course-Section: ECON 102 02  
 Title Prin Of Macroeconomics  
 Instructor: Dasgupta,Nandit  
 Enrollment: 77  
 Questionnaires: 48

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 463  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	27	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	4	General	16	Under-grad	48	Non-major	47
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 102 03  
 Title Prin Of Macroeconomics  
 Instructor: Goldfarb,M G  
 Enrollment: 40  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 464  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	2	2	9	4.20	927/1447	4.11	4.17	4.31	4.18	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	11	4.53	500/1447	4.16	4.17	4.27	4.30	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	451/1241	4.18	4.17	4.33	4.25	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	380/1402	4.25	4.09	4.24	4.15	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	0	3	9	4.36	507/1358	3.93	3.97	4.11	4.03	4.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	10	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1316	4.24	4.03	4.14	3.99	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	1	12	4.60	337/1427	4.36	4.31	4.19	4.24	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	1060/1447	4.46	4.61	4.69	4.68	4.53
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	516/1434	3.99	3.92	4.10	4.10	4.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	460/1387	4.48	4.46	4.46	4.46	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	1	12	4.67	982/1387	4.73	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	663/1386	4.21	4.15	4.32	4.32	4.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	204/1380	4.31	4.22	4.32	4.31	4.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	10	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	652/1193	3.83	3.76	4.02	3.99	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	6	0	0	2	0	1.75	1171/1172	3.36	3.71	4.15	3.95	1.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	1060/1182	3.65	3.98	4.35	4.18	3.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	3	0	3	3.57	1043/1170	4.09	4.16	4.38	4.17	3.57

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
-----												
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors		2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3							
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General		8	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	1							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives		3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		0				
				?	2							

Course-Section: ECON 102 04  
 Title Prin Of Macroeconomics  
 Instructor: Takacs,Wendy E  
 Enrollment: 41  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 465  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	1	6	7	4	3.50	1339/1447	4.11	4.17	4.31	4.18	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	6	9	2	3.45	1336/1447	4.16	4.17	4.27	4.30	3.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	3	9	3	4	3.30	1179/1241	4.18	4.17	4.33	4.25	3.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	3	2	4	2	3.45	1275/1402	4.25	4.09	4.24	4.15	3.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	3	7	4	3	3.28	1246/1358	3.93	3.97	4.11	4.03	3.28
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	14	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	1050/1316	4.24	4.03	4.14	3.99	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	4	5	8	3.90	1077/1427	4.36	4.31	4.19	4.24	3.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	646/1447	4.46	4.61	4.69	4.68	4.84
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	2	0	7	6	0	3.13	1335/1434	3.99	3.92	4.10	4.10	3.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	5	9	4	3.84	1243/1387	4.48	4.46	4.46	4.46	3.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	1081/1387	4.73	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	2	5	9	2	3.47	1265/1386	4.21	4.15	4.32	4.32	3.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	4	4	5	4	3.39	1274/1380	4.31	4.22	4.32	4.31	3.39
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	10	1	1	4	2	1	3.11	1072/1193	3.83	3.76	4.02	3.99	3.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	3	1	0	0	1.83	1169/1172	3.36	3.71	4.15	3.95	1.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	2	1	1	1	1	2.67	1166/1182	3.65	3.98	4.35	4.18	2.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	4	0	2	3.67	1013/1170	4.09	4.16	4.38	4.17	3.67

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	10	General	5	Under-grad	21	Non-major	20
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Course-Section: ECON 102 05  
 Title Prin Of Macroeconomics  
 Instructor: Goldfarb,M G  
 Enrollment: 43  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 466  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	4	8	14	4.38	742/1447	4.11	4.17	4.31	4.18	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	5	18	4.52	521/1447	4.16	4.17	4.27	4.30	4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	8	16	4.48	564/1241	4.18	4.17	4.33	4.25	4.48
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	12	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	616/1402	4.25	4.09	4.24	4.15	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	2	1	4	2	15	4.13	727/1358	3.93	3.97	4.11	4.03	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	16	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	527/1316	4.24	4.03	4.14	3.99	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	4	3	19	4.58	373/1427	4.36	4.31	4.19	4.24	4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	0	1	7	18	4.65	968/1447	4.46	4.61	4.69	4.68	4.65
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	6	8	10	4.17	733/1434	3.99	3.92	4.10	4.10	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	4	19	4.75	429/1387	4.48	4.46	4.46	4.46	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	6	18	4.75	859/1387	4.73	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	7	16	4.63	483/1386	4.21	4.15	4.32	4.32	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	6	16	4.58	571/1380	4.31	4.22	4.32	4.31	4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	10	0	1	4	1	8	4.14	574/1193	3.83	3.76	4.02	3.99	4.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	947/1172	3.36	3.71	4.15	3.95	3.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	856/1182	3.65	3.98	4.35	4.18	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	2	0	3	3	3.88	951/1170	4.09	4.16	4.38	4.17	3.88
4. Were special techniques successful	20	4	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 800	3.63	4.05	4.06	3.95	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 1	A 11	Required for Majors 15	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 2	C 4	General 5	Under-grad 28 Non-major 27
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 1	Other 0	
			? 1		

Course-Section: ECON 102 06  
 Title Prin Of Macroeconomics  
 Instructor: Takacs,Wendy E  
 Enrollment: 40  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 467  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	4	1	7	6	6	3.38	1364/1447	4.11	4.17	4.31	4.18	3.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	5	9	3	5	3.17	1383/1447	4.16	4.17	4.27	4.30	3.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	4	6	6	4	3.08	1212/1241	4.18	4.17	4.33	4.25	3.08
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	836/1402	4.25	4.09	4.24	4.15	4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	4	5	7	4	3.32	1237/1358	3.93	3.97	4.11	4.03	3.32
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	16	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	519/1316	4.24	4.03	4.14	3.99	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	0	5	5	11	4.00	971/1427	4.36	4.31	4.19	4.24	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	1	7	15	4.61	1018/1447	4.46	4.61	4.69	4.68	4.61
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	2	2	10	4	5	3.35	1290/1434	3.99	3.92	4.10	4.10	3.35
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	4	8	9	4.00	1176/1387	4.48	4.46	4.46	4.46	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	20	4.79	799/1387	4.73	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	6	6	5	6	3.48	1265/1386	4.21	4.15	4.32	4.32	3.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	3	5	3	9	3.52	1240/1380	4.31	4.22	4.32	4.31	3.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	16	1	2	2	0	3	3.25	1041/1193	3.83	3.76	4.02	3.99	3.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	3	0	2	2	1	2.75	1138/1172	3.36	3.71	4.15	3.95	2.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	2	3	0	0	3	2.88	1149/1182	3.65	3.98	4.35	4.18	2.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	1	1	1	1	4	3.75	988/1170	4.09	4.16	4.38	4.17	3.75
4. Were special techniques successful	16	6	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 800	3.63	4.05	4.06	3.95	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A 2	Required for Majors 12	Graduate 0	Major 2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 8			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 7	General 1	Under-grad 24	Non-major 22
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D 1			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 2		
				? 4			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	11	12	4.46	654/1447	4.11	4.17	4.31	4.18	4.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	11	12	4.46	604/1447	4.16	4.17	4.27	4.30	4.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	17	4.63	427/1241	4.18	4.17	4.33	4.25	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	1	0	2	6	11	4.30	715/1402	4.25	4.09	4.24	4.15	4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	4	6	11	4.09	756/1358	3.93	3.97	4.11	4.03	4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	1	2	6	11	4.35	534/1316	4.24	4.03	4.14	3.99	4.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	5	16	4.61	337/1427	4.36	4.31	4.19	4.24	4.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	592/1447	4.46	4.61	4.69	4.68	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	11	9	4.38	478/1434	3.99	3.92	4.10	4.10	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	307/1387	4.48	4.46	4.46	4.46	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	475/1387	4.73	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	6	15	4.50	607/1386	4.21	4.15	4.32	4.32	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	8	15	4.58	571/1380	4.31	4.22	4.32	4.31	4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	4	7	10	4.29	455/1193	3.83	3.76	4.02	3.99	4.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	360/1172	3.36	3.71	4.15	3.95	4.53
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	5	5	4	3.80	996/1182	3.65	3.98	4.35	4.18	3.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	264/1170	4.09	4.16	4.38	4.17	4.87
4. Were special techniques successful	10	7	1	2	0	1	4	3.63	624/ 800	3.63	4.05	4.06	3.95	3.63
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.37	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.26	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: ECON 102 07  
 Title Prin Of Macroeconomics  
 Instructor: Falcon III,Haro  
 Enrollment: 38  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 468  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	3	Under-grad	25	Non-major	24
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	1	6	8	15	4.03	1042/1447	4.11	4.17	4.31	4.18	4.03
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	0	4	11	15	4.16	947/1447	4.16	4.17	4.27	4.30	4.16
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	6	7	17	4.19	833/1241	4.18	4.17	4.33	4.25	4.19
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	4	2	6	15	4.19	836/1402	4.25	4.09	4.24	4.15	4.19
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	5	0	3	2	8	13	4.19	663/1358	3.93	3.97	4.11	4.03	4.19
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	9	0	2	3	5	12	4.23	644/1316	4.24	4.03	4.14	3.99	4.23
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	5	4	10	11	3.81	1144/1427	4.36	4.31	4.19	4.24	3.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	2	0	2	26	4.73	868/1447	4.46	4.61	4.69	4.68	4.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	0	0	0	3	7	5	4.13	765/1434	3.99	3.92	4.10	4.10	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	4	11	12	4.21	1071/1387	4.48	4.46	4.46	4.46	4.21
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	4	7	17	4.46	1167/1387	4.73	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.46
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	5	11	11	4.14	971/1386	4.21	4.15	4.32	4.32	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	4	10	12	4.11	997/1380	4.31	4.22	4.32	4.31	4.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	8	1	2	2	3	8	3.94	726/1193	3.83	3.76	4.02	3.99	3.94
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	521/1172	3.36	3.71	4.15	3.95	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	25	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	****/1182	3.65	3.98	4.35	4.18	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	25	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	****/1170	4.09	4.16	4.38	4.17	****
4. Were special techniques successful	25	3	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/ 800	3.63	4.05	4.06	3.95	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	31	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	31	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	31	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	31	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****



