

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|-----------------|-----------------|
| Course-Section: | ECAC 329 1 |
| Title: | Cost Accounting |
| Instructor: | Hardy,Timothy W |

Term - Fall 2010

| | |
|-----------------|----|
| Enrollment: | 32 |
| Questionnaires: | 26 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 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 | 2 | 0 | 7 | 10 | 7 | 3.77 | 1301/1528 | 3.77 | 4.43 | 4.31 | 4.34 | 3.77 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 6 | 8 | 3.58 | 1383/1527 | 3.58 | 4.41 | 4.28 | 4.27 | 3.58 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 8 | 8 | 3.73 | 1175/1333 | 3.73 | 4.47 | 4.34 | 4.34 | 3.73 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 9 | 3.83 | 1196/1495 | 3.83 | 4.32 | 4.25 | 4.28 | 3.83 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 16 | 4.31 | 605/1439 | 4.31 | 4.55 | 4.11 | 4.13 | 4.31 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 4 | 4 | 3.24 | 1310/1425 | 3.24 | 4.20 | 4.12 | 4.17 | 3.24 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 14 | 4.00 | 1050/1508 | 4.00 | 4.54 | 4.18 | 4.17 | 4.00 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 24 | 4.88 | 601/1526 | 4.88 | 4.86 | 4.66 | 4.68 | 4.88 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 7 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 8 | 7 | 1 | 3.21 | 1372/1490 | 3.21 | 4.14 | 4.11 | 4.11 | 3.21 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 8 | 3.40 | 1375/1428 | 3.40 | 4.31 | 4.49 | 4.48 | 3.40 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 19 | 4.68 | 1019/1436 | 4.68 | 4.72 | 4.74 | 4.74 | 4.68 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 8 | 2 | 9 | 3.48 | 1305/1427 | 3.48 | 4.34 | 4.32 | 4.31 | 3.48 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 8 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 7 | 2.88 | 1385/1425 | 2.88 | 4.21 | 4.34 | 4.34 | 2.88 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 4 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 2.94 | 1212/1291 | 2.94 | 3.98 | 4.05 | 4.09 | 2.94 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 8 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 2.78 | 1229/1271 | 2.78 | 3.93 | 4.16 | 4.19 | 2.78 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 9 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 3.76 | 1058/1276 | 3.76 | 4.38 | 4.33 | 4.37 | 3.76 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 4.00 | 947/1273 | 4.00 | 4.33 | 4.38 | 4.40 | 4.00 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 9 | 8 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3.44 | 755/922 | 3.44 | 3.44 | 4.02 | 4.02 | 3.44 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|-----------------|------------------|
| Course-Section: | ECAC 329 1 |
| Title: | Cost Accounting |
| Instructor: | Hardy, Timothy W |

Term - Fall 2010

| | |
|-----------------|----|
| Enrollment: | 32 |
| Questionnaires: | 26 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 23 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/198 | **** | **** | 4.16 | 4.26 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/208 | **** | **** | 4.27 | 4.31 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 24 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/194 | **** | **** | 4.56 | 4.59 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 24 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/194 | **** | **** | 4.37 | 4.37 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 24 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/176 | **** | **** | 4.23 | 4.33 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 23 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/76 | **** | **** | 4.51 | 4.02 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 24 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/74 | **** | **** | 4.31 | 3.86 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 24 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/66 | **** | **** | 4.27 | 4.00 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 24 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/76 | **** | **** | 4.27 | 3.68 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 24 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/73 | **** | **** | 3.94 | 4.27 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 23 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/42 | **** | **** | 4.00 | 3.20 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 24 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2.50 | ****/41 | **** | **** | 4.06 | 3.86 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 24 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/30 | **** | **** | 4.74 | 4.80 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 24 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.20 | 3.38 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 24 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.34 | 4.79 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 3.25 | ****/43 | **** | **** | 4.43 | 3.75 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 23 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/31 | **** | **** | 4.53 | 4.75 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 23 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/36 | **** | **** | 4.43 | 5.00 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|-----------------|------------------|
| Course-Section: | ECAC 329 1 |
| Title: | Cost Accounting |
| Instructor: | Hardy, Timothy W |

Term - Fall 2010

| | |
|-----------------|----|
| Enrollment: | 32 |
| Questionnaires: | 26 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 23 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/21 | **** | **** | 4.54 | 5.00 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 23 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/20 | **** | **** | 4.45 | 5.00 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 9 | Required for Majors | 17 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 4 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | 3 | C | 5 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 26 | Non-major | 12 |
| 84-150 | 9 | 3.00-3.49 | 2 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 4 | F | 0 | Electives | 3 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 1 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 1 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 7 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|-----------------|-----------------|
| Course-Section: | ECAC 330 1 |
| Title: | Taxation |
| Instructor: | Stmartin,Jeanne |

