Course-Section: ECAC 401 0101 University of Maryland Title ADVANCED ACCOUNTING

Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 477

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: DAVIS, MARY B Enrollment: 2.7

Ouestionnaires: 25

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 6 17 4.60 492/1522 4.60 4.42 4.30 4.42 4.60 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 00 2 6 17 4.60 432/1522 4.60 4.47 4.26 4.34 4.60 268/1285 4.76 4.55 4.30 4.42 4.76 0 1 4 20 4.76 0 1 11 12 4.46 551/1476 4.46 4.30 4.22 4.31 4.46 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 3 3 0 4 5 10 3.86 924/1412 3.86 4.35 4.06 4.11 3.86 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2 1 0 3 9 10 4.17 683/1381 4.17 4.12 4.08 4.21 4.17 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 2 4 19 4.68 300/1500 4.68 4.51 4.18 4.25 4.68 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 5 20 4.80 714/1517 4.80 4.88 4.65 4.71 4.80 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 1 0 2 3 16 4.50 385/1497 4.50 4.18 4.11 4.21 4.50 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 Ω 0 1 5 18 4.71 552/1440 4.71 4.65 4.45 4.52 4.71 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 1 1 22 4.88 575/1448 4.88 4.84 4.71 4.75 4.88 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 1 5 18 4.71 373/1436 4.71 4.56 4.29 4.32 4.71 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 3 4 17 4.58 548/1432 4.58 4.47 4.29 4.34 4.58 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 5 1 0 1 6 10 4.33 408/1221 4.33 4.06 3.93 4.04 4.33 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 1 1 10 4.75 222/1280 4.75 4.38 4.10 4.28 4.75 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13 0 0 0 0 1 11 4.92 205/1277 4.92 4.65 4.34 4.50 4.92 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0 0 0 0 1 11 4.92 200/1269 4.92 4.62 4.31 4.49 4.92 4. Were special techniques successful 13 3 0 1 2 6 4.56 180/854 4.56 4.32 4.02 4.31 4.56 Seminar 0 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 79 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.58 4.67 \*\*\*\* 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 24 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 77 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.52 4.60 \*\*\*\* 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 24 0 Ω Ω 0 0 1 0 4.00 \*\*\*\* / 65 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.49 4.65 \*\*\*\* 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 24 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 78 \*\*\*\* \*\*\* 4.45 4.58 \*\*\*\* 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 24 0 0 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 0 0 1 0 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 80 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.11 4.14 \*\*\*\* 24 0 0

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	12	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	12						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	25	Non-major	25
84-150	17	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			n
				P	0			responses to	be si	qnificant	
				I	0	Other	23	-		5	
				2	0						