Course-Section: ECAC 321 01

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment: 35

Title: Audit Theory & Practice

Instructor: Broache, Michael

Questionnaires: 25

| | _ | | | Fre | quen | cies | | In | structor | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|---|-----|------|------|----|------|-----------|--------|------|-------------|-------|------|
| Questions | 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 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 10 | 4.14 | 1077/1542 | 4.14 | 4.14 | 4.33 | 4.37 | 4.14 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 11 | 4.22 | 979/1542 | 4.22 | 4.18 | 4.29 | 4.31 | 4.22 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 14 | 4.41 | 694/1339 | 4.41 | 4.46 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 4.41 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 7 | 13 | 4.26 | 843/1498 | 4.26 | 4.34 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.26 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 15 | 4.26 | 619/1428 | 4.26 | 4.33 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.26 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 14 | 4.39 | 539/1407 | 4.39 | 4.31 | 4.15 | 4.20 | 4.39 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 17 | 4.57 | 452/1521 | 4.57 | 4.57 | 4.20 | 4.23 | 4.57 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 21 | 4.91 | 620/1541 | 4.91 | 4.71 | 4.70 | 4.71 | 4.91 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 9 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 4 | 3.88 | 1078/1518 | 3.88 | 3.84 | 4.11 | 4.13 | 3.88 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 14 | 4.48 | 858/1472 | 4.48 | 4.24 | 4.46 | 4.46 | 4.48 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 16 | 4.71 | 969/1475 | 4.71 | 4.67 | 4.72 | 4.74 | 4.71 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 14 | 4.48 | 681/1471 | 4.48 | 4.22 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 4.48 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 14 | 4.33 | 886/1470 | 4.33 | 4.23 | 4.33 | 4.35 | 4.33 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 8 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 10 | 4.27 | 566/1310 | 4.27 | 4.28 | 4.06 | 4.11 | 4.27 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 18 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 3.57 | 994/1210 | 3.57 | 3.91 | 4.18 | 4.27 | 3.57 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 18 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3.71 | 1053/1211 | 3.71 | 4.08 | 4.37 | 4.45 | 3.71 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 18 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 3.71 | 1051/1207 | 3.71 | 4.01 | 4.41 | 4.51 | 3.71 |

Course-Section: ECAC 321 01

Title: Audit Theory & Practice

Instructor: Broache, Michael

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment: 35

Questionnaires: 25

| | | | | Fre | quen | cies | | In | structor | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---------------------------------------|----|----|---|-----|------|------|---|------|----------|--------|------|-------------|-------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 18 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3.67 | ****/859 | **** | 4.60 | 4.08 | 4.13 | **** |

| Credits E | arned | Cum. GP/ | 4 | Expected | Grades | Reasons | | Туре | | Majors | |
|-----------|-------|-----------|---|----------|--------|---------------------|----|-------------------|--------------|-----------------|----|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | Α | 16 | Required for Majors | 16 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 2 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 1 | С | 0 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 25 | Non-major | 12 |
| 84-150 | 7 | 3.00-3.49 | 4 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 6 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | **** - Means the | re are not e | nough responses | |
| | | | | Р | 0 | | | to be significant | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 6 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: ECAC 330 01 Title: Taxation

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment: 32

Instructor: Cole, Richard M.

Questionnaires: 19

| | _ | | | Fre | quen | cies | | In | structor | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|---|-----|------|------|----|------|-----------|--------|------|-------------|-------|------|
| Questions | 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 | 1 | 4 | 13 | 4.67 | 435/1542 | 4.67 | 4.14 | 4.33 | 4.37 | 4.67 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 11 | 4.50 | 615/1542 | 4.50 | 4.18 | 4.29 | 4.31 | 4.50 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 12 | 4.56 | 529/1339 | 4.56 | 4.46 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 4.56 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 11 | 4.67 | 357/1498 | 4.67 | 4.34 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.67 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 13 | 4.81 | 137/1428 | 4.81 | 4.33 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.81 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 11 | 4.71 | 208/1407 | 4.71 | 4.31 | 4.15 | 4.20 | 4.71 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 12 | 4.47 | 560/1521 | 4.47 | 4.57 | 4.20 | 4.23 | 4.47 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 15 | 4.88 | 721/1541 | 4.88 | 4.71 | 4.70 | 4.71 | 4.88 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 4 | 4.00 | 920/1518 | 4.00 | 3.84 | 4.11 | 4.13 | 4.00 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 10 | 4.50 | 817/1472 | 4.50 | 4.24 | 4.46 | 4.46 | 4.50 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 12 | 4.67 | 1039/1475 | 4.67 | 4.67 | 4.72 | 4.74 | 4.67 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 10 | 4.39 | 809/1471 | 4.39 | 4.22 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 4.39 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 13 | 4.67 | 498/1470 | 4.67 | 4.23 | 4.33 | 4.35 | 4.67 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 9 | 4.33 | 495/1310 | 4.33 | 4.28 | 4.06 | 4.11 | 4.33 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.86 | 170/1210 | 4.86 | 3.91 | 4.18 | 4.27 | 4.86 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 4.71 | 402/1211 | 4.71 | 4.08 | 4.37 | 4.45 | 4.71 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 4.67 | 499/1207 | 4.67 | 4.01 | 4.41 | 4.51 | 4.67 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 13 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 4.20 | 388/859 | 4.20 | 4.60 | 4.08 | 4.13 | 4.20 |