Course-Section: ECON 102 08  
 Title Prin Of Macroeconomics  
 Instructor: Cinyabuguma, Mat  
 Enrollment: 44  
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 469  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	16	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	7	Under-grad	33	Non-major	33
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 121 02  
 Title Prin Of Accounting I  
 Instructor: Antlitz,Ronald  
 Enrollment: 45  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 470  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	4	5	5	4	7	3.20	1389/1447	3.89	4.17	4.31	4.18	3.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	9	6	7	3.64	1270/1447	4.04	4.17	4.27	4.30	3.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	4	6	4	7	3.33	1175/1241	3.92	4.17	4.33	4.25	3.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	2	0	7	2	5	3.50	1264/1402	3.89	4.09	4.24	4.15	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	5	8	4	6	3.48	1182/1358	4.01	3.97	4.11	4.03	3.48
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	3	2	4	4	4	3.24	1228/1316	3.85	4.03	4.14	3.99	3.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	4	6	7	7	3.60	1228/1427	4.12	4.31	4.19	4.24	3.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	436/1447	4.87	4.61	4.69	4.68	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	5	2	6	3	3.44	1265/1434	3.61	3.92	4.10	4.10	3.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	3	9	4	6	3.38	1320/1387	4.19	4.46	4.46	4.46	3.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	3	19	4.71	934/1387	4.64	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	4	3	7	4	6	3.21	1306/1386	3.81	4.15	4.32	4.32	3.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	3	6	2	9	3.48	1253/1380	3.84	4.22	4.32	4.31	3.48
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	2	1	5	5	5	3.56	943/1193	3.74	3.76	4.02	3.99	3.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	2	2	2	2	4	3.33	1042/1172	3.53	3.71	4.15	3.95	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	1	3	2	6	4.08	836/1182	4.02	3.98	4.35	4.18	4.08
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	576/1170	4.08	4.16	4.38	4.17	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	14	4	1	0	2	0	4	3.86	537/ 800	4.08	4.05	4.06	3.95	3.86

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 16	Graduate 0	Major 3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 5			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C 7	General 1	Under-grad 25	Non-major 22
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 3			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	9	10	4.27	849/1447	3.89	4.17	4.31	4.18	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	5	12	4.27	834/1447	4.04	4.17	4.27	4.30	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	13	4.45	599/1241	3.92	4.17	4.33	4.25	4.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	7	1	0	1	3	9	4.36	665/1402	3.89	4.09	4.24	4.15	4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	2	4	12	4.25	608/1358	4.01	3.97	4.11	4.03	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	1	0	3	2	8	4.14	719/1316	3.85	4.03	4.14	3.99	4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	5	15	4.55	410/1427	4.12	4.31	4.19	4.24	4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	592/1447	4.87	4.61	4.69	4.68	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	8	4	4	3.65	1162/1434	3.61	3.92	4.10	4.10	3.65
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	4	6	11	4.23	1063/1387	4.19	4.46	4.46	4.46	4.23
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	958/1387	4.64	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.68
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3	5	4	10	3.95	1087/1386	3.81	4.15	4.32	4.32	3.95
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	5	1	3	4	9	3.50	1246/1380	3.84	4.22	4.32	4.31	3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	1	0	5	1	6	3.85	791/1193	3.74	3.76	4.02	3.99	3.85
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	1	2	3	8	4.07	687/1172	3.53	3.71	4.15	3.95	4.07
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	638/1182	4.02	3.98	4.35	4.18	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	4	3	8	4.27	757/1170	4.08	4.16	4.38	4.17	4.27
4. Were special techniques successful	7	6	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	423/ 800	4.08	4.05	4.06	3.95	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: ECON 121 03  
 Title Prin Of Accounting I  
 Instructor: Davis,Alexis C.  
 Enrollment: 40  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 471  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	2	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	4	8	6	9	3.55	1324/1447	3.89	4.17	4.31	4.18	3.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	9	10	7	3.69	1254/1447	4.04	4.17	4.27	4.30	3.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	3	10	7	8	3.62	1109/1241	3.92	4.17	4.33	4.25	3.62
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	8	3	1	6	4	7	3.52	1256/1402	3.89	4.09	4.24	4.15	3.52
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	2	6	6	10	3.88	931/1358	4.01	3.97	4.11	4.03	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	1	1	11	6	4	3.48	1145/1316	3.85	4.03	4.14	3.99	3.48
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	9	8	11	3.97	1013/1427	4.12	4.31	4.19	4.24	3.97
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	6	21	4.71	901/1447	4.87	4.61	4.69	4.68	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	2	2	9	10	1	3.25	1312/1434	3.61	3.92	4.10	4.10	3.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	3	11	13	4.29	1015/1387	4.19	4.46	4.46	4.46	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	1	2	9	15	4.29	1248/1387	4.64	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	4	6	9	8	3.78	1184/1386	3.81	4.15	4.32	4.32	3.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	11	6	8	3.64	1204/1380	3.84	4.22	4.32	4.31	3.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	12	8	2	2	2	2	2.25	1172/1193	3.74	3.76	4.02	3.99	2.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	4	4	4	2	2	2.63	1154/1172	3.53	3.71	4.15	3.95	2.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	3	2	7	3	1	2.81	1151/1182	4.02	3.98	4.35	4.18	2.81
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	2	2	6	4	2	3.13	1132/1170	4.08	4.16	4.38	4.17	3.13
4. Were special techniques successful	14	13	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 800	4.08	4.05	4.06	3.95	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	26	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 65	****	****	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	28	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	28	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	28	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	28	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	28	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	28	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: ECON 121 04  
 Title Prin Of Accounting I  
 Instructor: Cole, Richard M.  
 Enrollment: 39  
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 472  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	8	General	1	Under-grad	30	Non-major	30
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	8	0	0	1	4	8	18	4.39	742/1447	3.89	4.17	4.31	4.18	4.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	9	0	0	1	4	6	19	4.43	633/1447	4.04	4.17	4.27	4.30	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	9	0	0	1	9	4	16	4.17	844/1241	3.92	4.17	4.33	4.25	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	8	10	0	0	3	7	11	4.38	635/1402	3.89	4.09	4.24	4.15	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	7	8	15	4.16	690/1358	4.01	3.97	4.11	4.03	4.16
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	11	0	0	2	7	11	4.45	455/1316	3.85	4.03	4.14	3.99	4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8	0	1	2	5	4	19	4.23	811/1427	4.12	4.31	4.19	4.24	4.23
8. How many times was class cancelled	10	0	0	0	0	1	28	4.97	194/1447	4.87	4.61	4.69	4.68	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	2	0	1	5	11	6	3.96	916/1434	3.61	3.92	4.10	4.10	3.96
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	1	0	2	1	23	4.67	566/1387	4.19	4.46	4.46	4.46	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	1	0	2	25	4.82	732/1387	4.64	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	1	2	4	6	14	4.11	997/1386	3.81	4.15	4.32	4.32	4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	2	2	4	19	4.36	799/1380	3.84	4.22	4.32	4.31	4.36
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	4	0	0	1	7	15	4.61	224/1193	3.74	3.76	4.02	3.99	4.61
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	25	0	1	0	2	6	5	4.00	710/1172	3.53	3.71	4.15	3.95	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	25	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	508/1182	4.02	3.98	4.35	4.18	4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	26	0	1	0	0	5	7	4.31	733/1170	4.08	4.16	4.38	4.17	4.31
4. Were special techniques successful	26	1	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	335/ 800	4.08	4.05	4.06	3.95	4.25
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	36	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	36	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	36	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	36	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	36	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	36	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	36	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	36	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	36	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	36	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	36	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	36	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	36	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	36	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	36	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	36	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	36	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	36	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	36	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: ECON 121 05  
 Title Prin Of Accounting I  
 Instructor: Medicus,Suzann  
 Enrollment: 49  
 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 473  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	21	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	7	General	1	Under-grad	39	Non-major	39
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	7	8	12	4.03	1042/1447	3.89	4.17	4.31	4.18	4.03
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	9	13	4.17	929/1447	4.04	4.17	4.27	4.30	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	6	7	13	4.03	909/1241	3.92	4.17	4.33	4.25	4.03
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	2	3	4	4	9	3.68	1195/1402	3.89	4.09	4.24	4.15	3.68
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	4	8	13	4.27	599/1358	4.01	3.97	4.11	4.03	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	7	0	2	5	5	8	3.95	861/1316	3.85	4.03	4.14	3.99	3.95
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	2	3	4	17	4.26	775/1427	4.12	4.31	4.19	4.24	4.26
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	3	23	4.88	538/1447	4.87	4.61	4.69	4.68	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	1	0	6	8	4	3.74	1103/1434	3.61	3.92	4.10	4.10	3.74
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	1	8	17	4.39	911/1387	4.19	4.46	4.46	4.46	4.39
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	4	22	4.71	919/1387	4.64	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	4	3	6	14	4.00	1047/1386	3.81	4.15	4.32	4.32	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	4	6	15	4.22	915/1380	3.84	4.22	4.32	4.31	4.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	2	2	4	16	4.42	367/1193	3.74	3.76	4.02	3.99	4.42
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	2	5	2	6	3.63	947/1172	3.53	3.71	4.15	3.95	3.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	1	4	1	10	4.25	737/1182	4.02	3.98	4.35	4.18	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	2	0	2	1	11	4.19	804/1170	4.08	4.16	4.38	4.17	4.19
4. Were special techniques successful	13	1	1	0	2	4	8	4.20	366/ 800	4.08	4.05	4.06	3.95	4.20
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.31	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	3.84	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	27	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: ECON 121 06  
 Title Prin Of Accounting I  
 Instructor: Medicus,Suzann  
 Enrollment: 49  
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 474  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	2	A	3	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	6	C	8	General	2	Under-grad	29	Non-major	29
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 122 01  
 Title Prin Of Accounting II  
 Instructor: McBride,Charles  
 Enrollment: 45  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 475  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	1	9	7	4.11	1007/1447	4.12	4.17	4.31	4.18	4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	457/1447	4.25	4.17	4.27	4.30	4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	12	4.63	415/1241	4.21	4.17	4.33	4.25	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	437/1402	4.17	4.09	4.24	4.15	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	5	13	4.58	299/1358	4.45	3.97	4.11	4.03	4.58
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	434/1316	3.92	4.03	4.14	3.99	4.46
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	9	9	4.42	568/1427	4.45	4.31	4.19	4.24	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	8	4.42	1139/1447	4.66	4.61	4.69	4.68	4.42
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	2	10	3	3.94	942/1434	3.73	3.92	4.10	4.10	3.94
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	383/1387	4.27	4.46	4.46	4.46	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	958/1387	4.63	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.68
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	2	7	9	4.21	911/1386	4.00	4.15	4.32	4.32	4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	7	10	4.26	877/1380	3.85	4.22	4.32	4.31	4.26
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	3	5	8	4.18	545/1193	3.66	3.76	4.02	3.99	4.18
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	710/1172	3.69	3.71	4.15	3.95	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	604/1182	4.08	3.98	4.35	4.18	4.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	624/1170	4.06	4.16	4.38	4.17	4.44
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	169/ 800	4.57	4.05	4.06	3.95	4.57