Term - Fall 2010

| | |
|-----------------|----|
| Enrollment: | 25 |
| Questionnaires: | 17 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 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 | 1 | 2 | 12 | 4.73 | 334/1528 | 4.57 | 4.43 | 4.31 | 4.34 | 4.73 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 13 | 4.87 | 152/1527 | 4.64 | 4.41 | 4.28 | 4.27 | 4.87 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 14 | 4.93 | 103/1333 | 4.67 | 4.47 | 4.34 | 4.34 | 4.93 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 11 | 4.79 | 197/1495 | 4.43 | 4.32 | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.79 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 10 | 4.53 | 344/1439 | 4.55 | 4.55 | 4.11 | 4.13 | 4.53 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 11 | 4.67 | 249/1425 | 4.58 | 4.20 | 4.12 | 4.17 | 4.67 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 14 | 4.87 | 114/1508 | 4.59 | 4.54 | 4.18 | 4.17 | 4.87 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 13 | 4.87 | 636/1526 | 4.87 | 4.86 | 4.66 | 4.68 | 4.87 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 4.56 | 305/1490 | 4.35 | 4.14 | 4.11 | 4.11 | 4.56 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 13 | 4.81 | 368/1428 | 4.52 | 4.31 | 4.49 | 4.48 | 4.81 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 14 | 4.88 | 612/1436 | 4.70 | 4.72 | 4.74 | 4.74 | 4.88 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 12 | 4.69 | 392/1427 | 4.55 | 4.34 | 4.32 | 4.31 | 4.69 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 14 | 4.88 | 197/1425 | 4.78 | 4.21 | 4.34 | 4.34 | 4.88 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 3 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.50 | ****/1291 | 4.00 | 3.98 | 4.05 | 4.09 | **** |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4.83 | 184/1271 | 4.51 | 3.93 | 4.16 | 4.19 | 4.83 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4.83 | 268/1276 | 4.69 | 4.38 | 4.33 | 4.37 | 4.83 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 11 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.17 | 877/1273 | 4.49 | 4.33 | 4.38 | 4.40 | 4.17 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 11 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/922 | **** | 3.44 | 4.02 | 4.02 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|-----------------|-----------------|
| Course-Section: | ECAC 330 1 |
| Title: | Taxation |
| Instructor: | Stmartin,Jeanne |

Term - Fall 2010

| | |
|-----------------|----|
| Enrollment: | 25 |
| Questionnaires: | 17 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|----------------|---|-----------|---|-----------------|---|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|---|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 9 | Required for Majors | 13 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 4 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 3 | 2.00-2.99 | 2 | C | 0 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 17 | Non-major | 1 |
| 84-150 | 3 | 3.00-3.49 | 4 | D | 1 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 2 | F | 0 | Electives | 1 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 3 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|-----------------|-----------------|
| Course-Section: | ECAC 330 2 |
| Title: | Taxation |
| Instructor: | Cole,Richard M. |

Term - Fall 2010

| | |
|-----------------|----|
| Enrollment: | 22 |
| Questionnaires: | 17 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 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 | 4 | 11 | 4.41 | 752/1528 | 4.57 | 4.43 | 4.31 | 4.34 | 4.41 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 12 | 4.41 | 720/1527 | 4.64 | 4.41 | 4.28 | 4.27 | 4.41 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 12 | 4.41 | 690/1333 | 4.67 | 4.47 | 4.34 | 4.34 | 4.41 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 4.07 | 1020/1495 | 4.43 | 4.32 | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.07 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 10 | 4.57 | 314/1439 | 4.55 | 4.55 | 4.11 | 4.13 | 4.57 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 4.50 | 396/1425 | 4.58 | 4.20 | 4.12 | 4.17 | 4.50 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 11 | 4.31 | 708/1508 | 4.59 | 4.54 | 4.18 | 4.17 | 4.31 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 14 | 4.88 | 618/1526 | 4.87 | 4.86 | 4.66 | 4.68 | 4.88 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 5 | 4.14 | 800/1490 | 4.35 | 4.14 | 4.11 | 4.11 | 4.14 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 12 | 4.24 | 1093/1428 | 4.52 | 4.31 | 4.49 | 4.48 | 4.24 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 12 | 4.53 | 1169/1436 | 4.70 | 4.72 | 4.74 | 4.74 | 4.53 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 13 | 4.41 | 757/1427 | 4.55 | 4.34 | 4.32 | 4.31 | 4.41 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 12 | 4.69 | 448/1425 | 4.78 | 4.21 | 4.34 | 4.34 | 4.69 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 7 | 4.00 | 728/1291 | 4.00 | 3.98 | 4.05 | 4.09 | 4.00 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 4.18 | 685/1271 | 4.51 | 3.93 | 4.16 | 4.19 | 4.18 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 4.55 | 557/1276 | 4.69 | 4.38 | 4.33 | 4.37 | 4.55 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 10 | 4.82 | 334/1273 | 4.49 | 4.33 | 4.38 | 4.40 | 4.82 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 6 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4.00 | ****/922 | **** | 3.44 | 4.02 | 4.02 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|-----------------|------------------|
| Course-Section: | ECAC 330 2 |
| Title: | Taxation |
| Instructor: | Cole, Richard M. |

