Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

Instructor:

Enrollment: 39 Questionnaires: 31

Baltimore County SORKIN, ALAN L Fall 2005

Page 523 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

							Fr	eque	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Cours	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski		om this course	0	0	1	3	9	16	2	3.48	1517/167	4 3.99	4.22	4.27	4.07	3.48
_	_	ctor make clear			1	0	0	3	11	10	6		1436/167			4.23	4.16	3.63
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	2	6	16	7		1107/142				4.16	3.90
		uations reflect			1	24	0	1	1	3	1		****/160		4.13	4.22	4.05	****
5. Did as	ssigned r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	3	5	9	9	5	3.26	1364/158	3.82	3.96	3.96	3.88	3.26
6. Did wi	ritten as	signments contr	ibute 1	to what you learned	1	27	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/153	3.79	4.01	4.08	3.89	****
7. Was th	he gradin	g system clearly	y expla	ained	0	1	0	5	4	7	14	4.00	1097/165	1 4.15	4.33	4.18	4.10	4.00
8. How ma	any times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	15	16	4.52	1196/167	3 4.48	4.66	4.69	4.67	4.52
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	2	1	0	4	12	12	0	3.29	1462/165	3.82	4.02	4.07	3.96	3.29
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	the instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	1	2	9	19	4.48	887/158	5 4.43	4.53	4.43	4.37	4.48
		ctor seem inter			0	0	1	0	2	16	12	4.23	1410/158	5 4.62	4.68	4.69	4.60	4.23
				explained clearly	0	0	0	3	9	13	6		1333/158			4.26	4.17	3.71
		es contribute to		-	0	0	0	0	6	13	12	4.19	1010/157	5 4.27	4.38	4.27	4.17	
				your understanding	0	23	0	2	2	3	1		1108/138		3.77		3.78	3.38
		Discus	gion															
1 Did di	lass disc			what you learned	4	0	3	5	10	5	4	3 07	1339/152	3.65	3.80	4.01	3.76	3.07
	Did class discussions contribute to what you learne Were all students actively encouraged to participat				5	0	3	10	5	4	4		1451/151			4.24	3.70	2.85
	Were all students actively encouraged to participate Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion				4	0	7	4	8	2	6		1454/151		4.12	4.27	4.00	2.85
		echniques succes		ia open arbeassion	5	24	1	1	0	0			****/ 99		3.64	3.94		****
		Labora	toru															
2. Were y	you provi		-	ground information	28	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 27	3 ****	****	4.19	3.97	****
		Field	ido sels															
1 Did f	iold owno			what you learned	28	0	0	2	0	1	Λ	2.67	****/ 7	< ****	****	3.98	3.32	****
				luation criteria	28	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	, .	-	****	3.93	3.42	****
		ctor available			28	2	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 5	•	****	4.45	4.34	****
		a 16																
1. Did se	elf-paced	Self : system contrib		what you learned	30	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 6	1 ****	****	4.09	3.87	****
				<b>T</b>		- <del>-</del>	1											
				Frequ	iency	DIS	Lrib	utlo	11									
Credits I	redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade							Re	ason	S			T	ype			Majors	3
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	2	A 3		Red	 quir	ed f	or M	 ajor	`s	7	Gradua	 te	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	в 11						-						_		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C 12		Gei	nera	1				3	Under-	grad	31	Non-	-major	31
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 2														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### -	Means	there a	are not	enoug	<sub>J</sub> h
				P 0									respon	ses to :	be sigr	nificar	nt	
				Ι 0		Otl	ner				1	7						
				? 0														

#### Course-Section: ECON 101 0201 University of Maryland Page 524 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006 Fall 2005

Instructor: SORKIN, ALAN L

Enrollment: 30 Questionnaires: 20

Ctudont	Conrac	Evaluation	Ougation	n - i - n - n
Scudent	COULSE	Evaluation	Ouescion	Halle

Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies					Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	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	0	3	4	4	9	3.95	1259/1674	3.99	4.22	4.27	4.07	3.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	8	5	5	3.60	1451/1674	4.12	4.25	4.23	4.16	3.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	7	9	4.20	894/1423	4.32	4.37	4.27	4.16	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1094/1609	4.07	4.13	4.22	4.05	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	5	7	3	3.25	1364/1585	3.82	3.96	3.96	3.88	3.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	19	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1535	3.79	4.01	4.08	3.89	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	1	4	4	9	4.00	1097/1651	4.15	4.33	4.18	4.10	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	11	4.55	1169/1673	4.48	4.66	4.69	4.67	4.55
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	1	0	5	7	3	3.69	1286/1656	3.82	4.02	4.07	3.96	3.69
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	2	16	4.74	,	4.43	4.53	4.43	4.37	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	6	12		1208/1585	4.62	4.68	4.69	4.60	4.53
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	2	6	10	4.26	924/1582	4.06	4.24	4.26	4.17	4.26
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	8	9	4.32	905/1575	4.27	4.38	4.27	4.17	4.32
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	14	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1094/1380	3.65	3.77	3.94	3.78	3.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	9	3	3	3.35	1243/1520	3.65	3.80	4.01	3.76	3.35
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	3	7	4	2	3.18	1399/1515	3.84	4.05	4.24	3.97	3.18
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	8	6	2	3.47	1315/1511	3.94	4.12	4.27	4.00	3.47
4. Were special techniques successful	3	14	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 994	3.44	3.64	3.94	3.73	****
Frequency Distribu														

Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA			Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	7	General	3	Under-grad	20	Non-major	18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	2						

ECON 101 0301 University of Maryland PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS Baltimore County

Title PRIN OF MICROECONOM: Instructor: CARROLL, KATHLE

Instructor: CARRO Enrollment: 41 Questionnaires: 26 Fall 2005

Page 525 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eauer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean			
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	7	2	15	4.12	1105/1674	3.99	4.22	4.27	4.07	4.12
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	6	6	13	4.15	1035/1674	4.12	4.25	4.23	4.16	4.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	9	14	4.38	718/1423	4.32	4.37	4.27	4.16	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	2	5	5	10	4.05	1068/1609	4.07	4.13	4.22	4.05	4.05
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	4	5	13	4.08	715/1585	3.82	3.96	3.96	3.88	4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	2	1	3	3	10	3.95	961/1535	3.79	4.01	4.08	3.89	3.95
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	5	18	4.60	393/1651	4.15	4.33	4.18	4.10	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1673	4.48	4.66	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	5	8	6	4.05	924/1656	3.82	4.02	4.07	3.96	4.05
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	21	4.88	266/1586	4.43	4 53	4.43	4.37	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	510/1585	4.62	4.68	4.69	4.60	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	4			4.50			4.24	4.26	4.17	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	0	21	4.67	495/1575	4.27	4.38	4.27	4.17	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	11	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	406/1380		3.77	3.94	3.78	4.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	2	0	9	3	2		1309/1520	3.65	3.80	4.01	3.76	3.19
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	2	5	4	4		1303/1515		4.05	4.24	3.97	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	3	4	8		1004/1511		4.12	4.27	4.00	4.13
4. Were special techniques successful	10	10	0	1	3	1	1	3.33	****/ 994	3.44	3.64	3.94	3.73	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	3.97	***
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	3.97	***
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.41	***
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.20	4.00	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	1	2	0	3 67	****/ 103	****	4.88	4.41	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 101	****	4.88	4.48	4.18	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	1	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 95	****	4.71	4.31	3.99	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	2	1		****/ 99	****	4.75	4.39	4.10	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	1	1	1		****/ 97	****	4.88	4.14	3.69	****
or note officers for granting made officer	23	Ü	Ü	Ü	_	-	_	1.00	, , ,		1.00		3.03	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	,	****	****	3.98	3.32	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.87	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	3.91	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	3.88	****

Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

Instructor: CARROLL, KATHLE

Enrollment: 41
Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 525 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	4	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	6	General	3	Under-grad	26	Non-major	26
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	1			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	1						

ECON 101 0401 University of Maryland PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS Baltimore County

Title PRIN OF MICROECONO

Instructor: MITCH, DAVID F

Enrollment: 41
Questionnaires: 27

# Fall 2005

Page 526 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
---------	--------	------------	---------------

