Course-Section: ECON 101 01 University of Maryland Page 453 Title Prin Of Microeconomics Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010

Instructor: Mutter, Ryan

Enrollment: 42 Questionnaires: 28

# Spring 2010 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	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
. How many times was class cancelled		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		****/ 800	3.38	4.05	4.06	3.95	****
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •														

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_			
				?	4						

University of Maryland Course-Section: ECON 101 01 Title Prin Of Microecon-Hono

Baltimore County Spring 2010

Instructor: Carroll, Kathlee Enrollment: 9

Questionnaires: 9

Page 454 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	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		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		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		1337/1402		4.09	4.24	4.15	3.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	4		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		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		1150/1434		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	00	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		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		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	Ο	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		2	0	1	1	0	0		****/ 800	3.38	4.05	4.06	3.95	****

Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA			Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	2	<u>.</u>					
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	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				2	1						

Course-Section: ECON 101 02 University of Maryland Page 455 Title Prin Of Microeconomics Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010

Instructor: Thomas,Mark

Enrollment: 82 Questionnaires: 40

Spring 2010 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Job IRBR3029

	Questions				NR	NA	Fre	-	ncie	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera																
		ew insights,ski			4	0	2	2	10	7	15		1190/1447	3.98	4.17	4.31		3.86
		ctor make clear			4	0	3	4	5	11	13		1228/1447	3.98	4.17	4.27	4.30	3.75
		uestions reflec			3	0	4	6	12	6	9		1184/1241	3.94	4.17	4.33	4.25	3.27
		uations reflect			3	21	2	5	1				1330/1402		4.09	4.24	4.15	3.25
	_	-		what you learned	3	16	3	3	7	4			1274/1358		3.97	4.11	4.03	3.14
				o what you learned	3	25	1	2	3				1134/1316		4.03	4.14	3.99	3.50
		g system clearl		ined	3	0	2	5	13	9			1281/1427		4.31	4.19	4.24	3.43
	-	was class canc			3	0	0	1	0	27			1291/1447		4.61	4.69	4.68	4.19
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing 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 tl	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	3	6	4	23	4 31	1000/1387	4.38	4.46	4.46	4.46	4.31
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	2	5	7			1218/1387	4.57	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.36
	2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearl						0		9	7			1119/1386		4.15	4.32	4.32	3.91
		es contribute t			6 5	0	2	6	5	6			1153/1380			4.32	4.31	
				our understanding	6	5	0	3	10	9	7		884/1193					
		Discus																
				what you learned	28	0	1	2	2	3		3.58			3.71		3.95	3.58
		_	_	d to participate	28	0	0	1	3	5		3.83			3.98	4.35	4.18	3.83
		_		d open discussion	28	0	0	0	2	3	7					4.38	4.17	4.42
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		28	8	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	****/ 800	3.38	4.05	4.06	3.95	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	crib	utic	n									
Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra-							Re	ason	.s			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
00-27 28-55	3	3 0.00-0.99 1 A 10 4 1.00-1.99 0 B 11					quire	ea f	or M	ajor	s 1	.5	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	1
28-55 56-83	4 0	2.00-1.99	1	B 11 C 7		Ger	nera'	1				8	Under-q	rad 4	:0	Non-	major	39
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D 0	General						U	onder -g.	rau 1	: 0	11011-	ilia JUI	22	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	Б 0	Electives						7	#### - 1	Moona t	horo a	ro not	onous	rh	
						ъ⊥€	=CLT,	ves				/	respons				_	ìII
P 0													respons	es to D	e sign	ıııcan	ıL	

Other

0

0

3

I ?

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

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	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 1 1	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		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		1137/1386	4.09	4.15	4.73	4.71	3.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	2	1	2	6	11	11		1081/1380	4.06	4.13	4.32	4.32	3.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	14	6	3	1	5	5		1087/1193		3.76	4.02	3.99	3.00
5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	14	O	3		3	5	3.00	1007/1193	3.03	3.70	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		****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	37	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 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		****/ 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	2.	^	_	0	^	^	-	4 22	**** / ^ -	المناسبان المناسبات		4 50	4 50	الد الد الله الله
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	***

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

Credits I	Earned	Cum. GPA	Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reas					Type		Majors	
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	 А	10	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	-			
				?	0						

Prin Of Microeconomics

Instructor: Kaikai,Alpha

Enrollment: 45 Questionnaires: 37

Title

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 457 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	mie	ncie	c c		Tnat	ructor	Course	Dent	UMBC	T.exre1	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NΙΔ	1	2 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		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		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			1400/1447		4.61	4.69	4.68	3.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	2	10	8			1066/1434		3.92		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		****/ 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	3.00	****/ 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		****/ 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	***
mini di mania														
Field Work	2.5	0	0	0	0	0	_	F 00	****/ 20	****		4 40	2 02	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	35	0	-	0	0	0	2		****/ 38	****	~ ~ ~ ~	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	35	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 36 ****/ 28	****	****	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	35	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	, 20			4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	35	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 30 ****/ 27	****	****	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	35	1	0	U	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 27	***	****	4.43	3.73	***
Colf Dogod														
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	****	****	4.72	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	35	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.36	***
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	35	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.64	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	35	1	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****
J. Here there chough proceeds for all the scudelles	55	_	J	_	U	U	U	2.00	/ 13			1.01	1.01	

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

Credits Ea	redits Earned Cum. GPA			Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	 А	19	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	_		-	
				?	0						

University of Maryland

Prin Of Microeconomics

Baltimore County Spring 2010 Viauroux,Christ

Enrollment: 79 Questionnaires: 31

Title

Instructor:

Page 458 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_	Mean		Mean
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
T														
Lecture	0	0	0	1	2	0	20	4 50	702/1207	4 20	1 10	1 10	1 10	4 50
<ol> <li>Were the instructor's lectures well prepared</li> <li>Did the instructor seem interested in the subject</li> </ol>	0	0	-	1 1	2 1	8 5	20	4.52		4.38	4.46	4.46 4.73	4.46	4.52
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly		0	1 1	0	7	5 7	23 16	4.19	1107/1387 927/1386	4.57 4.09	4.69 4.15	4.73	4.71 4.32	4.55 4.19
	0	0	1	1	2	6	21	4.19	709/1380	4.09	4.15	4.32	4.32	4.19
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	2	2	1	9	16	4.45	555/1193	3.83	3.76	4.32	3.99	4.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	U	4	4	Т	9	10	4.1/	555/1193	3.03	3.70	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
T - 1														
Laboratory	0.0	-	0	0	_	0	_	F 00	**** / 100	ale ale ale ale	ale ale ale ale	4 24	4 10	****
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	28	1	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0 0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	1	0	0	0 1	1	2 1		****/ 186 ****/ 187	****	****	4.48	4.46	****
<ol> <li>Did the lab instructor provide assistance</li> <li>Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified</li> </ol>	28 29	1	0	0	U T	1	U T		****/ 168	****	****	4.33	4.37 4.29	****
5. Were requirements for tab reports clearly specified	29	1	U	U	U	1	U	4.00	/ 100			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		****/ 30	****	****	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	29	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 27	****	****	4.43	3.73	****
3. Dia conferences help you early out freta activities	ر ہے	_	J	J	J	U	_	5.00	/ 41			1.13	5.75	
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	****

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

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	1	 А	13	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5	С	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	-		_	
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Prin Of Microeconomics

Instructor: Coomber, William

Enrollment: 43 Questionnaires: 21

Title

# Spring 2010 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 459 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	S 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
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		1029/1447		4.17	4.27	4.30	4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	7	9	4.05	905/1241		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	****

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

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	 А	13	Required for Majors	 7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	-	_		
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 101 07 University of Maryland Page 460 Title Prin Of Microeconomics Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010

Instructor: Thomas,Mark

Enrollment: 42 Questionnaires: 39

# Spring 2010 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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	-			1106/1182					3.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	29	0	0	1	4	4			1070/1170					3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	29	4	1	0	3	2			****/ 800					****
Theo are	. o. n. c	. Di ~:	- w i b-	.+ 4 ~ -	_									
Frequ	וצוע	Lribi	ıcıoı	1										
0 11. 5 1 0 0 05				_					_					

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d 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	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 101 08 University of Maryland Page 461 Title Prin Of Microeconomics Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010

Instructor: Thomas,Mark

Enrollment: 42 Questionnaires: 20

# Spring 2010 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

		Frequencies					Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	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		1241/1387		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	****
Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	ason	.s			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 5		Re	 quir	ed f	or M	 Major	s 1	.0	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo		2

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d 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	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

University of Maryland

Prin Of Macroeconomics Baltimore County Dasgupta, Nandit

Spring 2010

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Enrollment: 42 Questionnaires: 24

Title

Instructor:

Page 462 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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		****/1316		4.03	4.14	3.99	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	1	1	19		120/1427		4.31	4.19	4.24	4.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	6	11	4		1405/1447		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		****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 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		****/ 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	****

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

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d 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	В	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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	_			
				?	1						

• 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

Ctudant	('Ollive')	Evaluation	Ougetion	n $n$ $n$ $n$ $n$

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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		****/ 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	****

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

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	27	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	1	-	-		
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 102 03 University of Maryland Page 464 Title Prin Of Macroeconomics Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010

