

Course-Section: ECAC 321 0101
 Title AUDIT THEORY & PRACTIC
 Instructor: CROTEAU, MARCIA
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 484
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	1	14	4.71	379/1639	4.71	4.73	4.27	4.28	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	241/1639	4.76	4.78	4.22	4.20	4.76	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	3	13	4.65	383/1397	4.65	4.70	4.28	4.26	4.65	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	339/1583	4.65	4.69	4.19	4.24	4.65	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	269/1532	4.62	4.33	4.01	4.05	4.62	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	275/1504	4.63	4.48	4.05	4.12	4.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	166/1612	4.80	4.84	4.16	4.12	4.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.86	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	3	1	0	0	3	7	4.36	538/1579	4.36	4.47	4.08	4.07	4.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.88	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.95	4.70	4.68	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	0	15	4.71	360/1517	4.71	4.74	4.27	4.23	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	2	13	4.59	545/1550	4.59	4.71	4.22	4.20	4.59	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	0	1	2	11	4.47	297/1295	4.47	4.01	3.94	3.95	4.47	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	403/1398	4.55	4.43	4.07	4.13	4.55	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	227/1391	4.91	4.74	4.30	4.35	4.91	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	224/1388	4.91	4.87	4.28	4.34	4.91	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	99/ 958	4.80	4.54	3.93	3.97	4.80	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	4.06	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.21	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.04	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.59	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.65	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	4.08	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	4.52	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: ECAC 321 0101
 Title AUDIT THEORY & PRACTIC
 Instructor: CROTEAU, MARCIA
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 484
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECAC 329 0101
 Title COST ACCOUNTING
 Instructor: DAVIS, MARY B
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 485
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	482/1639	4.62	4.73	4.27	4.28	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	393/1639	4.68	4.78	4.22	4.20	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	617/1397	4.57	4.70	4.28	4.26	4.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	392/1583	4.60	4.69	4.19	4.24	4.58	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	3	6	2	3.91	911/1532	4.08	4.33	4.01	4.05	3.91	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	724/1504	4.28	4.48	4.05	4.12	4.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	160/1612	4.79	4.84	4.16	4.12	4.81	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1635	4.98	4.86	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	352/1579	4.39	4.47	4.08	4.07	4.54	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	602/1518	4.79	4.88	4.43	4.39	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	382/1520	4.90	4.95	4.70	4.68	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	474/1517	4.63	4.74	4.27	4.23	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	522/1550	4.63	4.71	4.22	4.20	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	2	0	1	1	3	3.43	1023/1295	3.91	4.01	3.94	3.95	3.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	735/1398	4.28	4.43	4.07	4.13	4.10	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	752/1391	4.53	4.74	4.30	4.35	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	496/1388	4.79	4.87	4.28	4.34	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	424/ 958	4.43	4.54	3.93	3.97	4.13	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 4	C 6	General 2	Under-grad 16 Non-major 16
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 12	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ECAC 329 0201
 Title COST ACCOUNTING
 Instructor: DAVIS, MARY B
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 486
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	7	15	4.61	508/1639	4.62	4.73	4.27	4.28	4.61	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	18	4.74	273/1639	4.68	4.78	4.22	4.20	4.74	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	18	4.70	342/1397	4.57	4.70	4.28	4.26	4.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	8	13	4.62	363/1583	4.60	4.69	4.19	4.24	4.62	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	9	11	4.26	571/1532	4.08	4.33	4.01	4.05	4.26	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	2	3	13	4.42	466/1504	4.28	4.48	4.05	4.12	4.42	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	207/1612	4.79	4.84	4.16	4.12	4.76	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	331/1635	4.98	4.86	4.65	4.66	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	2	0	2	2	2	10	4.25	657/1579	4.39	4.47	4.08	4.07	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	191/1518	4.79	4.88	4.43	4.39	4.91	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	648/1520	4.90	4.95	4.70	4.68	4.87	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	6	16	4.65	417/1517	4.63	4.74	4.27	4.23	4.65	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	4	18	4.65	468/1550	4.63	4.71	4.22	4.20	4.65	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	0	0	4	1	10	4.40	346/1295	3.91	4.01	3.94	3.95	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	3	0	8	4.45	468/1398	4.28	4.43	4.07	4.13	4.45	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	429/1391	4.53	4.74	4.30	4.35	4.73	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	224/1388	4.79	4.87	4.28	4.34	4.91	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	0	1	0	0	10	4.73	131/ 958	4.43	4.54	3.93	3.97	4.73	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 9		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 4	General	3
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 23
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	16
			? 0		

Course-Section: ECAC 330 0101
 Title TAXATION
 Instructor: ST MARTIN, JEAN
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 487
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.73	4.27	4.28	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.78	4.22	4.20	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.70	4.28	4.26	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	114/1583	4.93	4.69	4.19	4.24	4.93	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	311/1532	4.55	4.33	4.01	4.05	4.55	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	182/1504	4.75	4.48	4.05	4.12	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1612	5.00	4.84	4.16	4.12	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	1135/1635	4.50	4.86	4.65	4.66	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	197/1579	4.73	4.47	4.08	4.07	4.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	170/1518	4.93	4.88	4.43	4.39	4.93	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.95	4.70	4.68	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.74	4.27	4.23	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.71	4.22	4.20	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	2	0	1	0	5	3.75	838/1295	3.75	4.01	3.94	3.95	3.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	369/1398	4.60	4.43	4.07	4.13	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.74	4.30	4.35	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.87	4.28	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	201/ 958	4.50	4.54	3.93	3.97	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	2
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 14
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	11
			? 0		