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	15
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	B 11	Graduate	0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0	Under-grad	19
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	0

Course-Section: ECON 122 02  
 Title Prin Of Accounting II  
 Instructor: Hardy,Timothy W  
 Enrollment: 34  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 476  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	7	5	13	4.24	889/1447	4.12	4.17	4.31	4.18	4.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	5	2	15	4.16	938/1447	4.25	4.17	4.27	4.30	4.16
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	4	2	4	14	4.04	905/1241	4.21	4.17	4.33	4.25	4.04
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	3	3	2	10	3.89	1082/1402	4.17	4.09	4.24	4.15	3.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	1	5	16	4.32	540/1358	4.45	3.97	4.11	4.03	4.32
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	3	6	4	7	3.50	1134/1316	3.92	4.03	4.14	3.99	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	5	18	4.64	301/1427	4.45	4.31	4.19	4.24	4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	21	4.88	565/1447	4.66	4.61	4.69	4.68	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	1	8	5	5	3.74	1103/1434	3.73	3.92	4.10	4.10	3.74
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	1	7	5	9	3.75	1262/1387	4.27	4.46	4.46	4.46	3.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	1	6	16	4.50	1143/1387	4.63	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	2	7	3	11	3.88	1141/1386	4.00	4.15	4.32	4.32	3.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	4	3	3	10	3.46	1258/1380	3.85	4.22	4.32	4.31	3.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	4	1	5	1	8	3.42	991/1193	3.66	3.76	4.02	3.99	3.42
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	5	0	2	4	4	3.13	1078/1172	3.69	3.71	4.15	3.95	3.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	3	0	2	3	6	3.64	1042/1182	4.08	3.98	4.35	4.18	3.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	2	2	2	2	6	3.57	1043/1170	4.06	4.16	4.38	4.17	3.57
4. Were special techniques successful	11	9	2	1	2	0	0	2.00	****/ 800	4.57	4.05	4.06	3.95	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	5	General	4	Under-grad	25	Non-major	25
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 122 03  
 Title Prin Of Accounting II  
 Instructor: Hardy, Timothy W  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 477  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	2	1	11	4.25	869/1447	4.12	4.17	4.31	4.18	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	1	4	7	3.88	1161/1447	4.25	4.17	4.27	4.30	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	4	1	4	7	3.88	1008/1241	4.21	4.17	4.33	4.25	3.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	0	2	3	7	4.15	864/1402	4.17	4.09	4.24	4.15	4.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	3	2	9	4.43	430/1358	4.45	3.97	4.11	4.03	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	2	0	3	6	3.92	900/1316	3.92	4.03	4.14	3.99	3.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	459/1427	4.45	4.31	4.19	4.24	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	565/1447	4.66	4.61	4.69	4.68	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	1	4	3	4	3.62	1181/1434	3.73	3.92	4.10	4.10	3.62
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	990/1387	4.27	4.46	4.46	4.46	4.31
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	1090/1387	4.63	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	4	5	5	3.93	1103/1386	4.00	4.15	4.32	4.32	3.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	3	2	8	3.88	1118/1380	3.85	4.22	4.32	4.31	3.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	2	3	2	3	4	3.29	1035/1193	3.66	3.76	4.02	3.99	3.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/1172	3.69	3.71	4.15	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/1182	4.08	3.98	4.35	4.18	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/1170	4.06	4.16	4.38	4.17	****
4. Were special techniques successful	13	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 800	4.57	4.05	4.06	3.95	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	13
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 7	Graduate	0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 4	General	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0	Under-grad	16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other	0
			? 1		

Course-Section: ECON 122 04  
 Title Prin Of Accounting II  
 Instructor: McBride, Charles  
 Enrollment: 43  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 478  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	2	6	3	13	3.88	1174/1447	4.12	4.17	4.31	4.18	3.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	4	17	4.38	702/1447	4.25	4.17	4.27	4.30	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	6	15	4.31	743/1241	4.21	4.17	4.33	4.25	4.31
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	2	4	8	10	4.08	923/1402	4.17	4.09	4.24	4.15	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	10	14	4.46	387/1358	4.45	3.97	4.11	4.03	4.46
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	2	0	4	8	6	3.80	968/1316	3.92	4.03	4.14	3.99	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3	7	14	4.23	799/1427	4.45	4.31	4.19	4.24	4.23
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	14	12	4.46	1109/1447	4.66	4.61	4.69	4.68	4.46
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	10	9	4	3.63	1175/1434	3.73	3.92	4.10	4.10	3.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	5	5	13	4.21	1079/1387	4.27	4.46	4.46	4.46	4.21
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	1	21	4.79	799/1387	4.63	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	4	9	9	4.00	1047/1386	4.00	4.15	4.32	4.32	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	1	4	6	10	3.79	1156/1380	3.85	4.22	4.32	4.31	3.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	4	0	3	3	10	3.75	843/1193	3.66	3.76	4.02	3.99	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	2	2	4	5	3.92	782/1172	3.69	3.71	4.15	3.95	3.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	796/1182	4.08	3.98	4.35	4.18	4.15
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	1	1	6	5	4.15	822/1170	4.06	4.16	4.38	4.17	4.15
4. Were special techniques successful	13	9	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/ 800	4.57	4.05	4.06	3.95	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 23	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 10			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C 3	General 0	Under-grad 26	Non-major 26
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ECON 301 01  
 Title Intermed Accounting I  
 Instructor: McBride, Charles  
 Enrollment: 44  
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 479  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	9	6	14	4.17	945/1447	4.17	4.17	4.31	4.32	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	11	12	4.14	965/1447	4.14	4.17	4.27	4.23	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	7	15	4.24	790/1241	4.24	4.17	4.33	4.33	4.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	1	5	6	8	4.05	943/1402	4.05	4.09	4.24	4.24	4.05
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	9	6	14	4.17	681/1358	4.17	3.97	4.11	4.10	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	1	2	8	3	4	3.39	1180/1316	3.39	4.03	4.14	4.13	3.39
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	7	4	15	4.11	914/1427	4.11	4.31	4.19	4.15	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	4	14	11	4.24	1257/1447	4.24	4.61	4.69	4.65	4.24
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	7	8	7	4.00	849/1434	4.00	3.92	4.10	4.09	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	8	6	13	4.19	1092/1387	4.19	4.46	4.46	4.44	4.19
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	6	4	17	4.41	1203/1387	4.41	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	8	7	10	4.08	1014/1386	4.08	4.15	4.32	4.30	4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	7	6	13	4.15	971/1380	4.15	4.22	4.32	4.32	4.15
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	3	5	9	7	3.83	796/1193	3.83	3.76	4.02	4.05	3.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	1	3	3	4	3.67	925/1172	3.67	3.71	4.15	4.24	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	1	0	6	2	3	3.50	1078/1182	3.50	3.98	4.35	4.42	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	1	1	3	1	6	3.83	965/1170	3.83	4.16	4.38	4.49	3.83
4. Were special techniques successful	17	3	1	2	2	2	2	3.22	726/ 800	3.22	4.05	4.06	4.12	3.22
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.36	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.02	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	2.87	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.42	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	3.38	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	4.46	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	5.00	****