Instructor: Goldfarb,M G

Enrollment: 40 Questionnaires: 15

Spring 2010 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Job IRBR3029

Questions				NR	NA		equer 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank		-	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean	
		Genera	1															
_	_	ew insights,ski			0	0	0	2	2	2	9	4.20				4.31	4.18	4.20
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	1	2	11	4.53	,		4.17	4.27	4.30	4.53
		estions reflec			0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	- ,	4.18	4.17	4.33	4.25	4.60
		ations reflect	-		0	5	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	,		4.09	4.24	4.15	4.60
	_	_		what you learned	0	1	0	2	0	3	9	4.36	,		3.97	4.11	4.03	4.36
		_		what you learned	1	10	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1316		4.03	4.14	3.99	5.00
		g system clearl		ined	0	0	0	1	1	1	12		337/1427	4.36	4.31	4.19	4.24	4.60
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	7	8		1060/1447	4.46	4.61	4.69	4.68	4.53
9. How wor	uld you g	ning effectiveness	0	1	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	516/1434	3.99	3.92	4.10	4.10	4.36		
			0	0														
	. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared							0	0	4	11		460/1387			4.46	4.46	
	. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject							0	2				982/1387		4.69	4.73	4.71	
		-		xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	1		8		663/1386		4.15	4.32	4.32	4.47
		es contribute t	-		0	0	0	0	0	_	13	4.87	. ,			4.32	4.31	4.87
5. Did aud	diovisual	l techniques en	hance yo	our understanding	0	10	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	652/1193	3.83	3.76	4.02	3.99	4.00
		Discus																
				what you learned	7			0	0	2			1171/1172			4.15		1.75
				d to participate	8	0	1	1	1	1			1060/1182		3.98	4.35	4.18	
3. Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair and	d open discussion	8	0	1	0	3	0	3	3.57	1043/1170	4.09	4.16	4.38	4.17	3.57
				Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	
00-27	00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 3							ed fo	or Ma			2	Graduat	 -	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 3			4422		J	., 01	_	_	OZ adda o	_		11000	-	ŭ
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 3		Ge	nera	1				8	Under-g	rad 1	.5	Non-	major	15	
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4 1	D 1		-		_				-	511 <b>201</b> 3.			2.011	, 0 =	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		E1	ecti	ves				3	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h
0244.	ŭ	3.30 1.30	ŭ	P 0			-001					-	respons				_	
				I 0		O+	her					0	10050110		91		-	
				? 2		0.0						-						

Course-Section: ECON 102 04 University of Maryland Page 465
Title Prin Of Macroeconomics Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010

Instructor: Takacs, Wendy E

Enrollment: 41
Questionnaires: 21

Spring 2010
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UME	C Level	Sect
<u>.</u>		Mean
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 4.3	1 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 4.2	7 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 4.3	3 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 4.2	4 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 4.1	1 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 4.1	4 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 4.1	9 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 4.6	9 4.68	4.84
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness $6$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$	0 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 4.4	6 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 4.7		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 4.3		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 4.3		3.39
		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 4.1	5 3.95	1.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 15 0 2 1 1 1 2.67 1166/1182 3.65 3.98 4.3		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 4.3		3.67
of the institution distribution and open distribution is the contract of the institution in the institution in the institution of the institution in the institution	,	3.07
Frequency Distribution		
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type	Majors	3
00-27 4 0.00-0.99 0 A 0 Required for Majors 11 Graduate 0 Ma	 ior	1
28-55 2 1.00-1.99 0 B 3	,	_
	n-major	20
84-150 3 3.00-3.49 4 D 0	3	-
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0 Electives 2 #### - Means there are r	ot enoug	ah
P 0 responses to be signific	_	
I 0 Other 0		
2 4		

Course-Section: ECON 102 05 University of Maryland Page 466 Title Prin Of Macroeconomics Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010

Instructor: Goldfarb,M G

Enrollment: 43 Questionnaires: 28

Spring 2010 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

Questions						NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	3 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
1 543		General	_		_	^	_	^	4	0	1 1	4 20	740/1447	4 11	4 17	4 21	4 10	4 20
		ew insights, skil			2	0	0	0	4	8	14	4.38	742/1447	4.11	4.17	4.31	4.18	4.38
		ctor make clear			1 1	0	0	0	4 3	5 8	18 16	4.52	521/1447 564/1241	4.16	4.17	4.27	4.30	4.52 4.48
		uestions reflect uations reflect			1	12	0	0	3	3	10	4.48	616/1402	4.18 4.25	4.17 4.09	4.33	4.25	4.48
				what you learned	1	3	2	1	3 4	2	9 15	4.40	727/1358	3.93	3.97	4.24	4.15	4.40
	_	-		o what you learned	1	3 16	0	0	2	3	15	4.13	527/1316	4.24	4.03	4.14	3.99	4.13
		signments contri s system clearly		-	2	Τρ	0	0	4	3	19	4.58	373/1427	4.24	4.03	4.14	4.24	4.58
		was class cance	_	illed	0	2	0	0	1	3 7	18	4.65	968/1447	4.46	4.61	4.19	4.68	4.65
	-			ching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	- T	8	10	4.17	733/1434		3.92	4.10	4.10	
9. HOW WOL	iia you g	grade the overal	ming effectiveness	4	U	U	U	0	0	10	4.1/	/33/1434	3.99	3.94	4.10	4.10	4.1/	
		Lecture																
1 Wara th	o inatri	actor's lectures	propared	4	0	0	0	1	4	19	4.75	429/1387	4.48	4.46	4.46	4.46	4.75	
		ctor seem intere		4	0	0	0	0	6	18	4.75	859/1387	4.73	4.69	4.73	4.71		
				explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	7	16	4.63	,	4.21	4.15	4.32	4.32	4.63
		es contribute to			4	0	0	0	2	6	16	4.58	571/1380	4.31	4.22	4.32	4.31	4.58
				your understanding	4	10	0	1	4	1	8	4.14	574/1193			4.02	3.99	4.14
J. Dia auc	ilovisuai	r ceciniiques ein	iance y	our understanding	-	10	U	_	-		O	1.11	3/4/11/3	3.03	3.70	4.02	3.99	1.11
		Discuss	zion															
1 Did cla	ass discu			what you learned	20	0	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	947/1172	3.36	3.71	4.15	3.95	3.63
				ed to participate	20	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	856/1182	3.65	3.98	4.35	4.18	4.00
				nd open discussion	20	0	0	2	0	3	3	3.88	951/1170	4.09	4.16	4.38	4.17	3.88
		echniques succes		a open arboablen	20	4	0	0	1	1	2		****/ 800	3.63	4.05	4.06	3.95	****
		10000				_	-	-	_	_	_		, , , , ,					
				Frequ	ency	Dist	tribu	ation	ı									
Credits Ea	Expected Grades				Rea	sons	3			Ту	pe			Majors				
00-27	00-27 6 0.00-0.99 1 A 11							ed fo	or Ma	ior	s 1	.5	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 6						J						5		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C 4		Gei	nera:	1				5	Under-g	rad 2	8	Non-	major	27
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D 0									J				3	
Grad.	0	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h		
														161				

Other

0

Р 0

1

1

I ?

Course-Section: ECON 102 06 University of Maryland Page 467 Title Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010

Prin Of Macroeconomics

Instructor: Takacs, Wendy E

Enrollment: 40 Questionnaires: 24

Spring 2010 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Job IRBR3029

	Questions				NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies	5 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank		Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera		. 1	•			_	_	_	_					4 0 4		
		w insights,ski			0	0	4	1	7	6	6		1364/1447			4.31	4.18	3.38
		ctor make clear			0	0	2	5	9	3	5		1383/1447		4.17	4.27	4.30	3.17
	_	estions reflec		_	0	0	4	4	6	6	4		1212/1241		4.17	4.33	4.25	3.08
		ations reflect			0	13	0 2	0 4	3	3	5	4.18	,		4.09	4.24	4.15	4.18
	_	_		what you learned	0	2	_	_	5	7 1			1237/1358		3.97	4.11	4.03	3.32
		_		o what you learned	0	16	0	0	2	_	5	4.38	,		4.03	4.14	3.99	4.38
		system clearl		ined	0	1	2	0	5	5	11		971/1427		4.31	4.19	4.24	4.00
		was class canc			0	1	0	0	1	7	15		1018/1447		4.61	4.69	4.68	4.61
9. How wo	ould you s	hing effectiveness	1	0	2	2	10	4	5	3.35	1290/1434	3.99	3.92	4.10	4.10	3.35		
		Lectur																
1. Were t	he instru	nrenared	1	0	1	1	4	Ω	a	4 00	1176/1387	4.48	4.46	4.46	4.46	4.00		
		n the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	20	4.79	799/1387		4.69	4.73	4.71	4.79		
		xplained clearly	1	0	0	6	6	5	6		1265/1386		4.15	4.32	4.32	3.48		
		es contribute t			0	1	3	3	5	3	9		1240/1380		4.22	4.32	4.31	
				our understanding	0	16	1	2	2	0	-		1041/1193				3.99	
J. Did ad	alovisaai	. ceciniiques en	nance y	our understanding	U	10		2	2	U	J	3.23	1041/1193	3.03	3.70	1.02	3.99	3.23
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute 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 a	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	d 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 th	e instruc	tor encourage	fair an	d 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 s	special te	chniques succe	ssful	-	16	6	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 800	3.63	4.05	4.06	3.95	****
				Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27	00-27 4 0.00-0.99 0 A 2							 ed f	or Ma		 s 1	2	 Graduat	 е	0	Majo	r	2
	28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 8										_			-	-	) ~		_
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 7		Ge	nera	1				1	Under-q	rad 2	24	Non-	major	22
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D 1													5	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Εl	ecti	ves				5	#### -	Means t	here a	are not	enone	h
0100.	Ü	3.33 1.30	-	P 0								-	respons				_	
				I O		O+	her					2	10050110	-5 00 <b>k</b>	51			
				? 4								_						

Prin Of Macroeconomics

Title 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

			Fre	equer	cie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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			4.50	607/1386	4.21		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					_	_		4 = 0	0.00 / 4.4.7.0					4
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		****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	2	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.37	****
1. Did the lab instituted provide assistance	22	2	O	O	_	O	O	3.00	/ 107			1.33	1.57	
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	1.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	2	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	2	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 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	***

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

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d 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	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sid	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	-	-		
				?	0						

N 102 08 University of Maryland

Prin Of Macroeconomics Baltimore County Cinyabuguma, Mat Spring 2010

Instructor: Cinyabuguma, Mat

Enrollment: 44
Questionnaires: 33

Title

Page 469 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies				Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
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														
<ol> <li>Were the instructor's lectures well prepared</li> </ol>	5	0	0	1	4		12		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		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		4.32	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	0.4	•	0	0	0	_	_	4 22	F01 /11F0	2 26	2 11	4 1 5	2 05	4 22
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	521/1172		3.71	4.15	3.95	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	25	0	0	-	1	3	4		****/1182	3.65	3.98	4.35	4.18	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	25 25	0 3	0	0	1	2 1	5		****/1170	4.09	4.16	4.38	4.17	****
4. Were special techniques successful	25	3	U	U	U	Τ	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		****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	0	0	0	0	2	0		****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	0	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.29	****
o. Here requirements for tax reports creating specified	32	Ü	Ū	Ū	-	_	ŭ	3.30	, 100			1.20	1.27	
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		****/ 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		****/ 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	****
0.16														
Self Paced	2.1	^	0	0	-	-	^	2 50	**** 2 3	****	****	4 50	4 50	****
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 ****/ 20	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31 31	0	0	1	0 1	1	0	3.00	, 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3 <u>1</u>	U	U	U	Т	Т	0	3.50	****/ 15			4.61	4.31	