Term - Fall 2010

| | |
|-----------------|----|
| Enrollment: | 22 |
| Questionnaires: | 17 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 13 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/198 | **** | **** | 4.16 | 4.26 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4.33 | ****/208 | **** | **** | 4.27 | 4.31 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/194 | **** | **** | 4.56 | 4.59 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/194 | **** | **** | 4.37 | 4.37 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/176 | **** | **** | 4.23 | 4.33 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 14 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/76 | **** | **** | 4.51 | 4.02 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/74 | **** | **** | 4.31 | 3.86 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/66 | **** | **** | 4.27 | 4.00 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/76 | **** | **** | 4.27 | 3.68 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/73 | **** | **** | 3.94 | 4.27 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 14 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/42 | **** | **** | 4.00 | 3.20 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/41 | **** | **** | 4.06 | 3.86 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/30 | **** | **** | 4.74 | 4.80 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 15 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.50 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.20 | 3.38 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 15 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.50 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.34 | 4.79 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 14 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/43 | **** | **** | 4.43 | 3.75 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/31 | **** | **** | 4.53 | 4.75 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/36 | **** | **** | 4.43 | 5.00 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|-----------------|------------------|
| Course-Section: | ECAC 330 2 |
| Title: | Taxation |
| Instructor: | Cole, Richard M. |

Term - Fall 2010

| | |
|-----------------|----|
| Enrollment: | 22 |
| Questionnaires: | 17 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/21 | **** | **** | 4.54 | 5.00 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 15 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.50 | ****/20 | **** | **** | 4.45 | 5.00 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|---|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 5 | Required for Majors | 9 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 6 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 3 | 2.00-2.99 | 1 | C | 1 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 17 | Non-major | 16 |
| 84-150 | 3 | 3.00-3.49 | 4 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 1 | F | 0 | Electives | 1 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 5 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|-----------------|-----------------------|
| Course-Section: | ECAC 420 1 |
| Title: | Info Sys For Auditors |
| Instructor: | Mulchandani,Kab |

Term - Fall 2010

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| Enrollment: | 5 |
| Questionnaires: | 5 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 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 | 4 | 4.80 | 238/1528 | 4.80 | 4.43 | 4.31 | 4.39 | 4.80 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 206/1527 | 4.80 | 4.41 | 4.28 | 4.30 | 4.80 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 237/1333 | 4.80 | 4.47 | 4.34 | 4.37 | 4.80 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 4.60 | 369/1495 | 4.60 | 4.32 | 4.25 | 4.33 | 4.60 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 132/1439 | 4.80 | 4.55 | 4.11 | 4.20 | 4.80 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4.40 | 513/1425 | 4.40 | 4.20 | 4.12 | 4.26 | 4.40 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1508 | 5.00 | 4.54 | 4.18 | 4.24 | 5.00 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 742/1526 | 4.80 | 4.86 | 4.66 | 4.71 | 4.80 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 221/1490 | 4.67 | 4.14 | 4.11 | 4.19 | 4.67 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 385/1428 | 4.80 | 4.31 | 4.49 | 4.54 | 4.80 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 839/1436 | 4.80 | 4.72 | 4.74 | 4.75 | 4.80 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 230/1427 | 4.80 | 4.34 | 4.32 | 4.37 | 4.80 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4.40 | 815/1425 | 4.40 | 4.21 | 4.34 | 4.37 | 4.40 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1291 | 5.00 | 3.98 | 4.05 | 4.10 | 5.00 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1271 | **** | 3.93 | 4.16 | 4.33 | **** |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1276 | **** | 4.38 | 4.33 | 4.49 | **** |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1273 | **** | 4.33 | 4.38 | 4.55 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | | |
|------------------------------|------------------|-------------------|
| Course-Section: ECAC 420 1 | Term - Fall 2010 | Enrollment: 5 |
| Title: Info Sys For Auditors | | Questionnaires: 5 |
| Instructor: Mulchandani,Kab | | |

| | | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

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