Course-Section: ECAC 330 01

Title: Taxation

Instructor: Cole,Richard M.

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment: 32

Questionnaires: 19

| • | | | | Fre | quen | cies | | In | structor | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|---|-----|------|------|---|------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/210 | **** | **** | 4.17 | 4.21 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/202 | **** | **** | 4.50 | 4.54 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/202 | **** | **** | 4.32 | 4.44 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/199 | **** | **** | 4.15 | 4.18 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/69 | **** | **** | 4.56 | 4.70 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/69 | **** | **** | 4.60 | 4.68 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/68 | **** | **** | 4.50 | 4.51 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/67 | **** | **** | 4.17 | 4.46 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.20 | 3.88 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/35 | **** | **** | 4.36 | 4.08 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/25 | **** | **** | 4.59 | 4.24 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/23 | **** | **** | 4.41 | 3.84 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/17 | **** | **** | 4.62 | 4.17 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/30 | **** | **** | 4.27 | 3.17 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/19 | **** | **** | 4.57 | 4.33 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.29 | 2.17 | **** |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/18 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 1.00 | **** |

Course-Section: ECAC 330 01

Title: Taxation

Instructor: Cole,Richard M.

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment: 32

Questionnaires: 19

| | | | | Fre | quen | cies | | In | structor | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|---|-----|------|------|---|------|----------|--------|------|-------------|-------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/13 | **** | **** | 4.14 | 1.00 | **** |

| Credits E | arned | Cum. GP/ | 4 | Expected | l Grades | Reasons | | Туре | | Majors | |
|-----------|-------|-----------|---|----------|----------|---------------------|----|-------------------|--------------|-----------------|---|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | Α | 10 | Required for Majors | 11 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 3 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 3 | С | 2 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 19 | Non-major | 5 |
| 84-150 | 6 | 3.00-3.49 | 4 | D | 1 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 2 | F | 0 | Electives | 1 | **** - Means the | re are not e | nough responses | |
| | | | | Р | 0 | | | to be significant | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 3 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: ECAC 351 01

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment: 8

Instructor: Hardy, Timothy W

Title: Advanced Cost Acct

Questionnaires: 8

| | _ | | | Fre | quen | cies | | In | structor | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|---|-----|------|------|---|------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| Questions | 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 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 4.00 | 1173/1542 | 4.00 | 4.14 | 4.33 | 4.37 | 4.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.50 | 615/1542 | 4.50 | 4.18 | 4.29 | 4.31 | 4.50 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1339 | 5.00 | 4.46 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 5.00 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 4.75 | 252/1498 | 4.75 | 4.34 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.75 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4.25 | 629/1428 | 4.25 | 4.33 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.25 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4.00 | 874/1407 | 4.00 | 4.31 | 4.15 | 4.20 | 4.00 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 4.88 | 124/1521 | 4.88 | 4.57 | 4.20 | 4.23 | 4.88 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 4.13 | 1415/1541 | 4.13 | 4.71 | 4.70 | 4.71 | 4.13 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.20 | 744/1518 | 4.20 | 3.84 | 4.11 | 4.13 | 4.20 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4.00 | 1222/1472 | 4.00 | 4.24 | 4.46 | 4.46 | 4.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1475 | 5.00 | 4.67 | 4.72 | 4.74 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4.29 | 922/1471 | 4.29 | 4.22 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 4.29 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 4.14 | 1044/1470 | 4.14 | 4.23 | 4.33 | 4.35 | 4.14 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4.33 | 495/1310 | 4.33 | 4.28 | 4.06 | 4.11 | 4.33 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4.33 | 578/1210 | 4.33 | 3.91 | 4.18 | 4.27 | 4.33 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/1211 | 5.00 | 4.08 | 4.37 | 4.45 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/1207 | 5.00 | 4.01 | 4.41 | 4.51 | 5.00 |