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

Credits Ea	Credits Earned			Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		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	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-		_	
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 121 02 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County Prin Of Accounting I Instructor: Antlitz,Ronald

Spring 2010

Frequencies

Instructor

Page 470

JUN 28, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Enrollment:	45	
Questionnaires:	25	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				L T	equei	TOTES	>		TIID	LIUCLUI	Course	: Debr	ONIDC	телет	Sect			
		Question				NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera																
1 Did vor	ı dəin ne	w insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	4	5	5	4	7	3 20	1389/1447	3 89	4 17	4 31	4.18	3 20
				pected goals		0			9	6			1270/1447		4.17			3.64
		estions reflec		_		0							1175/1241					
	_	ations reflect		_		9			7				1264/1402			4.24		3.50
				what you learned		2							1182/1358					3.48
				o what you learned		8			4				1228/1316			4.14		3.24
		system clearl		-		0							1228/1427			4.19		3.60
		was class cance			2	0	0	0					436/1447			4.69	4.68	4.91
	-			hing effectiveness	8	1	0	5	2	6			1265/1434					3.44
				3														
		Lecture																
1. Were th	ne instru	ctor's lecture	s 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	e instruc	tor seem inter	ested i	n 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 led	cture mat	xplained 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	e lecture	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 aud	diovisual	techniques en	nance y	our understanding	2	5	2	1	5	5	5	3.56	943/1193	3.74	3.76	4.02	3.99	3.56
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned		0							1042/1172					
2. Were al	ll studen	ts actively en	courage	d 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	e instruc	tor encourage :	fair an	d open discussion	13	0			1	4	7	4.50	576/1170	4.08	4.16	4.38	4.17	4.50
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succe	ssful		14	4	1	0	2	0	4	3.86	537/ 800	4.08	4.05	4.06	3.95	3.86
				Freq	ıency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ty	pe			Majors	5
00-27	A 3		Re	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s 1	.6	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	3			
28-55	28-55 3 1.00-1.99 0 B 5																	
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C 7		Ge:	nera:	1				1	Under-g	rad 2	15	Non-	-major	22
84-150	84-150 0 3.00-3.49 5 D 0																	
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 4 F 0						El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	уh
P 0													respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				I 0		Ot:	her					0	_		_			
	? 3																	
	? 3																	

LIOII. ECON IZI US

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 Co	ourse 1	Evaluation	Questionnaire
------------	---------	------------	---------------

			Fre	miler	ncies			Tnet	ructor	Course	Dent	UMBC	T.exre1	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NΙΔ	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
׫«»«»»														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	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		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			1087/1386	3.81		4.32	4.32	3.95
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	5	1	3	4	9		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	3.71	4.15	4.18	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	4	3	8	4.27	757/1170	4.02	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		4.06	3.95	4.00
4. Weie special techniques successiul	,	O		U		3	-1	4.00	423/ 000	4.00	4.05	4.00	3.93	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		****/ 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	3.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	3	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	3	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 58	****	****	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	3	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 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 22	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	1	0	0	0	2		****/ 36	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 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		****/ 27	****	****	4.43	3.73	****
J. Did conferences help you carry out freid activities	1)	2	U	U	U	U	1	3.00	/ 2/			1.13	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	****

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

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-			
				?	1						

Prin Of Accounting I

Title Cole,Richard M.

Instructor:

Enrollment: 39 Questionnaires: 30

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 472 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Conoval														
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		1254/1447		4.17	4.27	4.30	3.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	3	10	7	8		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		1256/1402		4.09	4.24	4.15	3.52
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	2	6	6	10		931/1358		3.97	4.11	4.03	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	1	1	11	6	4		1145/1316		4.03	4.14	3.99	3.48
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	9	8	11		1013/1427		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		1015/1387		4.46	4.46	4.46	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	1	2	9	15		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		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		1204/1380		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		1154/1172		3.71	4.15	3.95	2.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	3	2	7	3	1		1151/1182		3.98	4.35	4.18	2.81
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	2	2	6	4	2		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		****/ 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	,	****	****	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	1 1	1 1	0	3.50		****	****	4.42	3.78 3.75	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	U	U	U	1	Т	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		****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	28	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	, -	****	****	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	****

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

Credits Ea	Credits Earned Cum.			Expected	Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	5 5	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	В	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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_		_	
				?	1						

Prin Of Accounting I

Instructor: Medicus,Suzann Enrollment: Questionnaires: 39

Title

49

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 473 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	cies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
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		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		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		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	3.71	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			4.25
1. Were special deciminates successful	20	_	O	O	2	5	,	1.25	3337 000	1.00	1.05	1.00	3.75	1.23
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		****/ 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	1.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	36	1	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	36	1	0	0	0	1	1	1.00	****/ 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														
	36	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	3.83	****
<ol> <li>Did field experience contribute to what you learned</li> <li>Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria</li> </ol>		0	1 0	0	1	1	1		****/ 36	****	****	4.49		***
	36 36	1	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 28	****	****	4.25	4.26 3.84	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	36	1	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 30	****	****	4.30	3.64	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations		1	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 27	****	****	4.30	3.73	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	36	1	U	U	U	Т	Τ	4.50	21			4.43	3./3	
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		****/ 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		****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	36	1	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 15	****	****		4.31	***
<u> </u>														

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

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	 А	8	Required for Majors	21	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3	-		_	
				?	0						

Prin Of Accounting I

Title 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

			Fre	eauei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	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		3.84		4.32	4.31	4.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	2	2	4	16		367/1193				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		4.20	366/ 800		4.05	4.06		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	****

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

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	2	 А	3	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-			
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 122 01 University of Maryland Baltimore County Title Prin Of Accounting II Instructor: McBride,Charles

JUN 28, 2010 Spring 2010 Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor

NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean

Page 475

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Enrollment:	45		
Questionnaires:	19	Student Course Evaluation	n Questionnaire

Questions

2. Did the 3. Did the 4. Did otl 5. Did ass 6. Did wr: 7. Was the 8. How man	e instru e exam q her eval signed r itten as e gradin ny times	signments contr g system clearl was class cand	lls from the extine extine extine to ibute to explant	spected goals expected goals expected goals what you learned to what you learn	ed		0 0 1 0 6 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0	2 0 0 0 1 0 0 0	1 1 0 1 0 1 1 0 2	9 6 7 6 5 9 11 10	7 12 12 11 13 7 9 8 3	4.58 4.63 4.56 4.58 4.46 4.42	1007/1447 457/1447 415/1241 437/1402 299/1358 434/1316 568/1427 1139/1447 942/1434	4.12 4.25 4.21 4.17 4.45 3.92 4.45 4.66 3.73	4.17 4.17 4.17 4.09 3.97 4.03 4.31 4.61 3.92	4.31 4.27 4.33 4.24 4.11 4.14 4.19 4.69 4.10	4.18 4.30 4.25 4.15 4.03 3.99 4.24 4.68 4.10	4.11 4.58 4.63 4.56 4.58 4.46 4.42 4.42 3.94
Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared  2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned  5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandin  Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  4. Were special techniques successful						0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 1 1	0 0 1 1 0	0 0 0 1 1 0 0 0	0 1 2 0 3 1 1 1	4 4 7 7 5	15 14 9 10 8 4 5 5 4	4.79 4.68 4.21 4.26 4.18 4.00 4.44 4.44 4.57	383/1387 958/1387 911/1386 877/1380 545/1193 710/1172 604/1182 624/1170 169/800	4.27 4.63 4.00 3.85 3.66 3.69 4.08 4.06 4.57	4.46 4.69 4.15 4.22 3.76 3.71 3.98 4.16 4.05	4.46 4.73 4.32 4.32 4.02 4.15 4.35 4.38 4.06	4.46 4.71 4.32 4.31 3.99 3.95 4.18 4.17 3.95	4.79 4.68 4.21 4.26 4.18 4.00 4.44 4.44 4.57
				Fr	equen	cy D	istr	ibu	tior	ı									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grad	es				Rea	ason	ıs			Тур	e			Majors	\$
00-27						[	 Requ Gene Elec Othe	eral etiv		or M	ajor		5 1 0	Graduate Under-gr #### - M response	ad 1 Jeans t		are not	major enoug	0 19 <sub>J</sub> h

Course-Section: ECON 122 02 University of Maryland Prin Of Accounting II Hardy, Timothy W Title