Course-Section: ECON 301 01  
 Title Intermed Accounting I  
 Instructor: McBride, Charles  
 Enrollment: 44  
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 479  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	13	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	29	Non-major	27
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						



Course-Section: ECON 302 01  
 Title Intermed Accounting II  
 Instructor: Stmartin,Jeanne  
 Enrollment: 38  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 480  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	430/1447	4.73	4.17	4.31	4.32	4.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	303/1447	4.76	4.17	4.27	4.23	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	334/1241	4.76	4.17	4.33	4.33	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	5	0	0	3	1	8	4.42	603/1402	4.53	4.09	4.24	4.24	4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	563/1358	4.35	3.97	4.11	4.10	4.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	128/1316	4.66	4.03	4.14	4.13	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	133/1427	4.83	4.31	4.19	4.15	4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	673/1447	4.92	4.61	4.69	4.65	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	2	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	158/1434	4.68	3.92	4.10	4.09	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	120/1387	4.86	4.46	4.46	4.44	4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1387	4.95	4.69	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	353/1386	4.68	4.15	4.32	4.30	4.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	17	4.89	181/1380	4.85	4.22	4.32	4.32	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	8	0	2	2	1	3	3.63	916/1193	4.03	3.76	4.02	4.05	3.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1172	4.67	3.71	4.15	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1182	4.57	3.98	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1170	4.57	4.16	4.38	4.49	****
4. Were special techniques successful	15	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 800	****	4.05	4.06	4.12	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 14	Graduate 0	Major 3	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 6				
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	5	C 5	General	0	Under-grad 19	Non-major 16
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	2	D 0				
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0				
				I 0	Other	0		
				? 1				

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	243/1447	4.73	4.17	4.31	4.32	4.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	187/1447	4.76	4.17	4.27	4.23	4.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	222/1241	4.76	4.17	4.33	4.33	4.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	0	4	15	4.65	325/1402	4.53	4.09	4.24	4.24	4.65
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	0	1	1	14	4.39	474/1358	4.35	3.97	4.11	4.10	4.39
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	372/1316	4.66	4.03	4.14	4.13	4.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	1	20	4.82	147/1427	4.83	4.31	4.19	4.15	4.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1447	4.92	4.61	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	270/1434	4.68	3.92	4.10	4.09	4.61
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	398/1387	4.86	4.46	4.46	4.44	4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	528/1387	4.95	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	4	16	4.64	470/1386	4.68	4.15	4.32	4.30	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	261/1380	4.85	4.22	4.32	4.32	4.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	15	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	358/1193	4.03	3.76	4.02	4.05	4.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	282/1172	4.67	3.71	4.15	4.24	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	508/1182	4.57	3.98	4.35	4.42	4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	538/1170	4.57	4.16	4.38	4.49	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	15	5	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 800	****	4.05	4.06	4.12	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.36	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.02	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	2.87	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.42	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	3.38	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	4.46	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	5.00	****

Course-Section: ECON 302 02  
 Title Intermed Accounting II  
 Instructor: Stmartin,Jeanne  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 481  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	19
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 311 01  
 Title Interm Microecon Analy  
 Instructor: Bradley, Michael  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 482  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	4	3	2	3.50	1339/1447	3.59	4.17	4.31	4.32	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	4	2	3.50	1323/1447	3.56	4.17	4.27	4.23	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	5	1	3.30	1179/1241	3.34	4.17	4.33	4.33	3.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1264/1402	3.53	4.09	4.24	4.24	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	2	5	1	3.56	1147/1358	3.52	3.97	4.11	4.10	3.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1050/1316	3.37	4.03	4.14	4.13	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	3	4	3.90	1077/1427	3.94	4.31	4.19	4.15	3.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	8	1	3.80	1414/1447	4.22	4.61	4.69	4.65	3.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	1	0	3	3	2	3.56	1213/1434	3.49	3.92	4.10	4.09	3.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	1144/1387	4.13	4.46	4.46	4.44	4.10
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	784/1387	4.61	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	3	2	2	3.33	1290/1386	3.44	4.15	4.32	4.30	3.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	1	5	2	3.50	1246/1380	3.58	4.22	4.32	4.32	3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	1136/1193	3.25	3.76	4.02	4.05	2.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1090/1172	2.97	3.71	4.15	4.24	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	1	0	2	0	2.75	1158/1182	3.41	3.98	4.35	4.42	2.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	864/1170	3.96	4.16	4.38	4.49	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
-----											
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	5
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 311 02  
 Title Interm Microecon Analy  
 Instructor: Coates,Dennis C  
 Enrollment: 29  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 483  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	954/1447	3.59	4.17	4.31	4.32	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	2	6	4.17	938/1447	3.56	4.17	4.27	4.23	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	1	4	4	3.58	1121/1241	3.34	4.17	4.33	4.33	3.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	827/1402	3.53	4.09	4.24	4.24	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	799/1358	3.52	3.97	4.11	4.10	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	812/1316	3.37	4.03	4.14	4.13	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	716/1427	3.94	4.31	4.19	4.15	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	436/1447	4.22	4.61	4.69	4.65	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	849/1434	3.49	3.92	4.10	4.09	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	1	8	4.42	891/1387	4.13	4.46	4.46	4.44	4.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	982/1387	4.61	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	4	4	4.00	1047/1386	3.44	4.15	4.32	4.30	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	1	7	4.25	887/1380	3.58	4.22	4.32	4.32	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	843/1193	3.25	3.76	4.02	4.05	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	619/1172	2.97	3.71	4.15	4.24	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	767/1182	3.41	3.98	4.35	4.42	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	522/1170	3.96	4.16	4.38	4.49	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 800	****	4.05	4.06	4.12	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.36	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ECON 311 03  
 Title Interm Microecon Analy  
 Instructor: Bradley, Michael  
 Enrollment: 41  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 484  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	4	3	2	5	4	3.11	1400/1447	3.59	4.17	4.31	4.32	3.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	5	5	5	1	3.00	1400/1447	3.56	4.17	4.27	4.23	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	6	3	2	4	3.13	1209/1241	3.34	4.17	4.33	4.33	3.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	7	2	2	2	3	1	2.90	1373/1402	3.53	4.09	4.24	4.24	2.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	4	3	2	3	4	3.00	1291/1358	3.52	3.97	4.11	4.10	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	10	2	3	0	1	1	2.43	1303/1316	3.37	4.03	4.14	4.13	2.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	5	4	6	3.61	1223/1427	3.94	4.31	4.19	4.15	3.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	3	12	2	3.94	1387/1447	4.22	4.61	4.69	4.65	3.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	2	3	1	4	2	2	2.92	1377/1434	3.49	3.92	4.10	4.09	2.92

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	2	4	4	6	3.88	1235/1387	4.13	4.46	4.46	4.44	3.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	0	0	6	9	4.38	1214/1387	4.61	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	5	3	3	3	3.00	1328/1386	3.44	4.15	4.32	4.30	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	4	2	2	2	4	3.00	1317/1380	3.58	4.22	4.32	4.32	3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	12	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	****/1193	3.25	3.76	4.02	4.05	****

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	3	3	1	0	0	1.71	1172/1172	2.97	3.71	4.15	4.24	1.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	2	3	0	2	3.29	1118/1182	3.41	3.98	4.35	4.42	3.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	3	1	1	2	3.29	1113/1170	3.96	4.16	4.38	4.49	3.29
4. Were special techniques successful	12	6	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 800	****	4.05	4.06	4.12	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	15
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 5	Graduate	0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 5	General	0
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 2	Under-grad	19
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other	0
			? 2		

