

Course-Section: ECAC 321 0101  
 Title AUDIT THEORY & PRACTIC  
 Instructor: CROTEAU, MARCIA  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 510  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	479/1670	4.67	3.93	4.31	4.24	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	943/1666	4.27	3.74	4.27	4.18	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	703/1406	4.42	4.42	4.32	4.22	4.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	953/1615	4.18	3.92	4.24	4.18	4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	1	7	4.25	643/1566	4.25	3.63	4.07	4.04	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	2	1	6	4.20	760/1528	4.20	3.77	4.12	4.07	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	903/1650	4.25	4.18	4.22	4.12	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.50	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	0	4	6	4.36	605/1626	4.36	3.87	4.11	4.06	4.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	796/1559	4.58	4.14	4.46	4.40	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	1090/1560	4.67	4.53	4.72	4.67	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	683/1549	4.50	3.80	4.31	4.25	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	987/1546	4.25	3.58	4.32	4.24	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	456/1323	4.36	4.08	4.00	3.99	4.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	1314/1384	2.75	3.38	4.10	4.12	2.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	1336/1378	2.75	3.75	4.29	4.30	2.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1276/1378	3.25	4.00	4.31	4.33	3.25
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 904	****	3.75	4.03	4.03	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 1	General 1	Under-grad 12	Non-major 12
84-150	6	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 9		
				? 2			

Course-Section: ECAC 351 0101  
 Title ADVANCED COST ACCT  
 Instructor: HARDY, TIMOTHY  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 511  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	0	2	6	0	3.20	1602/1670	3.20	3.93	4.31	4.24	3.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	2	1	3.20	1582/1666	3.20	3.74	4.27	4.18	3.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	2	1	4	3.67	1380/1615	3.67	3.92	4.24	4.18	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	4	3	0	3.00	1478/1566	3.00	3.63	4.07	4.04	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	2	1	2	1	3.33	1368/1528	3.33	3.77	4.12	4.07	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	1067/1650	4.11	4.18	4.22	4.12	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	4.00	1524/1667	4.00	4.50	4.67	4.67	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	2	5	0	3.38	1448/1626	3.38	3.87	4.11	4.06	3.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	0	6	2	3.70	1421/1559	3.70	4.14	4.46	4.40	3.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	1326/1560	4.40	4.53	4.72	4.67	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	0	3	5	0	3.10	1483/1549	3.10	3.80	4.31	4.25	3.10
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	3	3	1	2.90	1496/1546	2.90	3.58	4.32	4.24	2.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	2	4	3	3.80	894/1323	3.80	4.08	4.00	3.99	3.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	820/1384	4.00	3.38	4.10	4.12	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	400/1378	4.75	3.75	4.29	4.30	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	439/1378	4.75	4.00	4.31	4.33	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	629/ 904	3.75	3.75	4.03	4.03	3.75

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
-----											
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	10
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	1						