Baltimore County Spring 2010

Instructor: Enrollment: 34

Questionnaires: 25

Page 476 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

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

Questions						Fre	equer	ncies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
	Questions			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
1 Did 1101	anin nor	General insights,skil		thia anyman	0	0	0	0	7	5	13	4.24	889/1447	4.12	4.17	4.31	4.18	4.24
_	_	or make clear			0	0	0	3	5	2	15	4.24	938/1447		4.17	4.31	4.18	4.24
		estions reflect			0	0	1	4	2	4	14	4.10	905/1241		4.17	4.33	4.25	4.10
		ations reflect			0	6	1	3	3	2	10		1082/1402		4.09	4.24	4.15	3.89
		adings contribu			0	0	1	2	1	5	16	4.32	540/1358		3.97	4.11	4.03	4.32
	_	-		what you learned	0	3	2	3	6	4	7		1134/1316		4.03	4.14	3.99	3.50
		system clearly		-	0	0	0	0	2	5	18		301/1427		4.31	4.19	4.24	4.64
		vas class cance		-	1	0	0	0	0	3	21		565/1447		4.61	4.69	4.68	4.88
-				ng effectiveness	5	1	0	1	8	5	5		1103/1434			4.10		3.74
	7			5														
		Lecture	9															
1. Were the	e instruc	ctor's lectures	s well pr	epared	1	0	2	1	7	5	9	3.75	1262/1387	4.27	4.46	4.46	4.46	3.75
		or seem intere		-	1	0	1	0	1	6	16	4.50	1143/1387	4.63	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.50
		erial presented			1	0	1	2	7	3	11	3.88	1141/1386	4.00	4.15	4.32	4.32	3.88
		s contribute to			1	0	4	4	3	3	10		1258/1380		4.22		4.31	
5. Did audi	. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandir				1	5	4	1	5	1	8	3.42	991/1193	3.66	3.76	4.02	3.99	3.42
	Discussion																	
						•	_	•					4000/4400					
		ssions contribu			10	0	5	0	2	4	4		1078/1172		3.71		3.95	3.13
		s actively end			11	0	3	0	2	3	6		1042/1182		3.98	4.35	4.18	3.64
				open discussion	11	0 9	2	2 1	2 2	2	6		1043/1170		4.16	4.38	4.17	3.57 ****
4. were spe	ecial teo	chniques succes	SSIUI		11	9	2	Т	2	U	0	2.00	****/ 800	4.5/	4.05	4.06	3.95	* * * * *
		Self F	Paced															
1. Did self	-paced s	system contribu	ite to wh	at vou learned	22	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
		ions make clear			22	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
		cts with the in			22	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	***
4. Was the	feedback	x/tutoring by p	roctors :	helpful	22	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were the	ere enoug	gh proctors for	all the	students	22	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****
				Frequ	ıency	Dist	cribu	utior	1									
Credita Far	Condity Found Com CD3 Foundated Cond							Pos	sons				ጥና	pe			Majors	
	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade												ту					
00-27	00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 6			A 6		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s 1	.8	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	в 11														
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C 5		Ger	neral	L				4	Under-g	rad 2	25	Non-	major	25
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D 0														
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0				Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es		0 #### - Means there are n				re not	enoug	h				
P 0											respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt			
I 0				Oth	ner					0								
				? 1														

Course-Section: ECON 122 03 University of Maryland
Title Prin Of Accounting II Baltimore County
Instructor: Hardy, Timothy W Spring 2010

Enrollment:

23

University of Maryland Page 477
Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010
Spring 2010 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires:	16	Student (	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
-----------------	----	-----------	--------	------------	---------------

	Questions				NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
1 544		Genera w insights,ski			0	0	1	1	2	1	11	4.25	869/1447	4 10	4.17	4.31	4.18	4 05
		tor make clear			0	0	0	4	1	1	7		1161/1447	4.12 4.25	4.17	4.31	4.18	4.25 3.88
		estions reflec			0	0	0	4	1	4	7		1008/1241		4.17	4.33	4.25	3.88
		ations reflect			0	3	1	0	2	3	7	4.15	864/1402		4.09	4.24	4.15	4.15
				what you learned	0	2	0	0	3	2	9	4.43			3.97	4.11	4.03	4.43
	_	-		what you learned	1	3	1	2	0	3	6	3.92	,		4.03	4.14	3.99	3.92
		system clearly			0	0	0	1	1	3	-		459/1427		4.31	4.19	4.24	4.50
		was class cance		IIICa	0	0	0	0	0	2	14		565/1447		4.61	4.69	4.68	4.88
	-			ning effectiveness	3	0	1	1	4	3	4		1181/1434					3.62
J. How wou	ira you g	rade the overa	II ccac.	iiiig circciveness	3	Ü	-	_	-	3	-	3.02	1101/1101	3.73	3.72	1.10	1.10	3.02
1. Were th	ne instru	ctor's lecture	swell:	prepared	0	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	990/1387	4.27	4.46	4.46	4.46	4.31
		instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	2	3	11		1090/1387		4.69	4.73	4.71	4.56
	ecture material presented and explained clearly					0	0	1	4	5	5		1103/1386		4.15	4.32	4.32	3.93
	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	1	2	3	2	8		1118/1380		4.22	4.32	4.31	3.88
				our understanding	2	0	2	3	2	3	4		1035/1193				3.99	3.29
		1																
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ss discu	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	13	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/1172	3.69	3.71	4.15	3.95	****
				d to participate	13	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/1182	4.08	3.98	4.35	4.18	****
3. Did the	instruc	tor encourage :	fair and	d open discussion	13	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/1170	4.06	4.16	4.38	4.17	****
4. Were sp	ecial te	chniques succe	ssful	_	13	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 800	4.57	4.05	4.06	3.95	****
_		_																
				Freq	uency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	rned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	 ajor	s 1	.3	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	в 7			-			-								
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C 4		Ge	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.6	Non-	major	16
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D 0													-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives							0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
				P 0	210001105								respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0	Other				0									
				? 1	OCHEL													

Course-Section: ECON 122 04 University of Maryland Title Prin Of Accounting II Baltimore County Instructor: McBride, Charles Spring 2010

Enrollment:

Grad.

Questionnaires: 26

43

Questions

3.50-4.00

University of Maryland Page 478
Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010
Spring 2010 Job IRBR3029

0

0

Instructor

Rank

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Mean Mean Mean Mean

### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

	Ouestionnaire

Frequencies

NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean

												rican		rican	rican	rican	rican	rican
		General	 L															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,skil	lls fro	m 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 th	e instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	pected 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	e exam qu	estions reflect	the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	2	3	6	15	4.31	743/1241	4.21	4.17	4.33	4.25	4.31
4. Did ot	her evalu	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	2	0	2	4	8	10	4.08	923/1402	4.17	4.09	4.24	4.15	4.08
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contribu	ite 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 wr	itten ass	signments contri	bute t	o 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	e grading	g system clearly	/ expla	ined	0	0	1	1	3	7	14	4.23	799/1427	4.45	4.31	4.19	4.24	4.23
8. How man	ny times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	14	12	4.46	1109/1447	4.66	4.61	4.69	4.68	4.46
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overal	ll teac	hing 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 t			2	0	1	0	5	5	13		1079/1387				4.46	4.21		
	. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject . Was lecture material presented and explained clear.						0	0	2	1	21	4.79	799/1387	4.63	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.79
					2	0	1	1	4	9	9		1047/1386	4.00	4.15	4.32	4.32	4.00
		es contribute to			2	0	3	1	4	6	10		1156/1380		4.22	4.32	4.31	
5. Did au	diovisual	l techniques enh	nance y	our understanding	3	3	4	0	3	3	10	3.75	843/1193	3.66	3.76	4.02	3.99	3.75
		Discuss																
1 544 -1					1 2	0	0	2	2	1	_	2 00	782/1172	2 (0	2 71	4 1 5	2 05	2 00
				what you learned d to participate	13	0	0	2 1	2	4	5 6	3.92 4.15	- ,	3.69 4.08	3.71 3.98	4.15 4.35	3.95 4.18	3.92 4.15
		_	_		13 13	0	0	1		6	5	4.15	822/1170	4.08	4.16	4.35	4.18	4.15
		_		d open discussion	13	9	1	U	1	1	5 1			4.06	4.16		3.95	4.15 ****
4. were s	peciai te	echniques succes	SSLUI		13	9	Т	U	1	Т	Τ	3.25	***/ 800	4.5/	4.05	4.06	3.95	
				Frequ	ienci	n Dist	trib	ıt i o	n									
	rrequ	aciicy	DIS	CIID	acic	11												
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad								Re	ason	ıs			Тур	e			Majors	;
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 10		Red	quir	ed f	or M	Iajor	s 2	13	Graduate	9	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	в 10														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C 3		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-gr	ad 2	16	Non-	major	26
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	D 0														

Electives

Other

0

0

0

0

Ρ

Ι

Course-Section: ECON 301 01

University of Maryland

Intermed Accounting I

McBride,Charles

Enrollment: 44 Questionnaires: 29

Title

Instructor:

Baltimore County Spring 2010

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 479 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	quer	cies	3		Tnst	tructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean			Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
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		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		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		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				4.02		3.83
J. Did addiovisual techniques emiance your understanding	J	2	U	J	5	,	,	3.03	750/1155	3.03	3.70	1.02	4.05	3.03
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		,	****	****	4.48	4.36	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.02	****
		_	-	-	-	-	_		,					
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 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		****/ 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		****/ 36	****	****	4.25	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	28	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 28	****	****	4.52	4.46	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	28	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 30	****	****	4.32	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	28	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 27	****	****	4.43	4.50	***
5. Did conferences help you carry out freid accivities	40	U	U	U	U	U		3.00	/ 2/			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

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	 А	13	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 302 01 University of Maryland Title Intermed Accounting II Baltimore County

Baltimore County Spring 2010 Page 480

JUN 28, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 38
Questionnaires: 19
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Stmartin, Jeanne

Instructor:

84-150

Grad.

8

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

2

D

Ρ

I

0

0

0

0

1

	Frequencies					Tnst	ructor	Course	Dept	TIMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	Λ	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	U T	18	5.00	1/1387	4.86	4.46	4.40	4.44	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.72	353/1386	4.68	4.09	4.73	4.71	4.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	17	4.89	181/1380	4.85	4.13	4.32	4.32	4.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	8	0	2	2	1	٦,	3.63	916/1193	4.03	3.76	4.02	4.05	3.63
J. Did addiovibadi ecciniiques ciniance your understanding	3	O	O	2	2	_	3	3.03	210/1123	1.05	3.70	1.02	1.05	3.03
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1172		3.71	4.15	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	0	4		****/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		****/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	***
Frequ	ıency	Dist	ribu	atior	ı									
				_					_					
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ту]	pe 			Majors	
00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 4		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s 1	4	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	3
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 6														
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 5 C 5		Gei	nera!	L				0	Under-g	rad 1	9	Non-	major	16

Electives

Other

1

0

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

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

			Fre	muar	cies			Inat	ructor	Course	Dent	UMBC	Levral	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NΑ	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
׫«»«»»														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	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	•	0	0	•	-	2	1.0	4 55	200/1205	1 06	1 16	4 46		4 55
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		4.64	470/1386	4.68		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		****/ 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		****/ 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		****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 58	****	****	4.41	2.87	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 65	****	****	4.42	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 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		****/ 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	****	****	4.72	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 31	****	****	4.64	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	1.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 15	****	****	4.61	5.00	****
5. Here shere changin proceeds for all the beautiful	21	J	J	J	J	J	_	3.00	, 13			1.01	3.00	

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

Credits	lits Earned Cum. GPA			Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	12	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 311 01

Interm Microecon Analy

Title Bradley,Michael Instructor:

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 10

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 482 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Quest:	ionna:	ire
---------	--------	------------	--------	--------	-----