Course-Section: ECON 312 01  
 Title Interm Macroecon Analy  
 Instructor: Cinyabuguma,Mat  
 Enrollment: 42  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 485  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	4	10	7	3.83	1214/1447	4.25	4.17	4.31	4.32	3.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	5	10	6	3.75	1228/1447	4.25	4.17	4.27	4.23	3.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	4	6	12	4.08	887/1241	4.35	4.17	4.33	4.33	4.08
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	2	2	5	7	5	3.52	1256/1402	4.02	4.09	4.24	4.24	3.52
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	2	7	4	6	3.60	1125/1358	4.00	3.97	4.11	4.10	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	1	1	3	5	7	3	3.42	1164/1316	4.09	4.03	4.14	4.13	3.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	2	4	9	6	3.77	1156/1427	4.37	4.31	4.19	4.15	3.77
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	1	1	8	12	4.41	1155/1447	4.76	4.61	4.69	4.65	4.41
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	1	1	8	4	2	3.31	1297/1434	3.96	3.92	4.10	4.09	3.31
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	3	1	5	7	8	3.67	1282/1387	4.48	4.46	4.46	4.44	3.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	2	5	4	11	3.96	1330/1387	4.57	4.69	4.73	4.71	3.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	4	5	5	9	3.71	1209/1386	4.22	4.15	4.32	4.30	3.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	7	7	7	3.67	1198/1380	4.23	4.22	4.32	4.32	3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	7	1	1	6	1	4	3.46	975/1193	3.73	3.76	4.02	4.05	3.46
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	2	1	1	3	3.71	899/1172	3.64	3.71	4.15	4.24	3.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	1	4	1	1	3.29	1118/1182	3.57	3.98	4.35	4.42	3.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	864/1170	4.50	4.16	4.38	4.49	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	17	3	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 800	****	4.05	4.06	4.12	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	12	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	24	Non-major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 312 02  
 Title Interm Macroecon Analy  
 Instructor: Rose,Morgan J  
 Enrollment: 34  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 486  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	5	13	4.43	695/1447	4.25	4.17	4.31	4.32	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	12	4.43	648/1447	4.25	4.17	4.27	4.23	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	13	4.48	576/1241	4.35	4.17	4.33	4.33	4.48
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	635/1402	4.02	4.09	4.24	4.24	4.39
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	7	10	4.25	608/1358	4.00	3.97	4.11	4.10	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	1	1	6	8	4.31	564/1316	4.09	4.03	4.14	4.13	4.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	191/1427	4.37	4.31	4.19	4.15	4.76
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	485/1447	4.76	4.61	4.69	4.65	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	657/1434	3.96	3.92	4.10	4.09	4.23
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	215/1387	4.48	4.46	4.46	4.44	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	707/1387	4.57	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	0	8	10	4.42	719/1386	4.22	4.15	4.32	4.30	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	4	11	4.39	775/1380	4.23	4.22	4.32	4.32	4.39
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	11	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	****/1193	3.73	3.76	4.02	4.05	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/1172	3.64	3.71	4.15	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/1182	3.57	3.98	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/1170	4.50	4.16	4.38	4.49	****
4. Were special techniques successful	17	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 800	****	4.05	4.06	4.12	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	19
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	8	14	4.50	585/1447	4.25	4.17	4.31	4.32	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	15	4.58	447/1447	4.25	4.17	4.27	4.23	4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	15	4.50	541/1241	4.35	4.17	4.33	4.33	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	0	2	10	8	4.14	873/1402	4.02	4.09	4.24	4.24	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	1	2	5	10	4.16	700/1358	4.00	3.97	4.11	4.10	4.16
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	362/1316	4.09	4.03	4.14	4.13	4.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	6	16	4.58	361/1427	4.37	4.31	4.19	4.15	4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	243/1447	4.76	4.61	4.69	4.65	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	10	7	4.33	540/1434	3.96	3.92	4.10	4.09	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	261/1387	4.48	4.46	4.46	4.44	4.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	475/1387	4.57	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	4	16	4.52	587/1386	4.22	4.15	4.32	4.30	4.52
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	1	3	17	4.64	506/1380	4.23	4.22	4.32	4.32	4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	14	1	0	2	0	5	4.00	652/1193	3.73	3.76	4.02	4.05	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	2	0	0	2	3	3.57	970/1172	3.64	3.71	4.15	4.24	3.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	1	1	0	1	4	3.86	968/1182	3.57	3.98	4.35	4.42	3.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1170	4.50	4.16	4.38	4.49	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	17	4	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 800	****	4.05	4.06	4.12	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.20	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	4.17	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	3.38	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	4.46	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	15
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	5	12	14	4.29	829/1447	4.29	4.17	4.31	4.32	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	2	4	10	15	4.23	882/1447	4.23	4.17	4.27	4.23	4.23
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	2	4	12	12	4.03	909/1241	4.03	4.17	4.33	4.33	4.03
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	6	1	2	2	9	11	4.08	923/1402	4.08	4.09	4.24	4.24	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	9	1	3	6	3	9	3.73	1043/1358	3.73	3.97	4.11	4.10	3.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	7	0	1	3	9	11	4.25	617/1316	4.25	4.03	4.14	4.13	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	3	3	11	14	4.16	866/1427	4.16	4.31	4.19	4.15	4.16
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	1	1	16	12	4.30	1223/1447	4.30	4.61	4.69	4.65	4.30
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	0	0	0	6	8	6	4.00	849/1434	4.00	3.92	4.10	4.09	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	3	8	18	4.40	902/1387	4.40	4.46	4.46	4.44	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	1	3	8	17	4.30	1241/1387	4.30	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.30
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	1	5	6	16	4.21	919/1386	4.21	4.15	4.32	4.30	4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	1	2	11	15	4.38	783/1380	4.38	4.22	4.32	4.32	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	4	1	2	3	8	7	3.86	786/1193	3.86	3.76	4.02	4.05	3.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	1	1	4	6	4.00	710/1172	4.00	3.71	4.15	4.24	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	1	0	3	3	5	3.92	932/1182	3.92	3.98	4.35	4.42	3.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	2	1	2	2	5	3.58	1039/1170	3.58	4.16	4.38	4.49	3.58
4. Were special techniques successful	22	2	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	351/ 800	4.22	4.05	4.06	4.12	4.22
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	31	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.36	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.02	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	31	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	31	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	2.87	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 65	****	****	4.42	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	3.38	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	4.46	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	5.00	****

Course-Section: ECON 320 01  
 Title Quant Mthds:Management  
 Instructor: Palmateer,Jason  
 Enrollment: 42  
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 488  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	33	Non-major	30
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 374 01  
 Title Fund Financial Mgmt  
 Instructor: Lamdin,Douglas  
 Enrollment: 37  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 489  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	626/1447	4.47	4.17	4.31	4.32	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	575/1447	4.49	4.17	4.27	4.23	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	469/1241	4.48	4.17	4.33	4.33	4.59
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	5	8	4.31	705/1402	4.35	4.09	4.24	4.24	4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	4	5	6	4.13	718/1358	4.04	3.97	4.11	4.10	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	434/1316	4.26	4.03	4.14	4.13	4.46
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	5	10	4.41	582/1427	4.55	4.31	4.19	4.15	4.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	1	12	3	4.13	1321/1447	4.48	4.61	4.69	4.65	4.13
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	623/1434	4.13	3.92	4.10	4.09	4.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	596/1387	4.71	4.46	4.46	4.44	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	579/1387	4.81	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	1	12	4.50	607/1386	4.49	4.15	4.32	4.30	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	11	4.41	749/1380	4.48	4.22	4.32	4.32	4.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	2	0	2	2	7	3.92	737/1193	3.68	3.76	4.02	4.05	3.92