Course-Section: ECAC 351 01

Title: Advanced Cost Acct
Instructor: Hardy,Timothy W

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment: 8

Questionnaires: 8

| | | | | Fre | quen | cies | | In | structor | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---------------------------------------|----|----|---|-----|------|------|---|------|----------|--------|------|-------------|-------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/859 | 5.00 | 4.60 | 4.08 | 4.13 | 5.00 |

| Credits E | arned | Cum. GPA | 4 | Expected | Grades | Reasons | | Туре | | Majors | |
|-----------|-------|-----------|---|----------|--------|---------------------|---|-------------------|-------------|-----------------|---|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | Α | 5 | Required for Majors | 6 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 1 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 1 | С | 0 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 8 | Non-major | 2 |
| 84-150 | 4 | 3.00-3.49 | 2 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 3 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | **** - Means ther | e are not e | nough responses | |
| | | | | Р | 0 | | | to be significant | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 1 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 2 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: ECAC 401 01

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment: 31

- . .

Title: Advanced Accounting

Questionnaires: 22

Instructor: Hardy, Kendrall

| | NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank | | | | | | | structor | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect | |
|---|---------------------------|----|---|---|---|---|----|----------|-----------|------|-------------|-------|------|------|
| Questions | 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 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 3.77 | 1331/1542 | 3.77 | 4.14 | 4.33 | 4.42 | 3.77 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 6 | 7 | 3.50 | 1406/1542 | 3.50 | 4.18 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 3.50 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 10 | 3.86 | 1076/1339 | 3.86 | 4.46 | 4.32 | 4.44 | 3.86 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 12 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 3.70 | 1263/1498 | 3.70 | 4.34 | 4.26 | 4.35 | 3.70 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 6 | 4.00 | 851/1428 | 4.00 | 4.33 | 4.12 | 4.22 | 4.00 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4.13 | 810/1407 | 4.13 | 4.31 | 4.15 | 4.30 | 4.13 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 14 | 4.36 | 708/1521 | 4.36 | 4.57 | 4.20 | 4.24 | 4.36 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 18 | 4.90 | 689/1541 | 4.90 | 4.71 | 4.70 | 4.72 | 4.90 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 7 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 4 | 1 | 3.29 | 1367/1518 | 3.29 | 3.84 | 4.11 | 4.18 | 3.29 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 11 | 4.00 | 1222/1472 | 4.00 | 4.24 | 4.46 | 4.50 | 4.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 12 | 4.30 | 1320/1475 | 4.30 | 4.67 | 4.72 | 4.74 | 4.30 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 3 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 6 | 6 | 3.74 | 1254/1471 | 3.74 | 4.22 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 3.74 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 6 | 3.78 | 1230/1470 | 3.78 | 4.23 | 4.33 | 4.38 | 3.78 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 4 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4.20 | 626/1310 | 4.20 | 4.28 | 4.06 | 4.09 | 4.20 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 13 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2.89 | 1159/1210 | 2.89 | 3.91 | 4.18 | 4.34 | 2.89 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 13 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2.89 | 1190/1211 | 2.89 | 4.08 | 4.37 | 4.47 | 2.89 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 13 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2.67 | 1200/1207 | 2.67 | 4.01 | 4.41 | 4.53 | 2.67 |

Course-Section: ECAC 401 01

Title: Advanced Accounting

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment: 31

Questionnaires: 22

Instructor: Hardy, Kendrall

| | | | | Fre | quen | cies | | In | structor | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---------------------------------------|----|----|---|-----|------|------|---|------|----------|--------|------|-------------|-------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 14 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | ****/859 | **** | 4.60 | 4.08 | 4.19 | **** |

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Туре | | Majors | |
|-----------------------|----|-----------|---|------------------------|----|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|---|
| 00-27 | 2 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | Α | 11 | Required for Majors | 18 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 4 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 2 | С | 3 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 22 | Non-major | 5 |
| 84-150 | 12 | 3.00-3.49 | 2 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 8 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | **** - Means there are not enough responses | | | |
| | | | | Р | 0 | | | to be significant | | | |
| | | | | 1 | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 3 | | | | | | |