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	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	Λ	2 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		1158/1182		3.71	4.15	4.42	2.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion		0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	864/1170		4.16	4.38	4.49	4.00
3. Did the institution encourage rail and open discussion	6	U	U	_	U	_	4	1.00	004/11/0	3.50	1.10	1.50	1.19	1.00

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	0	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	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 a	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sign	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-	_		
				2	0						

Course-Section: ECON 311 02

ECON 311 02 University of Maryland Interm Microecon Analy Baltimore County

I 0

Title Interm Microecon A
Instructor: Coates, Dennis C

Enrollment: 29
Questionnaires: 12

Spring 2010

Page 483 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Eval	ation Questionnaire
---------------------	---------------------

							Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions				NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 544		Genera		+ 10	0	0	0	1	2	2	_	1 17	954/1447	3.59	4 17	4.31	4 20	1 17
		w insights,ski tor make clear			0	0	0	1	2 4	2	6 6	4.17	938/1447	3.59	$4.17 \\ 4.17$	4.27	4.32	4.17 4.17
		estions reflec			0	0	2	1	1	4	4		1121/1241		4.17	4.33	4.23	3.58
		ations reflect			0	7	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	827/1402		4.09	4.24	4.24	4.20
				what you learned	0	5	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	799/1358		3.97	4.11	4.10	4.00
				o what you learned	0	9	0	0	1	1	1		812/1316		4.03	4.14	4.13	4.00
		system clearly		-	1	1	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	716/1427	3.94	4.31	4.19	4.15	4.30
		was class cance		illea	0	0	0	0	0	1	-	4.92	- ,		4.61		4.65	4.92
	-			hing effectiveness	3	1	0	0	2	4	2.	4.00	849/1434		3.92	4.10	4.09	4.00
J. 110W W	ouid you g	rade the overa	ii ceac	ming effectiveness	J		U	U	2	-	2	1.00	049/1434	3.49	3.72	1.10	4.00	1.00
1. Were	the instru	ctor's lecture	prepared	0	0	0	0	3	1	8	4.42	891/1387	4.13	4.46	4.46	4.44	4.42	
2. Did tl	he instruc	n 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 le	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clear							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	4	1	7	4.25	887/1380	3.58	4.22	4.32	4.32	4.25
5. Did a	udiovisual	techniques en	nance y	our understanding	0	8	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	843/1193	3.25	3.76	4.02	4.05	3.75
		Discus	aion															
1 Did a	lace diego			what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	619/1172	2.97	3.71	4.15	4.24	4.20
				d to participate	7	0	0	0	2	0	3				3.98	4.35	4.42	4.20
				d open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60			4.16	4.38	4.49	4.60
		chniques succe		a open discussion	7	3	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 800	****	4.05	4.06	4.12	****
i. were i	opeciai ce	ciniiques succe	SDIGI		,	3	Ü	Ü	-	Ü	_	1.00	, 600		1.05	1.00	1.12	
		Labora	tory															
				ground information		0	0	1	1	0	0		****/ 192		****	4.34	4.20	****
3. Were	necessary	materials avai	lable f	or lab activities	10	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.36	****
				Frequ	lency	Dist	trib	ation	n									
		-	-															
Credits 1	Expected Grades		Reasons Type						pe			Majors	3					
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Red	guire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	 s	9	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В 4						J						5		
56-83						Ger	nera:	L				0	Under-g	rad 1	2	Non-	-major	9
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 1 D 0													J				-	
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0						Ele	ecti	<i>r</i> es				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
												•	-		_			

Other

0

Course-Section: ECON 311 03

Interm Microecon Analy

Title 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

	Frequencies					Instructor		ructor	Course Dept		UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	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	2	2	1	Λ	Λ	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 T	0	2		1118/1182	3.41	3.71	4.15	4.42	3.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	3	1	1	2		1113/1170	3.96	4.16	4.38	4.49	3.29
4. Were special techniques successful	12	6	1	0	U	U	٥		-,	****	4.05	4.06	4.12	****
1. Here special techniques successful	14	U	_	U	U	U	U	1.00	, 500		1.05	1.00	7.12	

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	16
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				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

	Frequencies					Inst	tructor	Course Dept		UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	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	- ,		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	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l 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	В	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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 312 02 University of Maryland Baltimore County

Title Interm Macroecon Analy

Instructor: Rose,Morgan J Enrollment: 34 Questionnaires: 21

Spring 2010 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 486

JUN 28, 2010

Job IRBR3029

		Frequencies				Instructor		Course Dept		UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	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		****/1172		3.71	4.15	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	1	0	1	0	2		****/1182		3.98	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	1	0	1	0	2		****/1170		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	****
Freq	encv	Dist	rib	ıt.i or	n									

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				?	2						

Course-Section: ECON 312 03

Interm Macroecon Analy

Instructor: Rose, Morgan J

Enrollment: 32
Questionnaires: 24

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010 Page 487 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

					equer			_		tructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
Questions		NR	NA 	1	2	3	4 	5 	Mean	Rank 	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	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	3	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 lear	rned	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 le	earned	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 effective	veness	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	Ē	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 clear	arly	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 understand	nding	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 lear	rned	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 particip	pate	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 discus	ssion	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 inform	mation	22	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.20	****
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced the	neme	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 learn	ned	22	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criter	ria	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 lear	rned	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	****
	Freque	ency	Dist	ribu	ıtior	ı									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected G	Grades						c			т.	ne			Majors	•
creares garned cum Gra Expected G							o 			Ту 	 ħg				
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 6 28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 11			Rec	quire	ed fo	or M	ajor	s 1	.9	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	9
56-83 7 2.00-2.99 3 C 4	_		~	7						1	1 0				15
84-150 4 3.00-3.49 5 D 0	=		Ger	neral	-				0	Under-g	rad 2	4	Non-	major	15

Other

1

0

0

2

P I Course-Section: ECON 320 01

Quant Mthds:Management

Instructor: Palmateer, Jason

Enrollment: 42
Questionnaires: 33

Title

### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 488 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Frequencies		Instructor		Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect			
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
׫«» « « « « « « « « « « « « « « « « « «														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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		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	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4 E0	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.26	****
<u> </u>	31 31	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.20	****
<ol> <li>Were you provided with adequate background information</li> <li>Were necessary materials available for lab activities</li> </ol>	31	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 186	****	****	4.34	4.20	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 187	****	****	4.40	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 168	****	****	4.33	4.11	****
J. Were requirements for lab reports creatry specified	31	U	U	U	U	_	1	1.50	/ 100			1.20	1.02	
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		****/ 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							_	- 0-				4 56	= 00	
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: Palm
Enrollment: 42
Questionnaires: 33

Quant Mthds:Management
Palmateer,Jason

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010 Page 488 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits	s Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reaso					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	В	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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-			
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 374 01 University of Maryland
Title Fund Financial Mgmt Baltimore County
Instructor: Lamdin,Douglas Spring 2010

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 17

37

University of Maryland Page 489
Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010
Spring 2010 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	cructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	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
Frequ	iency	Dist	rib	ution	า									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons	Туре			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	В	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	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: ECON 374 02 University of Maryland Title Fund Financial Mgmt

Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 490

JUN 28, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: Rose,Morgan J Enrollment: 29

Questionnaires: 19

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Questions					NR	NA	Fr 1	-	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
1 Did vou	a dain ne	Genera w insights,skil		this course	0	0	0	0	1	Ω	10	4.47	626/1447	4.47	4.17	4.31	4.32	4.47
		tor make clear			1	0	0	0	3	3	12	4.50	532/1447	4.49	4.17	4.27	4.23	4.50
		estions reflect	_	9	0	0	0	1	2	5	11	4.37	692/1241	4.48	4.17	4.33	4.33	4.37
		ations reflect			0	1	0	0	1	9	8	4.39	635/1402		4.09	4.24	4.24	4.39
				hat you learned	0	3	0	0	4	9	3	3.94			3.97	4.11	4.10	3.94
	_	_		what you learned	0	4	0	0	3	8	4	4.07			4.03	4.14	4.13	4.07
		system clearly			0	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	265/1427	4.55	4.31	4.19	4.15	4.68
		was class cance		nea	1	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	,		4.61	4.69	4.65	4.83
				ing effectiveness	3	0	0	0	4	8	4	4.00	849/1434		3.92	4.10	4.09	4.00
y. 110	.14 704 3	, rado orio overa.	00001	ing cricocryonobb		Ū	ŭ	ŭ	-	Ü	-	1.00	015/1101	11.15	3.72	1.10	1.05	1.00
		Lecture	Э															
1. Were th	ne instru	ctor's lecture:	s well p	repared	1	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	398/1387	4.71	4.46	4.46	4.44	4.78
2. Did the	e instruc	tor seem intere	ested 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 led	ture mat	erial presented	d and ex	plained 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	. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	604/1380	4.48	4.22	4.32	4.32	4.56
5. Did aud	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandin					7	0	2	3	2	2	3.44	983/1193	3.68	3.76	4.02	4.05	3.44
		Discus																
				hat you learned	13	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	,		3.71	4.15	4.24	4.17
				to participate	14	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	638/1182		3.98	4.35	4.42	4.40
				open discussion	14	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	798/1170		4.16	4.38	4.49	4.20
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succes	ssful		14	1	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	****/ 800	***	4.05	4.06	4.12	***
		Labora	torv															
2. Were vo	ou provid		-	round information	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.20	****
													,					
				Freq	uency	/ Dis	strib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	rned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	2			Ty	ne			Majors	
										, 								
00-27	00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 8						equir	ed f	or Ma	jor	s 1	.3	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	1
28-55	28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 4						-			-						_		
56-83	56-83 2 2.00-2.99 3 C 5					Ge	enera	1				2	Under-g	rad 1	9	Non-	major	18
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	D 0														
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0						El	ecti	ves				2	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	ŗh
P 0													respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
	I 0						her					0						
				? 0														

Course-Section: ECON 387 01

Econ Devel Latin Amer Ba

Title Econ Devel Latin 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	Questionn	aire
---------	--------	------------	-----------	------