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	17	Non-major	16
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 374 02  
 Title Fund Financial Mgmt  
 Instructor: Rose, Morgan J  
 Enrollment: 29  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 490  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	8	10	4.47	626/1447	4.47	4.17	4.31	4.32	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	3	12	4.50	532/1447	4.49	4.17	4.27	4.23	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	11	4.37	692/1241	4.48	4.17	4.33	4.33	4.37
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	9	8	4.39	635/1402	4.35	4.09	4.24	4.24	4.39
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	4	9	3	3.94	881/1358	4.04	3.97	4.11	4.10	3.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	3	8	4	4.07	779/1316	4.26	4.03	4.14	4.13	4.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	265/1427	4.55	4.31	4.19	4.15	4.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	673/1447	4.48	4.61	4.69	4.65	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	4	8	4	4.00	849/1434	4.13	3.92	4.10	4.09	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	398/1387	4.71	4.46	4.46	4.44	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	889/1387	4.81	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	649/1386	4.49	4.15	4.32	4.30	4.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	604/1380	4.48	4.22	4.32	4.32	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	7	0	2	3	2	2	3.44	983/1193	3.68	3.76	4.02	4.05	3.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	637/1172	4.17	3.71	4.15	4.24	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	638/1182	4.40	3.98	4.35	4.42	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	798/1170	4.20	4.16	4.38	4.49	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	14	1	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	****/ 800	****	4.05	4.06	4.12	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.20	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	2	Under-grad	19	Non-major	18
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 387 01  
 Title Econ Devel Latin Amer  
 Instructor: Gindling JR,Tho  
 Enrollment: 42  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 491  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	7	15	4.48	612/1447	4.48	4.17	4.31	4.32	4.48
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	9	13	4.36	728/1447	4.36	4.17	4.27	4.23	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	6	17	4.52	523/1241	4.52	4.17	4.33	4.33	4.52
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	1	3	10	8	4.00	976/1402	4.00	4.09	4.24	4.24	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	5	9	8	3.88	931/1358	3.88	3.97	4.11	4.10	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	10	11	4.20	671/1316	4.20	4.03	4.14	4.13	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	3	8	13	4.28	739/1427	4.28	4.31	4.19	4.15	4.28
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	436/1447	4.92	4.61	4.69	4.65	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	4	8	9	4.24	657/1434	4.24	3.92	4.10	4.09	4.24
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	3	20	4.68	551/1387	4.68	4.46	4.46	4.44	4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	2	0	22	4.72	919/1387	4.72	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	3	7	14	4.36	784/1386	4.36	4.15	4.32	4.30	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	4	18	4.56	593/1380	4.56	4.22	4.32	4.32	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	12	3	1	3	2	2	2.91	1117/1193	2.91	3.76	4.02	4.05	2.91
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	2	1	2	2	3.25	1058/1172	3.25	3.71	4.15	4.24	3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	1	1	1	1	4	3.75	1011/1182	3.75	3.98	4.35	4.42	3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	1	0	4	0	3	3.50	1070/1170	3.50	4.16	4.38	4.49	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	18	4	2	0	0	1	1	2.75	****/ 800	****	4.05	4.06	4.12	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	25	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	4.17	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	26	Non-major	14
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 405 01  
 Title Benefit-Cost Evaluatio  
 Instructor: Farrow,Robert S  
 Enrollment: 38  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 492  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	0	4	9	12	4.19	927/1447	4.19	4.17	4.31	4.43	4.19
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	4	12	8	4.00	1053/1447	4.00	4.17	4.27	4.31	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	7	6	10	3.85	1028/1241	3.85	4.17	4.33	4.41	3.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	7	11	7	4.00	976/1402	4.00	4.09	4.24	4.34	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	10	13	4.44	409/1358	4.44	3.97	4.11	4.15	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	8	8	6	3.64	1063/1316	3.64	4.03	4.14	4.27	3.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	1	5	7	10	4.13	890/1427	4.13	4.31	4.19	4.20	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	1	3	20	4.79	770/1447	4.79	4.61	4.69	4.72	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	1	5	9	4	3.84	1024/1434	3.84	3.92	4.10	4.17	3.84
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	2	6	14	4.43	870/1387	4.43	4.46	4.46	4.48	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	4	18	4.67	982/1387	4.67	4.69	4.73	4.76	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	6	10	7	3.96	1087/1386	3.96	4.15	4.32	4.34	3.96
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	3	10	9	4.17	952/1380	4.17	4.22	4.32	4.34	4.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	1	2	8	6	5	3.55	946/1193	3.55	3.76	4.02	4.00	3.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	3	7	3	3.79	868/1172	3.79	3.71	4.15	4.25	3.79
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	1	5	5	3	3.71	1023/1182	3.71	3.98	4.35	4.49	3.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	695/1170	4.36	4.16	4.38	4.51	4.36
4. Were special techniques successful	12	9	1	0	2	0	3	3.67	****/ 800	****	4.05	4.06	4.19	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 15	Graduate 5	Major 7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 14			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 4	General 0	Under-grad 22	Non-major 20
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	4	D 0			
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	9	F 0	Electives 4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 2		
				? 0			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	723/1447	4.40	4.17	4.31	4.43	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	677/1447	4.40	4.17	4.27	4.31	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	658/1241	4.40	4.17	4.33	4.41	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	414/1402	4.57	4.09	4.24	4.34	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	799/1358	4.00	3.97	4.11	4.15	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	719/1316	4.14	4.03	4.14	4.27	4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	914/1427	4.10	4.31	4.19	4.20	4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	1079/1447	4.50	4.61	4.69	4.72	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	775/1434	4.13	3.92	4.10	4.17	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.46	4.46	4.48	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	859/1387	4.75	4.69	4.73	4.76	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	719/1386	4.43	4.15	4.32	4.34	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	520/1380	4.63	4.22	4.32	4.34	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1193	5.00	3.76	4.02	4.00	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1172	****	3.71	4.15	4.25	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1182	****	3.98	4.35	4.49	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1170	****	4.16	4.38	4.51	****
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 800	****	4.05	4.06	4.19	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.80	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.60	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors	
-----								
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1				
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 4	General	0	Under-grad	10 Non-major 10
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0				
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0				
				I 0	Other	0		
				? 0				



Course-Section: ECON 410 01  
 Title Topics In Fin Econ  
 Instructor: Carroll, Kathlee  
 Enrollment: 32  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 494  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	709/1447	4.41	4.17	4.31	4.43	4.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	814/1447	4.29	4.17	4.27	4.31	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	4	0	6	7	3.94	962/1241	3.94	4.17	4.33	4.41	3.94
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	494/1402	4.50	4.09	4.24	4.34	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	7	7	4.24	626/1358	4.24	3.97	4.11	4.15	4.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	9	4	4.06	779/1316	4.06	4.03	4.14	4.27	4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	200/1427	4.75	4.31	4.19	4.20	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	8	4.47	1101/1447	4.47	4.61	4.69	4.72	4.47
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	611/1434	4.27	3.92	4.10	4.17	4.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	626/1387	4.63	4.46	4.46	4.48	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	369/1387	4.94	4.69	4.73	4.76	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	2	11	4.50	607/1386	4.50	4.15	4.32	4.34	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	434/1380	4.69	4.22	4.32	4.34	4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	11	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/1193	****	3.76	4.02	4.00	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	4	4	4.11	666/1172	4.11	3.71	4.15	4.25	4.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	604/1182	4.44	3.98	4.35	4.49	4.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	549/1170	4.56	4.16	4.38	4.51	4.56
4. Were special techniques successful	9	5	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 800	****	4.05	4.06	4.19	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	1	Under-grad	17	Non-major	11
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 2						

Course-Section: ECON 421 01  
 Title Intro To Econometrics  
 Instructor: Ma,Bing  
 Enrollment: 41  
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 495  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	1	5	7	13	3.90	1166/1447	3.90	4.17	4.31	4.43	3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	5	5	16	4.17	929/1447	4.17	4.17	4.27	4.31	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	5	8	13	4.07	896/1241	4.07	4.17	4.33	4.41	4.07
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	1	1	2	7	8	4.05	943/1402	4.05	4.09	4.24	4.34	4.05
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	6	4	11	4.24	626/1358	4.24	3.97	4.11	4.15	4.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	15	0	0	4	1	9	4.36	534/1316	4.36	4.03	4.14	4.27	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	7	19	4.55	398/1427	4.55	4.31	4.19	4.20	4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	5	21	4.68	948/1447	4.68	4.61	4.69	4.72	4.68
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	2	2	5	8	6	3.61	1188/1434	3.61	3.92	4.10	4.17	3.61
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	8	16	4.48	818/1387	4.48	4.46	4.46	4.48	4.48
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	8	18	4.63	1030/1387	4.63	4.69	4.73	4.76	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	2	5	5	14	4.07	1018/1386	4.07	4.15	4.32	4.34	4.07
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	0	2	5	16	4.19	940/1380	4.19	4.22	4.32	4.34	4.19
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	12	1	2	2	2	5	3.67	895/1193	3.67	3.76	4.02	4.00	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	580/1172	4.25	3.71	4.15	4.25	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	553/1182	4.50	3.98	4.35	4.49	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	576/1170	4.50	4.16	4.38	4.51	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	17	4	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	423/ 800	4.00	4.05	4.06	4.19	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 15	Graduate 0	Major 4
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 8			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	5	C 5	General 0	Under-grad 29	Non-major 25
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	4	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 2		
				? 1			

Course-Section: ECON 422 01  
 Title Topics In Econometrics  
 Instructor: Yuan, Chunming  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 496  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	1017/1447	4.08	4.17	4.31	4.43	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	3	5	4.00	1053/1447	4.00	4.17	4.27	4.31	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	496/1241	4.56	4.17	4.33	4.41	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	555/1402	4.45	4.09	4.24	4.34	4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	2	1	4	3.50	1170/1358	3.50	3.97	4.11	4.15	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	681/1316	4.18	4.03	4.14	4.27	4.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	361/1427	4.58	4.31	4.19	4.20	4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	673/1447	4.83	4.61	4.69	4.72	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	802/1434	4.09	3.92	4.10	4.17	4.09
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	475/1387	4.73	4.46	4.46	4.48	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	528/1387	4.91	4.69	4.73	4.76	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	5	2	4	3.91	1128/1386	3.91	4.15	4.32	4.34	3.91
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	868/1380	4.27	4.22	4.32	4.34	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	401/1193	4.36	3.76	4.02	4.00	4.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1172	****	3.71	4.15	4.25	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1182	****	3.98	4.35	4.49	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1170	****	4.16	4.38	4.51	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors		6	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3							
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General		0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	7
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	0	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives		6	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		0				
				?	0							

