

Course-Section: ECAC 329 0101
 Title COST ACCOUNTING
 Instructor: HARDY, TIMOTHY
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 504
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	1	2	3	5	7	3.83	1327/1649	3.88	4.43	4.28	4.27	3.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	8	6	4.06	1094/1648	3.90	4.43	4.23	4.18	4.06	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	8	6	3.94	1000/1375	3.72	4.41	4.27	4.22	3.94	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	1027/1595	4.41	4.69	4.20	4.21	4.08	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	4	10	4.29	584/1533	4.25	4.48	4.04	4.05	4.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	8	1	1	1	2	3	3.63	1191/1512	3.63	4.52	4.10	4.11	3.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	2	3	11	4.35	696/1623	4.43	4.74	4.16	4.08	4.35	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	15	1	3.94	1580/1646	4.10	4.55	4.69	4.67	3.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	1	10	2	4.08	875/1621	3.94	4.36	4.06	4.02	4.08	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	1031/1568	4.09	4.60	4.43	4.39	4.35	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	16	4.88	640/1572	4.86	4.92	4.70	4.64	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	2	7	6	4.00	1127/1564	3.88	4.50	4.28	4.25	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	4	2	4	7	3.82	1236/1559	3.75	4.41	4.29	4.23	3.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	1	4	6	2	3.69	955/1352	3.49	4.14	3.98	3.97	3.69	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	2	2	2	6	4.00	795/1384	4.00	4.34	4.08	4.11	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	2	1	2	5	3.73	1116/1382	4.28	4.52	4.29	4.37	3.73	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	624/1368	4.69	4.80	4.30	4.39	4.55	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	8	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 948	****	****	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.07	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	3.89	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.21	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.63	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	4.46	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	****	****	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.21	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.32	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.44	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	4.05	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	3	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	11	
?	0			

Course-Section: ECAC 329 0201
 Title COST ACCOUNTING
 Instructor: HARDY, TIMOTHY
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 505
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	4	5	3	3.92	1263/1649	3.88	4.43	4.28	4.27	3.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	2	4	3.75	1347/1648	3.90	4.43	4.23	4.18	3.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	1	7	1	3.50	1208/1375	3.72	4.41	4.27	4.22	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	236/1595	4.41	4.69	4.20	4.21	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	680/1533	4.25	4.48	4.04	4.05	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1512	3.63	4.52	4.10	4.11	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	502/1623	4.43	4.74	4.16	4.08	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	3	4.25	1398/1646	4.10	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	4	4	2	3.80	1151/1621	3.94	4.36	4.06	4.02	3.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	4	3	4	3.83	1373/1568	4.09	4.60	4.43	4.39	3.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	765/1572	4.86	4.92	4.70	4.64	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	3	3	4	3.75	1297/1564	3.88	4.50	4.28	4.25	3.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	4	3	3.67	1322/1559	3.75	4.41	4.29	4.23	3.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	1	0	4	0	2	3.29	1149/1352	3.49	4.14	3.98	3.97	3.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	795/1384	4.00	4.34	4.08	4.11	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	312/1382	4.28	4.52	4.29	4.37	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	337/1368	4.69	4.80	4.30	4.39	4.83	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	3.89	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	****	4.29	4.22	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.21	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.43	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 312	****	****	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.32	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.44	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 7	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 3	Under-grad 12	Non-major 12
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	0	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 9		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ECAC 330 0101
 Title TAXATION
 Instructor: ST MARTIN, JEAN
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 506
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	2	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	230/1649	4.71	4.43	4.28	4.27	4.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	148/1648	4.78	4.43	4.23	4.18	4.90	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	1	19	4.86	199/1375	4.81	4.41	4.27	4.22	4.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	4	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	180/1595	4.82	4.69	4.20	4.21	4.82	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	7	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	525/1533	4.45	4.48	4.04	4.05	4.36	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	8	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	186/1512	4.73	4.52	4.10	4.11	4.77	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	0	20	4.90	121/1623	4.92	4.74	4.16	4.08	4.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	748/1646	4.77	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.85	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	261/1621	4.59	4.36	4.06	4.02	4.63	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	387/1568	4.90	4.60	4.43	4.39	4.81	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	296/1572	4.94	4.92	4.70	4.64	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	263/1564	4.87	4.50	4.28	4.25	4.81	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	261/1559	4.77	4.41	4.29	4.23	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	17	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/1352	4.78	4.14	3.98	3.97	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	1	1	8	4.36	582/1384	4.35	4.34	4.08	4.11	4.36	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	425/1382	4.53	4.52	4.29	4.37	4.73	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	550/1368	4.82	4.80	4.30	4.39	4.64	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	10	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 948	****	****	3.95	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.32	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.44	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	11
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	3
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	5	D	0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	0
			Required for Majors	0	Graduate
			General	5	Under-grad
			Electives	1	Non-major
			Other	13	

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ECAC 330 0201
 Title TAXATION
 Instructor: ST MARTIN, JEAN
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 507
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	2	0	0	1	1	2	12	4.56	563/1649	4.71	4.43	4.28	4.27	4.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	388/1648	4.78	4.43	4.23	4.18	4.65	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	283/1375	4.81	4.41	4.27	4.22	4.76	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	186/1595	4.82	4.69	4.20	4.21	4.81	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	342/1533	4.45	4.48	4.04	4.05	4.53	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	240/1512	4.73	4.52	4.10	4.11	4.69	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	73/1623	4.92	4.74	4.16	4.08	4.94	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	1015/1646	4.77	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.69	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	331/1621	4.59	4.36	4.06	4.02	4.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1568	4.90	4.60	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	414/1572	4.94	4.92	4.70	4.64	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	118/1564	4.87	4.50	4.28	4.25	4.94	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	1	14	4.69	487/1559	4.77	4.41	4.29	4.23	4.69	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	147/1352	4.78	4.14	3.98	3.97	4.78	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	613/1384	4.35	4.34	4.08	4.11	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	774/1382	4.53	4.52	4.29	4.37	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1368	4.82	4.80	4.30	4.39	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 948	****	****	3.95	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ECAC 420 0101
 Title INFO SYS FOR AUDITORS
 Instructor: MULCHANDANI, KA
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 508
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	5	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.43	4.28	4.50	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	216/1648	4.80	4.43	4.23	4.36	4.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.41	4.27	4.48	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.69	4.20	4.36	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.48	4.04	4.14	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1512	5.00	4.52	4.10	4.26	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1623	5.00	4.74	4.16	4.27	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.55	4.69	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	165/1621	4.75	4.36	4.06	4.24	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.60	4.43	4.54	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.92	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.50	4.28	4.40	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.41	4.29	4.41	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	133/1352	4.80	4.14	3.98	4.07	4.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.34	4.08	4.35	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.52	4.29	4.56	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.80	4.30	4.58	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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