Ouestions							Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	<u>-</u>	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	•		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rar	ık	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 General																	
1. Did vo	u gain ne	ew insights,skil		ourse	1	0	0	0	3	7	15	4.48	612/1	447	4.48	4.17	4.31	4.32	4.48
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	1	2	9	13	4.36	728/1		4.36	4.17	4.27	4.23	4.36
		estions reflect			1	0	1	0	1	6	17	4.52	523/1		4.52	4.17	4.33	4.33	4.52
		ations reflect			1	2	1	1	3	10	8	4.00	976/1	1402	4.00	4.09	4.24	4.24	4.00
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contribu	ite to what you	learned	1	0	0	3	5	9	8	3.88	931/1	L358	3.88	3.97	4.11	4.10	3.88
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contri	bute to what y	ou learned	1	0	0	2	2	10	11	4.20	671/1	L316	4.20	4.03	4.14	4.13	4.20
7. Was th	e grading	system clearly	explained		1	0	1	0	3	8	13	4.28	739/1	L427	4.28	4.31	4.19	4.15	4.28
8. How man	ny times	was class cance	elled		1	1	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	436/1	L447	4.92	4.61	4.69	4.65	4.92
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overal	l teaching eff	ectiveness	4	1	0	0	4	8	9	4.24	657/1	L434	4.24	3.92	4.10	4.09	4.24
		Lecture																	
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lectures	well prepared		1	0	0	1	1	3	20	4.68	551/1	L387	4.68	4.46	4.46	4.44	4.68
		ctor seem intere			1	0	0	1	2	0	22	4.72			4.72	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.72
		erial presented			1	0	0	1	3	7	14	4.36			4.36	4.15	4.32	4.30	4.36
		es contribute to			1	0	0	1	2	4	18		593/1			4.22	4.32	4.32	4.56
	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi					12	3	1	3	2	2				2.91		4.02	4.05	2.91
	Discussion																		
1 Did al	acc dica	ussions contribu		learned	18	0	1	2	1	2	2	3 25	1058/1	172	3.25	3.71	4.15	4.24	3.25
		its actively end	-		18	0	1	1	1	1	_		1011/1		3.75	3.98	4.35	4.42	3.75
		ctor encourage f		-	18	0	1	0	4	0			1070/1		3.50	4.16	4.38	4.49	3.50
		echniques succes		IBC UBBION	18	4	2	0	0	1			****/		****	4.05	4.06	4.12	****
1 511.1		Laborat			0.5	0	-	0	0	0	•	1 00	ale ale ale ale /	100	de de de de	****	1 2 1	1 06	ale ale ale ale
1. Dia th	e lab inc	crease understan	ding of the ma	terial	25	0	1	0	0	0	U	1.00	****/	189	****	****	4.34	4.26	****
		Seminar																	
1. Were a	ssigned t	copics relevant	to the announce	ed theme	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	66	****	****	4.58	4.17	****
				Frequ	ıency	Dis	tribu	utior	1										
Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad							Rea	ason	s				Тур	oe .			Majors	}
																			1.0
	00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 5 28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 12					Red	quire	ed fo	or M	ajor	s 1	ь	Grad	uate	9	0	Majo	r	12
28-55 56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3 C			Cor	nera					1	IIndo	er-gi	ad a	16	Non	major	14
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	5 D			Gel	иста.	L				_	UIIGE	=r -91	au 2	.0	NOII-	iiia jul	T.4
	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 4 F 0					, רק	ectiv	700				3	####	, _ t	leane +	here a	re not	enous	rh
P 0						E16	CCCI	(CD				J	#### - Means there are no responses to be significa				111		
	P 0 I 0					O+1	her					0	1021	0110	-5 CO L	c bigii	ıııcaı		
			?			001						J							
			•	U															

Course-Section: ECON 405 01 University of Maryland
Title Benefit-Cost Evaluatio Baltimore County

Instructor: Farrow, Robert S

Enrollment: 38
Questionnaires: 27

lltimore County Spring 2010 Page 492 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student C	ourse Ev	raluation	Questionn	aire
-----------	----------	-----------	-----------	------

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	_								005/4445	4 4 4 4		4 04		4 4 4 4
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	Τ	0	Τ	0	4	9	12	4.19	927/1447		4.17	4.31	4.43	4.19
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	4	12	8		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		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		4.09	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	1	0	Λ	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
· ·		0	0	1	6	_	7		,					
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	•	•	1	•	10	•		1087/1386	3.96	4.15	4.32	4.34	3.96
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	Ţ	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		****/ 800	****	4.05	4.06	4.19	****
<u></u>		-	_	J	_		-	3.07	, 300		2.00	1.00	>	
From	onar	Diat	rib	1+ 1 01	_									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	GPA Expected Grades			Reasons		Type			
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	В	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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 408 01

Managerial Economics

Title Dickson,Lisa M

Instructor:

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 10

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 493 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

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

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	Λ	0	0	1	1	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	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Reasons	Reasons Type					
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	3	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant		
				I	0	Other						
				?	0							

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

32

Enrollment:

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Frequencies

Instructor

Page 494 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Ouestionnaires:	17	Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

							rr	eque	пстег	3		Inst	ructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	телет	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did you	u gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m 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	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected 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	e exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	4	0	6	7	3.94	962/1241	3.94	4.17	4.33	4.41	3.94
4. Did otl	her eval	uations reflect	the exp	pected goals	0	3	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	494/1402	4.50	4.09	4.24	4.34	4.50
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contrib	ute 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 wr	itten as:	signments contr	ibute 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	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	1	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	200/1427	4.75	4.31	4.19	4.20	4.75
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	9	8	4.47	1101/1447	4.47	4.61	4.69	4.72	4.47
				ning effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	611/1434	4.27	3.92	4.10	4.17	4.27
		Lectur	e															
1. Were tl	he instr	uctor's lecture		prepared	1	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	626/1387	4.63	4.46	4.46	4.48	4.63
		ctor seem inter		-	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	,		4.69	4.73	4.76	4.94
	as lecture material presented and explained clear					0	0	0	3	2	11	4.50	,		4.15	4.32	4.34	4.50
	id the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	434/1380		4.22	4.32	4.34	4.69
	old the lectures contribute to what you learned oid audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi					11	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/1193		3.76	4.02	4.00	****
		-	-	3														
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute 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 a	ll stude	nts actively en	courage	d 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	e instru	ctor encourage	fair and	d 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 s	pecial to	echniques succe	ssful		9	5	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 800	****	4.05	4.06	4.19	****
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s	8	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	6
	8-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 5					<b>a</b> -		,				1	TT	1 1	7	37		11
56-83						Ge	nera	T				1	Under-g	raa 1	.7	Non-	-major	11
84-150						m 3						4	- пппп -	Maana +	.b			la
Grad.	U	3.50-4.00	۷	P 0		ъT	ecti <sup>.</sup>	ves				4	#### - 1				_	JTT.
						O+.	her					0	respons	es to t	e sign	ıııcan	IL	
	P 0					Ut.	ner.					U						

Course-Section: ECON 421 01 University of Maryland Page 495
Title Intro To Econometrics Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010

Instructor: Ma,Bing
Enrollment: 41
Questionnaires: 29

41

Spring 2010
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

			Fr	equei	ncies	;		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you 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		1018/1386		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	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	12	1	2	2	2	5	3.67	895/1193		3.76	4.02		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
Frequ	lency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Farned Cum GDA Fynested Grades	-			Da	aanna				Тъл				Majors	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		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	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	=			
				2	1						

Course-Section: ECON 422 01 University of Maryland Page 496 Title Topics In Econometrics Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010

Spring 2010

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: Yuan,Chunming Enrollment: 14

Questionnaires: 12 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

? 0

		Question	3		NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	_															
		w insights,ski			0	0	0	0	4	3	5		1017/1447		4.17	4.31	4.43	4.08
		tor make clear			0	0	0	1	3	3	5		1053/1447	4.00	4.17	4.27	4.31	4.00
		estions reflect			0	3	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	496/1241	4.56	4.17	4.33	4.41	4.56
		ations reflect			0	1	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	555/1402		4.09	4.24	4.34	4.45
	_	-		what you learned	0	2	1	2	2	Τ	4		1170/1358	3.50	3.97	4.11	4.15	3.50
		-		o what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	681/1316	4.18	4.03	4.14	4.27	4.18
		system clearly	_	ined	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	361/1427	4.58	4.31	4.19	4.20	4.58
-		was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	673/1447	4.83	4.61	4.69	4.72	4.83
9. How woul	.d you gi	rade the overa.	II teac	hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	802/1434	4.09	3.92	4.10	4.17	4.09
		T	_															
11		Lecture		1	0	•	0	0	_	•	4 50	485 /1205	4 50	1 16	1 16	4 40	4 50	
	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared Did the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	475/1387		4.46	4.46	4.48	4.73
						0	0	0	0	Ţ	10	4.91	528/1387	4.91	4.69	4.73	4.76	4.91
					1	0	0	0	5	2	4		1128/1386		4.15	4.32	4.34	3.91
		s contribute to			1	0	0	0	2 1	4 5	5 5	4.27	868/1380		4.22	4.32	4.34	4.27
5. Dia audi	ovisuai	techniques en	nance y	our understanding	1	U	U	U	Τ	5	5	4.36	401/1193	4.36	3.76	4.02	4.00	4.36
		Discus																
1 544 -1				what you learned	1.0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2 00	****/1172	****	2 71	4 1 5	4.25	****
				d to participate	10 10	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/1182		3.71	4.15	4.49	****
		-	_	d to participate d open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	2	0		****/1170		4.16	4.35	4.49	****
3. Did the	Instruc	cor encourage .	Lair an	a open aiscussion	10	U	U	U	U	4	U	4.00	***/11/0	* * * *	4.10	4.38	4.51	
				Frequ	iency	Dist	cribu	utior	1									
Credits Ear	ned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	sons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	}
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 8		Rec	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	 s	6	Graduat	 е	0	Majo	r	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 3														
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C 0		Ger	nera:	L				0	Under-g	rad 1	.2	Non-	major	7
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				6	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ıh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	t	
				I 0		Oth	ner					0						

Course-Section: ECON 441 01

American Economic Hist

Title Instructor: Lord, William A

Enrollment: 40 Questionnaires: 22 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 497 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Questions						ncies 3	5 4	Е		tructor	Course	_		Level	
	Questions		NK	NA	1	2		-4 	5	Mean	Rank	mean	mean	mean	Mean	mean
	General															
1. Did you gain new		om 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 instructo			1	0	0	1	7	4	9		1053/1447	4.00	4.17	4.27	4.31	4.00
3. Did the exam ques	stions 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 evaluat	tions reflect the e	xpected 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 read	dings 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 assig	gnments 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 s	system clearly expl	ained	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 wa			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 gra	ade the overall tea	ching 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 instruct	cor'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 instructo	or 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 mater	rial 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 t	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 discuss	sions 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			16	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1078/1182	3.50	3.98	4.35	4.49	3.50
3. Did the instructo		nd open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	4	2		710/1170	4.33	4.16	4.38	4.51	4.33
4. Were special tech	nniques successful		16	3	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 800	****	4.05	4.06	4.19	****
	Laboratory															
2. Were you provided	d with adequate bac	kground information	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.61	****
	Field Work															
1. Did field experie	ence contribute to	what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	4.68	****
2. Did you clearly u	understand your eva	luation criteria	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.42	****
	Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced sy	ystem contribute to	what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.80	****
2. Did study question	ons make clear the	expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	5.00	****
<ol><li>Were your contact</li></ol>			21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.60	****
4. Was the feedback			21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 20	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
5. Were there enough	n proctors for all	the students	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	5.00	****
		Frequ	iency	Dist	tribu	utio	n									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Tv	pe			Maiors	

Credits E	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	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				2	1						

Course-Section: ECON 453 01 University of Mary Title Household Economics Baltimore Count Instructor: Lord, William A Spring 2010

University of Maryland Page 498
Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010
Spring 2010 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	78					
Questionnaires:	40		Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

?