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	6	6	8	3.91	1159/1447	3.91	4.17	4.31	4.43	3.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	7	4	9	4.00	1053/1447	4.00	4.17	4.27	4.31	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	3	7	9	4.00	923/1241	4.00	4.17	4.33	4.41	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	13	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	1094/1402	3.88	4.09	4.24	4.34	3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	2	4	12	4.30	563/1358	4.30	3.97	4.11	4.15	4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	13	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	812/1316	4.00	4.03	4.14	4.27	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	1	3	2	14	4.45	541/1427	4.45	4.31	4.19	4.20	4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	2	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	786/1447	4.79	4.61	4.69	4.72	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	2	8	4	4	3.56	1213/1434	3.56	3.92	4.10	4.17	3.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	611/1387	4.63	4.46	4.46	4.48	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	3	3	12	4.50	1143/1387	4.50	4.69	4.73	4.76	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	5	6	7	4.00	1047/1386	4.00	4.15	4.32	4.34	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	2	0	2	13	4.16	965/1380	4.16	4.22	4.32	4.34	4.16
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	4	2	3	7	3.81	807/1193	3.81	3.76	4.02	4.00	3.81
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	637/1172	4.17	3.71	4.15	4.25	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1078/1182	3.50	3.98	4.35	4.49	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	710/1170	4.33	4.16	4.38	4.51	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	16	3	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 800	****	4.05	4.06	4.19	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.61	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	4.68	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.42	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.80	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.60	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	4	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	22	Non-major	10
84-150	14	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	1	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 453 01  
 Title Household Economics  
 Instructor: Lord,William A  
 Enrollment: 78  
 Questionnaires: 40

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 498  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	4	3	10	15	5	3.38	1364/1447	3.38	4.17	4.31	4.43	3.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	1	3	11	16	6	3.62	1278/1447	3.62	4.17	4.27	4.31	3.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	2	4	7	17	7	3.62	1109/1241	3.62	4.17	4.33	4.41	3.62
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	18	4	2	6	3	4	3.05	1356/1402	3.05	4.09	4.24	4.34	3.05
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	2	6	4	8	8	9	3.29	1244/1358	3.29	3.97	4.11	4.15	3.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	23	1	1	4	5	3	3.57	1101/1316	3.57	4.03	4.14	4.27	3.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	1	7	7	22	4.35	656/1427	4.35	4.31	4.19	4.20	4.35
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	1	0	7	29	4.73	885/1447	4.73	4.61	4.69	4.72	4.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	2	4	14	6	4	3.20	1325/1434	3.20	3.92	4.10	4.17	3.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	2	2	16	15	4.26	1039/1387	4.26	4.46	4.46	4.48	4.26
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	2	2	7	24	4.51	1134/1387	4.51	4.69	4.73	4.76	4.51
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	2	4	12	6	11	3.57	1243/1386	3.57	4.15	4.32	4.34	3.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	5	7	7	14	3.74	1172/1380	3.74	4.22	4.32	4.34	3.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	11	4	2	7	8	2	3.09	1077/1193	3.09	3.76	4.02	4.00	3.09
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	2	3	1	1	3.14	****/1172	****	3.71	4.15	4.25	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	32	0	1	1	4	1	1	3.00	****/1182	****	3.98	4.35	4.49	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	32	0	1	0	4	3	0	3.13	****/1170	****	4.16	4.38	4.51	****
4. Were special techniques successful	32	5	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 800	****	4.05	4.06	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	4.87	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	4.43	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	22	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	6	General	1	Under-grad	40	Non-major	29
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	8	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	463/1447	4.61	4.17	4.31	4.43	4.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	6	8	4.22	882/1447	4.22	4.17	4.27	4.31	4.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	646/1241	4.41	4.17	4.33	4.41	4.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	665/1402	4.35	4.09	4.24	4.34	4.35
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	4	5	5	3.93	881/1358	3.93	3.97	4.11	4.15	3.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	4	7	5	4.06	779/1316	4.06	4.03	4.14	4.27	4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	301/1427	4.65	4.31	4.19	4.20	4.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	885/1447	4.72	4.61	4.69	4.72	4.72
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	3	7	4	3.93	942/1434	3.93	3.92	4.10	4.17	3.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	0	4	13	4.56	727/1387	4.56	4.46	4.46	4.48	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	707/1387	4.83	4.69	4.73	4.76	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	766/1386	4.39	4.15	4.32	4.34	4.39
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	534/1380	4.61	4.22	4.32	4.34	4.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	13	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1193	****	3.76	4.02	4.00	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	637/1172	4.17	3.71	4.15	4.25	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	856/1182	4.00	3.98	4.35	4.49	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	864/1170	4.00	4.16	4.38	4.51	4.00
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.61	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	4.87	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.80	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	4.59	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	4.68	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	4.72	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.80	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	9	General	3	Under-grad	18	Non-major	12
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 467 01  
 Title Health Economics  
 Instructor: Ma,Bing  
 Enrollment: 76  
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 500  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	5	11	17	4.36	761/1447	4.36	4.17	4.31	4.43	4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	4	14	12	4.06	1017/1447	4.06	4.17	4.27	4.31	4.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	3	12	16	4.24	790/1241	4.24	4.17	4.33	4.41	4.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	15	1	0	6	5	6	3.83	1120/1402	3.83	4.09	4.24	4.34	3.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	3	3	16	8	3.78	1001/1358	3.78	3.97	4.11	4.15	3.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	17	0	1	8	2	5	3.69	1038/1316	3.69	4.03	4.14	4.27	3.69
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	13	16	4.33	680/1427	4.33	4.31	4.19	4.20	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	28	4.85	646/1447	4.85	4.61	4.69	4.72	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	14	13	4.33	540/1434	4.33	3.92	4.10	4.17	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	10	20	4.56	712/1387	4.56	4.46	4.46	4.48	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	7	26	4.79	814/1387	4.79	4.69	4.73	4.76	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	2	11	17	4.42	733/1386	4.42	4.15	4.32	4.34	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	10	18	4.48	679/1380	4.48	4.22	4.32	4.34	4.48
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	18	2	2	1	6	3	3.43	991/1193	3.43	3.76	4.02	4.00	3.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	4	4	7	4.00	710/1172	4.00	3.71	4.15	4.25	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	1	0	3	5	6	4.00	856/1182	4.00	3.98	4.35	4.49	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	1	0	2	3	9	4.27	757/1170	4.27	4.16	4.38	4.51	4.27
4. Were special techniques successful	19	11	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/ 800	****	4.05	4.06	4.19	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 13	Required for Majors 14	Graduate 1	Major 3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 11			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C 1	General 3	Under-grad 33	Non-major 31
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	6	D 0			
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	8	F 0	Electives 10	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 2			

Course-Section: ECON 475 01  
 Title Financial Invstmnt Ana  
 Instructor: Lamdin,Douglas  
 Enrollment: 62  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 501  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	243/1447	4.81	4.17	4.31	4.43	4.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	249/1447	4.75	4.17	4.27	4.31	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	282/1241	4.75	4.17	4.33	4.41	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	336/1402	4.64	4.09	4.24	4.34	4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	2	1	9	4.38	474/1358	4.38	3.97	4.11	4.15	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	166/1316	4.75	4.03	4.14	4.27	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	113/1427	4.87	4.31	4.19	4.20	4.87
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	9	6	4.40	1155/1447	4.40	4.61	4.69	4.72	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	206/1434	4.69	3.92	4.10	4.17	4.69

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	353/1387	4.80	4.46	4.46	4.48	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	784/1387	4.80	4.69	4.73	4.76	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	341/1386	4.73	4.15	4.32	4.34	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	463/1380	4.67	4.22	4.32	4.34	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	288/1193	4.50	3.76	4.02	4.00	4.50

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	0	7	4.50	377/1172	4.50	3.71	4.15	4.25	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	0	0	7	4.50	553/1182	4.50	3.98	4.35	4.49	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	679/1170	4.38	4.16	4.38	4.51	4.38
4. Were special techniques successful	8	4	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	103/ 800	4.75	4.05	4.06	4.19	4.75

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 16 Non-major 16
84-150	7	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 0		