1

		Ouestions	,		MD	NA	Fre	eque 2	ncie 3	s 1	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank		Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Questions 	; 									Mean	Railk	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	_															
1. Did	you gain :	new insights,skil	ls from	this course	3	0	4	3	10	15	5	3.38	1364/1447	3.38	4.17	4.31	4.43	3.38
		uctor make clear			3	0	1	3	11	16	6	3.62	1278/1447	3.62	4.17	4.27	4.31	3.62
		questions reflect			3	0	2	4	7	17	7	3.62	1109/1241		4.17	4.33	4.41	3.62
		luations reflect			3	18	4	2	6	3	4		1356/1402		4.09	4.24	4.34	3.05
	_	readings contribu		_	3	2	6	4	8	8	9		1244/1358		3.97	4.11	4.15	3.29
		ssignments contri			3	23	1	1	4	5	3		1101/1316		4.03	4.14	4.27	3.57
		ng system clearly		ned	3	0	0	1	7	7	22	4.35	656/1427		4.31	4.19	4.20	4.35
		s was class cance			3	0	0	1	0	7	29	4.73	885/1447		4.61	4.69	4.72	4.73
9. How	would you	grade the overal	.l teach:	ing effectiveness	10	0	2	4	14	6	4	3.20	1325/1434	3.20	3.92	4.10	4.17	3.20
		Lecture																
		ructor's lectures	_	-	5	0	0	2	2	16	15		1039/1387		4.46	4.46	4.48	4.26
		uctor seem intere			5	0	0	2	2	7	24		1134/1387		4.69	4.73	4.76	4.51
		aterial presented			5	0	2	4	12	6	11		1243/1386		4.15	4.32	4.34	3.57
	the lectu		5	0	2	5	7	7	14		1172/1380		4.22	4.32	4.34	3.74		
5. Did	audiovisu	al techniques enh	iance yoi	ur understanding	6	11	4	2	7	8	2	3.09	1077/1193	3.09	3.76	4.02	4.00	3.09
		Discuss																
		cussions contribu		4	33	0	0	2	3	1	1		****/1172		3.71	4.15	4.25	****
		ents actively end			32	0	1	1	4	1	1		****/1182		3.98	4.35	4.49	****
		uctor encourage f		open discussion	32	0	1	0	4	3	0		****/1170		4.16	4.38	4.51	****
4. Were	e special	techniques succes	ssiul		32	5	U	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 800	****	4.05	4.06	4.19	****
		Seminar																
		topics relevant			39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	, 00	****	****	4.58	4.87	****
		ions contribute t		you learned	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.42	4.55	***
5. Were	e criteria	for grading made	clear		39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 64	***	****	4.09	4.43	****
				Frequ	lency	Dist	trib	utic	n									
Credita	s Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	ason	.s			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	 A 8		Red	 quire	ed f	or M	 aior	 s 2	 !2	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	11		
28-55		B 14							_		2_2.2.300	-	-	) ~	-			
56-83		C 6		Gei	nera:	1				1	Under-9	rad 4	:0	Non-	-major	29		
84-15	0 12	2.00-2.99 3.00-3.49	8	D 1									_				-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				4	#### -				_	јh
				P 0 I 0		Otl	her					0	respons	es to b	e sign	uiican	ıt	

Course-Section: ECON 463 01

Title Theory Of Public Finan

Instructor: Coates, Dennis C

Enrollment: 33
Questionnaires: 18

### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 499 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Questions		NR	NA	Fro	eque: 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank		e Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General															
1. Did yo	u gain n	ew insights, skills from	om this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	463/144	7 4.61	4.17	4.31	4.43	4.61
2. Did th	e instru	ctor make clear the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	0	4	6	8	4.22	882/144	7 4.22	4.17	4.27	4.31	4.22
3. Did th	e exam q	uestions reflect the e	expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	646/124	1 4.41	4.17	4.33	4.41	4.41
		uations reflect the ex		1	0	0	0	2	7	8	4.35				4.24	4.34	4.35
	_	eadings contribute to	-	0	3	0	1	4	5	5	3.93				4.11	4.15	3.93
		signments contribute t		0	2	0	0	4	7	5	4.06				4.14	4.27	4.06
	_	g system clearly expla	ained	1	0	0	0	2	2		4.65				4.19	4.20	4.65
		was class cancelled	whime offertions	0	0	0	0 1	1	3 7	14 4	4.72	,			4.69	4.72	4.72
9. HOW WO	oura you	grade the overall tead	ening effectiveness	3	U	U	Τ	3	/	4	3.93	942/143	4 3.93	3.92	4.10	4.17	3.93
		Lecture															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lectures well	prepared	0	0	1	0	0	4	13	4.56	727/138	7 4.56	4.46	4.46	4.48	4.56
		ctor seem interested i		0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	707/138			4.73	4.76	4.83
		terial presented and e		0	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	766/138	6 4.39	4.15	4.32	4.34	4.39
		es contribute to what	-	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	,			4.32	4.34	4.61
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques enhance y	your understanding	2	13	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/119	3 ****	3.76	4.02	4.00	***
		Discussion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contribute to	what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	637/117	2 4.17	3.71	4.15	4.25	4.17
			_	11	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	856/118			4.35	4.49	4.00
3. Did th	re all students actively encouraged to participat d the instructor encourage fair and open discussi				0	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	864/117	0 4.00	4.16	4.38	4.51	4.00
		Laboratory															
2. Were y	ou provi	ded with adequate back	ground information	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 19	2 ****	****	4.34	4.61	****
		Seminar															
1. Were a	ssigned	topics relevant to the	announced theme	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 6	6 ****	****	4.58	4.87	***
2. Was th	e instru	ctor available for inc	dividual attention	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 6	2 ****	****	4.56	4.80	****
3. Did re	search p	rojects contribute to	what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 5	8 ****	****	4.41	4.59	****
		Field Work															
1. Did fi	eld expe	rience contribute to w	what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 3	8 ****	****	4.49	4.68	****
2. Did yo	u clearl	y understand your eval	luation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 3	6 ****	****	4.25	4.42	****
3. Was th	e instru	ctor available for cor	nsultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 2	8 ****	****	4.52	4.72	****
		Self Paced															
1. Did se	lf-paced	system contribute to	what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 3	1 ****	****	4.72	4.80	****
2. Did st	udy ques	tions make clear the e	expected goal	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 2	1 ****	****	4.57	5.00	****
			Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	;			Т	ype			Majors	3
00-27	1	 A 4					or Ma		 a 1	2	 Gradua	 +a	0	 Majo		6	
28-55	-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 4					quil	eu I	OT ING	TOL	o I		Gradua	LC	U	ria JC	) <u> </u>	U
56-83	3 2.00-2.99 2 C 9					nera	1				3	Under-	grad	18	Non-	-major	12
84-150	5	D 0											•		3		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0		El	ecti <sup>.</sup>	ves				3		Means			_	jh
						_						respon	ses to	be sig	nificar	nt	
	P 0 I 0				Ot:	her					0						

Course-Section: ECON 467 01 University of Maryland Title Health Economics Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010 Spring 2010 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: Ma,Bing Enrollment: 76 Questionnaires: 34

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 500

Ouestions	NR	NA	Fre	equer	ncie	s A	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Questions		11/27												
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		•					_	4 00	540/4450	4 00			4 05	4 00
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	4	4	-/	4.00	710/1172		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		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	Т	U	Т	Т	Т	3.25	****/ 800	***	4.05	4.06	4.19	****
Freq	uency	Dis	trib	ution	ı									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	ason	.s			Tyr	pe			Majors	
										- 				
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 13 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 11		Re	quire	ed fo	or M	ajor	s 1	4	Graduat	е	1	Majo	r	3
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 11														

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		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	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1				
				2	2						

Course-Section: ECON 475 01 University of Maryland Page 501 Title Financial Invstmnt Ana Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010

Lamdin, Douglas

Instructor: 62

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 16

Spring 2010 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

							Fre	201101	ncies			Inct	ructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	}		NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean			Mean
		General																
1 Did you	u dain ne	General w insights,skil		m this course	0	0	0	Λ	1	1	14	4.81	243/1447	4.81	4.17	4.31	4.43	4.81
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	249/1447	4.75	4.17	4.27	4.31	4.75
		estions reflect			0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	282/1241	4.75	4.17	4.33	4.41	4.75
	_	ations reflect			0	2	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	336/1402	4.64	4.09	4.24	4.34	4.64
				what you learned	1	2	0	1	2	1	9	4.38	474/1358	4.38	3.97	4.11	4.15	4.38
	_	-		o what you learned	1	3	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	166/1316		4.03	4.14	4.27	4.75
		g system clearly			1	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	113/1427	4.87	4.31	4.19	4.20	4.87
		was class cance			1	0	0	0	0	9	- 6		1155/1447	4.40	4.61	4.69	4.72	4.40
	-			hing effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	206/1434		3.92	4.10	4.17	4.69
	200. 5	,																
		Lecture	:															
1. Were th	he instru	uctor'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
		ctor seem intere			1	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	784/1387	4.80	4.69	4.73	4.76	4.80
				explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	341/1386	4.73	4.15	4.32	4.34	4.73
		es contribute to			1	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	463/1380	4.67	4.22	4.32	4.34	4.67
5. Did aud	diovisual	l techniques enh	ance y	our understanding	2	4	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	288/1193	4.50	3.76	4.02	4.00	4.50
		-	-	3														
		Discuss	ion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ussions contribu	ite 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
				ed to participate	8	0	1	0	0	0	7	4.50	553/1182	4.50	3.98	4.35	4.49	4.50
		_	_	d open discussion	8	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	679/1170	4.38	4.16	4.38	4.51	4.38
		echniques succes		-	8	4	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	103/ 800	4.75	4.05	4.06	4.19	4.75
-	-	-																
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	ution	ı									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ту	pe			Majors	<b>;</b>
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 10					or Ma			 9	 Graduat		0	 Majo	·	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3		кес	4urr.e	eu I	лт Ма	JUE	D	)	Graduat	E	U	Ma JC	).T	U
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	General			U	onder-9	Luu 1	. 0	IVOII-	iia jui	10				
Grad.	0	3.50-3.49	<i>5</i>	г О		רק.	ectiv	700				2	#### - :	Maana +	hara n	re not	enous	rh
Grau.	U	3.50-4.00	5	r U		<b>₽</b> 1€	=CLT,	ves				4	#### -	means t	леге а	TE 1101	. emoug	İTT

Other

0

Ρ

. .

0

0

0

Course-Section: ECON 476 01 University of Maryland Page 502 Title Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010 Portfolio Management

Instructor: Yuan,Chunming

Enrollment: 43 Questionnaires: 23

Spring 2010 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Job IRBR3029

Questions		NR	NA	Fre 1	equer 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean			
		General																
1 Did vo	nı gain ne	General w insights,skil	-	m this source	0	0	0	0	3	7	13	4.43	681/1447	4.43	4.17	4.31	4.43	4.43
_	_	tor make clear			0	0	1	0	3	6	13	4.30	805/1447	4.30	4.17	4.27	4.31	4.30
		estions reflect			0	0	0	0	2	5	16	4.61	,	4.61	4.17	4.33	4.41	4.61
		ations reflect			0	0	0	1	2	5	15	4.48	530/1402		4.09	4.24	4.34	4.48
				what you learned	0	3	1	1	3	5	10	4.10	746/1358	4.10	3.97	4.11	4.15	4.10
	_	-		o what you learned	0	4	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	372/1316	4.53	4.03	4.14	4.27	4.53
		system clearly			0	1	1	1	1	5	14	4.36	644/1427	4.36	4.31	4.19	4.20	4.36
		was class cance			0	1	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.61	4.69	4.72	5.00
	-			hing effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	10	7	4.26	623/1434			4.10	4.17	4.26
		,		3														
		Lecture	<u>:</u>															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor'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 th	ne instruc	tor seem intere	sted i	n 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 th	ne lecture	es 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 au	diovisual	techniques enh	ance y	our understanding	2	6	2	0	4	6	3	3.53	950/1193	3.53	3.76	4.02	4.00	3.53
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did cl	lass discu	ssions contribu	ite to	what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/1172	****	3.71	4.15	4.25	****
2. Were a	all studen	its actively end	ourage	d to participate	18	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/1182	****	3.98	4.35	4.49	****
3. Did th	ne instruc	tor encourage f	air an	d open discussion	18	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/1170	****	4.16	4.38	4.51	****
4. Were s	special te	chniques succes	sful		18	1	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/ 800	****	4.05	4.06	4.19	***
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	า									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 15		Re	guire	ed fo	 or M	 aior	 s 1	4	Graduat	 e	0	Majo		0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 4		100	-1011(	- L	J. 1.11	۱۰ د د	~ 1	-	Gradac	_	•	11450	-	J
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 3		Ger	nera:	1				3	Under-g	rad 2	23	Non-	major	23
84-150	14	3.00-3.49	5	D 0			a.	_				-	011001 9	2	-	2.021		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 0		E1	ecti	ves				3	#### - :	Means t	here a	re not	enouc	rh
	-	2.22 2.20	-	P 0								-	respons				_	•
				I O		Ot]	her					1			5			
							-											

Course-Section: ECON 478 1 University of Maryland Title Real Estate Econ And F

Baltimore County Spring 2010

Instructor: Getter,Darryl E Enrollment: 41

Questionnaires: 28

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 503

JUN 28, 2010

Job IRBR3029

110000000000000000000000000000000000000	-
General	
*****	4.89 158/1447 4.89 4.17 4.31 4.43 4.89
	4.86 154/1447 4.86 4.17 4.27 4.31 4.86
	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 4.0	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 $4.43$ $4.43$ $4.43$ $3.97$ $4.11$ $4.15$ $4.6$	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 4.0	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 5 22 4.81 147/1427 4.81 4.31 4.19 4.20 4.5	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.	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 4.8	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 4.48 4.48	4.80 353/1387 4.80 4.46 4.46 4.48 4.80
	4.96 211/1387 4.96 4.69 4.73 4.76 4.96
	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 5.0	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.	4.40 376/1193 4.40 3.76 4.02 4.00 4.40
Discussion	
	4.67 282/1172 4.67 3.71 4.15 4.25 4.67
	,

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	=			
				2	1						

Course-Section: ECON 490 01

Analytic Methods In Ec

Instructor: Brennan, Timothy

Enrollment: 39
Questionnaires: 29

Title

### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 504 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ouestions		NA	Fre	equer 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	-	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Quescions	NR									Mean			Mean	Mean .
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	1	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	23 27	4.79	211/1387	4.79	4.40	4.73	4.46	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	2	8	17	4.43	719/1386	4.43	4.09	4.73	4.76	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	8 6	20	4.43	549/1380	4.43	4.15	4.32	4.34	4.43
	3	14	0	1	3	2	20 6	4.01	620/1193	4.01	3.76	4.32		4.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	14	U	Т	3	2	О	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		****/ 189		****	4.34	4.74	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 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	***

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majo		
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	25	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	В	15						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	6	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	29	Non-major	24
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	12	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_		_	
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 600 1

Policy Consq:Econ Anal

Instructor: Brennan, Timothy

Enrollment: 10
Questionnaires: 7

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010 Page 505 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies				Inst	ructor	Course Dept		-		Sect			
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	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
<ol> <li>Was the grading system clearly explained</li> </ol>	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	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		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	В	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	Ĺ
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Baltimore County

Course-Section: ECON 602 01 University of Maryland Macroeconomic Analysis Carpenter, Rober Title Instructor:

Enrollment: 10 Questionnaire

Spring 2010

Page 506

JUN 28, 2010

Job IRBR3029

			Ouestionnaire
res:			

	Frequencies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect				
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	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

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	 6	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	6	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: ECON 612 01 Title Econometrics II Instructor: Dickson,Lisa M Spring 2010

Enrollment:	14
Questionnaires:	12

Page 507 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Studont	Courac	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire
Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

							Frequencies				Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	Questions					NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General																		
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,skil	lls fro	m this cou	rse	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	585/1447	4.50	4.17	4.31	4.46	4.50
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goal	ls	0	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	766/1447	4.33	4.17	4.27	4.30	4.33
3. Did th	ne exam qu	uestions reflect	the e	expected goa	als	0	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	646/1241	4.42	4.17	4.33	4.38	4.42
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	spected goal	ls	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	402/1402	4.58	4.09	4.24	4.29	4.58
5. Did as	ssigned re	eadings contribu	ite to	what you le	earned	0	0	2	0	3	4	3	3.50	1170/1358	3.50	3.97	4.11	4.26	3.50
6. Did wr	ritten as:	signments contri	ibute t	o 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 th	ne grading	g system clearly	y expla	ined		0	0	0	1	3	2	6	4.08	925/1427	4.08	4.31	4.19	4.25	4.08
8. How ma	any times	was class cance	elled			0	0	0	0	2	9	1	3.92	1400/1447	3.92	4.61	4.69	4.74	3.92
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overal	ll teac	ching effect	tiveness	4	0	0	0	1	7	0	3.88	1003/1434	3.88	3.92	4.10	4.21	3.88
		Lecture	2																
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lectures		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	
		terial presented		_		0	0	0	0	1	7	4	4.25	879/1386	4.25	4.15	4.32	4.43	4.25
		es contribute to				0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	571/1380	4.58	4.22	4.32	4.38	4.58
		l techniques enh		-		0	3	0	0	5	0	4	3.89	769/1193	3.89	3.76	4.02	4.02	3.89
		Discuss	sion																
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contribu		what you le	earned	3	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	710/1172	4.00	3.71	4.15	4.32	4.00
		nts actively end				3	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	219/1182	4.89	3.98	4.35	4.46	4.89
		ctor encourage f	_	_	_	3	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	549/1170	4.56	4.16	4.38	4.52	4.56
		echniques succes		- or		3	5	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	195/ 800	4.50	4.05	4.06	4.10	4.50
					Frequ	ıency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades				Rea	asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	3
00 27	3	 0.00-0.99	 0											Cwadust	- 				1
00-27 28-55	3 2	1.00-1.99	0	A B	6 4		Required for Majors					S	6	Graduat	е	4	Majo	or.	1

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	4	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	are not enough		
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-			
				2	Ω						

Course-Section: ECON 699 1 University of Maryland Page 508
Title EPA Seminar Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010
Instructor: Mitch, David F Spring 2010 Job IRBR 3029
Enrollment: 9

Questionnaires: 7

Student	Course	Evalua	ation	Quest:	ionnaire	2
---------	--------	--------	-------	--------	----------	---

Ouestions	NR	NA	Frequencies NA 1 2 3 4 5			5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean	
Questions														
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
Freq	uency	, Dis	trib	utio	n									
Consider Found Con CD3 Truncated Consider				Da		_			m				Ma dana	
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				ке:	asons				Ту:	pe 			Majors	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 5		Required for Majors					S	7	Graduat	е	5	Majo	r	0

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	В	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	## - Means there are not enough		
				P	0			responses to be significant		gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				2	Λ						