Course-Section: ECON 476 01  
 Title Portfolio Management  
 Instructor: Yuan, Chunming  
 Enrollment: 43  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 502  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	7	13	4.43	681/1447	4.43	4.17	4.31	4.43	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	6	13	4.30	805/1447	4.30	4.17	4.27	4.31	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	16	4.61	451/1241	4.61	4.17	4.33	4.41	4.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	15	4.48	530/1402	4.48	4.09	4.24	4.34	4.48
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	1	3	5	10	4.10	746/1358	4.10	3.97	4.11	4.15	4.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	372/1316	4.53	4.03	4.14	4.27	4.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	1	1	5	14	4.36	644/1427	4.36	4.31	4.19	4.20	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.61	4.69	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	10	7	4.26	623/1434	4.26	3.92	4.10	4.17	4.26
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	353/1387	4.81	4.46	4.46	4.48	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	844/1387	4.76	4.69	4.73	4.76	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	3	8	9	4.19	927/1386	4.19	4.15	4.32	4.34	4.19
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	8	10	4.29	858/1380	4.29	4.22	4.32	4.34	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	2	0	4	6	3	3.53	950/1193	3.53	3.76	4.02	4.00	3.53
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/1172	****	3.71	4.15	4.25	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/1182	****	3.98	4.35	4.49	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/1170	****	4.16	4.38	4.51	****
4. Were special techniques successful	18	1	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/ 800	****	4.05	4.06	4.19	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 15	Required for Majors 14	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 3	General 3	Under-grad 23	Non-major 23
84-150	14	3.00-3.49	5	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ECON 478 1  
 Title Real Estate Econ And F  
 Instructor: Getter,Darryl E  
 Enrollment: 41  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 503  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	25	4.89	158/1447	4.89	4.17	4.31	4.43	4.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	24	4.86	154/1447	4.86	4.17	4.27	4.31	4.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	22	4.75	282/1241	4.75	4.17	4.33	4.41	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	0	5	20	4.69	281/1402	4.69	4.09	4.24	4.34	4.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	1	3	3	14	4.43	430/1358	4.43	3.97	4.11	4.15	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	3	3	16	4.48	423/1316	4.48	4.03	4.14	4.27	4.48
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	5	22	4.81	147/1427	4.81	4.31	4.19	4.20	4.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	2	24	4.92	388/1447	4.92	4.61	4.69	4.72	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	2	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	117/1434	4.81	3.92	4.10	4.17	4.81
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	0	1	23	4.80	353/1387	4.80	4.46	4.46	4.48	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	211/1387	4.96	4.69	4.73	4.76	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	55/1386	4.96	4.15	4.32	4.34	4.96
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.22	4.32	4.34	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	13	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	376/1193	4.40	3.76	4.02	4.00	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	0	0	8	4.67	282/1172	4.67	3.71	4.15	4.25	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	1	0	0	8	4.67	430/1182	4.67	3.98	4.35	4.49	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.16	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	20	4	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 800	****	4.05	4.06	4.19	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors					
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required for Majors 19	Graduate	0	Major	4	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 13						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 4	General	0	Under-grad	28	Non-major	24
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	7	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives	6	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P 0						
				I 0	Other	0				
				? 1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	7	17	4.38	752/1447	4.38	4.17	4.31	4.43	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	1	9	16	4.48	561/1447	4.48	4.17	4.27	4.31	4.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	20	4.59	469/1241	4.59	4.17	4.33	4.41	4.59
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	1	1	8	13	4.29	725/1402	4.29	4.09	4.24	4.34	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	2	2	6	6	9	3.72	1043/1358	3.72	3.97	4.11	4.15	3.72
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	5	6	11	4.27	599/1316	4.27	4.03	4.14	4.27	4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	4	5	18	4.43	568/1427	4.43	4.31	4.19	4.20	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	0	27	4.93	388/1447	4.93	4.61	4.69	4.72	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	4	10	10	4.25	634/1434	4.25	3.92	4.10	4.17	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	23	4.79	383/1387	4.79	4.46	4.46	4.48	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	27	4.96	211/1387	4.96	4.69	4.73	4.76	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	2	8	17	4.43	719/1386	4.43	4.15	4.32	4.34	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	6	20	4.61	549/1380	4.61	4.22	4.32	4.34	4.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	14	0	1	3	2	6	4.08	620/1193	4.08	3.76	4.02	4.00	4.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	2	0	4	1	5	3.58	966/1172	3.58	3.71	4.15	4.25	3.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	691/1182	4.33	3.98	4.35	4.49	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	2	2	2	6	4.00	864/1170	4.00	4.16	4.38	4.51	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	17	9	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 800	****	4.05	4.06	4.19	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.74	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.61	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.72	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors	25
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 1	B 15		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 6	C 6	General	0
84-150	12	3.00-3.49 12	D 0	Under-grad	29
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Non-major	24
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0		
			? 0		

Course-Section: ECON 600 1  
 Title Policy Consq:Econ Anal  
 Instructor: Brennan,Timothy  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 505  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	954/1447	4.17	4.17	4.31	4.46	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	1053/1447	4.00	4.17	4.27	4.30	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	541/1241	4.50	4.17	4.33	4.38	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	766/1402	4.25	4.09	4.24	4.29	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	3	2	3.71	1050/1358	3.71	3.97	4.11	4.26	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	497/1316	4.40	4.03	4.14	4.34	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	283/1427	4.67	4.31	4.19	4.25	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.61	4.69	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	1	3	2	3.71	1117/1434	3.71	3.92	4.10	4.21	3.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	798/1387	4.50	4.46	4.46	4.51	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.69	4.73	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	953/1386	4.17	4.15	4.32	4.43	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	815/1380	4.33	4.22	4.32	4.38	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	1188/1193	1.00	3.76	4.02	4.02	1.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	710/1172	4.00	3.71	4.15	4.32	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	723/1182	4.29	3.98	4.35	4.46	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	480/1170	4.67	4.16	4.38	4.52	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	0	6	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 800	****	4.05	4.06	4.10	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ECON 602 01  
 Title Macroeconomic Analysis  
 Instructor: Carpenter, Rober  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 506  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	179/1447	4.88	4.17	4.31	4.46	4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	401/1447	4.63	4.17	4.27	4.30	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	427/1241	4.63	4.17	4.33	4.38	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	645/1402	4.38	4.09	4.24	4.29	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	709/1358	4.14	3.97	4.11	4.26	4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	91/1316	4.88	4.03	4.14	4.34	4.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	775/1427	4.25	4.31	4.19	4.25	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	565/1447	4.88	4.61	4.69	4.74	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	190/1434	4.71	3.92	4.10	4.21	4.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	626/1387	4.63	4.46	4.46	4.51	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	604/1387	4.88	4.69	4.73	4.81	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	316/1386	4.75	4.15	4.32	4.43	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	339/1380	4.75	4.22	4.32	4.38	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	478/1193	4.25	3.76	4.02	4.02	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	377/1172	4.50	3.71	4.15	4.32	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	271/1182	4.83	3.98	4.35	4.46	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	480/1170	4.67	4.16	4.38	4.52	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	335/ 800	4.25	4.05	4.06	4.10	4.25

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ECON 612 01  
 Title Econometrics II  
 Instructor: Dickson,Lisa M  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 507  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	585/1447	4.50	4.17	4.31	4.46	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	766/1447	4.33	4.17	4.27	4.30	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	646/1241	4.42	4.17	4.33	4.38	4.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	402/1402	4.58	4.09	4.24	4.29	4.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	3	4	3	3.50	1170/1358	3.50	3.97	4.11	4.26	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	617/1316	4.25	4.03	4.14	4.34	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	2	6	4.08	925/1427	4.08	4.31	4.19	4.25	4.08
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	9	1	3.92	1400/1447	3.92	4.61	4.69	4.74	3.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	7	0	3.88	1003/1434	3.88	3.92	4.10	4.21	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	7	4	4.25	1039/1387	4.25	4.46	4.46	4.51	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	859/1387	4.75	4.69	4.73	4.81	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	7	4	4.25	879/1386	4.25	4.15	4.32	4.43	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	571/1380	4.58	4.22	4.32	4.38	4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	5	0	4	3.89	769/1193	3.89	3.76	4.02	4.02	3.89
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	710/1172	4.00	3.71	4.15	4.32	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	219/1182	4.89	3.98	4.35	4.46	4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	549/1170	4.56	4.16	4.38	4.52	4.56
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	195/ 800	4.50	4.05	4.06	4.10	4.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 6	Graduate 4	Major 1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 8	Non-major 11
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	8	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ECON 699 1  
 Title EPA Seminar  
 Instructor: Mitch,David F  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 508  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	201/1447	4.86	4.17	4.31	4.46	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	648/1447	4.43	4.17	4.27	4.30	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	541/1241	4.50	4.17	4.33	4.38	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	591/1402	4.43	4.09	4.24	4.29	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	345/1358	4.50	3.97	4.11	4.26	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	700/1316	4.17	4.03	4.14	4.34	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	739/1427	4.29	4.31	4.19	4.25	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	619/1447	4.86	4.61	4.69	4.74	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1188/1434	3.60	3.92	4.10	4.21	3.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	566/1387	4.67	4.46	4.46	4.51	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	982/1387	4.67	4.69	4.73	4.81	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	748/1386	4.40	4.15	4.32	4.43	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	759/1380	4.40	4.22	4.32	4.38	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	186/1193	4.67	3.76	4.02	4.02	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	323/1172	4.60	3.71	4.15	4.32	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	490/1182	4.60	3.98	4.35	4.46	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	657/1170	4.40	4.16	4.38	4.52	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	195/ 800	4.50	4.05	4.06	4.10	4.50

Frequency Distribution

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