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	0	3	10	12	4.23	979/1674	3.99	4.22	4.27	4.07	4.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	13	10	4.27	919/1674		4.25	4.23	4.16	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	5	19	4.62	445/1423	4.32	4.37	4.27	4.16	4.62
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	2	1	3	5	12	4.04	1068/1609	4.07	4.13	4.22	4.05	4.04
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	7	6	12	4.08	722/1585	3.82	3.96	3.96	3.88	4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	3	2	3	8	8	3.67	1207/1535	3.79	4.01	4.08	3.89	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	2	5	16	4.27	855/1651	4.15	4.33	4.18	4.10	4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1673	4.48	4.66	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	5	14	2	3.86	1162/1656	3.82	4.02	4.07	3.96	3.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	9	15	4.44	945/1586	4.43	4.53	4.43	4.37	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	5	21	4.74	938/1585	4.62	4.68	4.69	4.60	4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	5	8	12		1070/1582	4.06	4.24	4.26	4.17	4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	2	7			1010/1575	4.27	4.38	4.27		4.19
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	15	2	1	2	5	2	3.33	1127/1380	3.65	3.77	3.94	3.78	3.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	6	3	1	2	7		1343/1520	3.65	3.80	4.01	3.76	3.05
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	3	2	3	5	5		1346/1515	3.84	4.05	4.24	3.97	3.39
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	4	2	4	7		1265/1511	3.94	4.12	4.27	4.00	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	1	3	5	3	5	3.47	747/ 994	3.44	3.64	3.94	3.73	3.47
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	3.97	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	3.97	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.41	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	2	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.20	4.00	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	1	0	1	0	0	1		****/ 103	****	4.88	4.41	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 101	****	4.88	4.48	4.18	***
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 95	****	4.71	4.31	3.99	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	2	0	1		****/ 99	****	4.75	4.39	4.10	***
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 97	****	4.88	4.14	3.69	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	3.32	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	1	0	0	0	2		****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	2	0	1		****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	1	0	1		****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.87	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.07	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	3.91	***
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	3.88	****

Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

Instructor: MITCH, DAVID F

Enrollment: 41
Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 526 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	 А	13	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	2	Under-grad	27	Non-major	25
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	1						

PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

Title

Instructor: MITCH, DAVID F

Enrollment: 43 Questionnaires: 25

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 527 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	5	11	8	4.04	1163/1674	3.99	4.22	4.27	4.07	4.04
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	3	7	12		1060/1674		4.25	4.23	4.16	4.12
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	9	14	4.48	599/1423		4.37	4.27	4.16	4.48
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	3	7	10	4.35	715/1609	4.07	4.13	4.22	4.05	4.35
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	4	10	7	3.91	893/1585	3.82	3.96	3.96	3.88	3.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	2	1	4	8	6	3.71	1177/1535	3.79	4.01	4.08	3.89	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	1	6	4	11	4.00	1097/1651	4.15	4.33	4.18	4.10	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	0	22	4.91	635/1673	4.48	4.66	4.69	4.67	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	10	8	2	3.60	1330/1656	3.82	4.02	4.07	3.96	3.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	8	14	4.44	945/1586		4.53	4.43	4.37	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	20	4.76	896/1585	4.62	4.68	4.69	4.60	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	4	3	9	9		1199/1582		4.24	4.26	4.17	3.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	6	8	11		1010/1575	4.27	4.38	4.27	4.17	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	11	2	2	2	3	4	3.38	1103/1380	3.65	3.77	3.94	3.78	3.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	3	5	6	5		1080/1520		3.80	4.01	3.76	3.68
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	2	4	5	6		1282/1515	3.84	4.05	4.24	3.97	3.58
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6 6	0 7	1 2	2 4	2	9 1	5		1205/1511		4.12	4.27	4.00	3.79
4. Were special techniques successful	ь	/	2	4	U	Τ	5	3.25	835/ 994	3.44	3.64	3.94	3.73	3.25
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	3.97	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	3.97	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.41	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	2	0	1	0	1	0		****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.20	4.00	****
Seminar		_		_		_	_							
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 103	***	4.88	4.41	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 101	****	4.88	4.48	4.18	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 95	****	4.71	4.31	3.99	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21 21	1 2	0	0	0	1 1	2 1	4.67 4.50	****/ 99 ****/ 97	****	4.75 4.88	4.39 4.14	4.10 3.69	****
5. Were criteria for grading made crear	21	2	U	U	U	1		4.50	/ 9/		4.00	4.14	3.09	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	3.32	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	1	2	0		****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.87	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	3.91	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	3.88	****

Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

Instructor: MITCH, DAVID F

Enrollment: 43
Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 527 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	redits Earned Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	 7	0.00-0.99	2	 А	9	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	В	9						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	6	General	3	Under-grad	25	Non-major	22
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 101 0601 University of Maryland Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

Baltimore County Fall 2005

Instructor: DASGUPTA, NANDI Enrollment: 41 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questionnaires: 16

Page 528 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncie	5		Instr	ructor	Course	Der
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mea

Questions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Me General	ean Mean Mean Mean Mean
Conoral	
General	
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 1 0 0 1 2 7 5 4.07 1147/1674 3.99 4.22 4.27 4.07 4.	.99 4.22 4.27 4.07 4.07
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 0 1 0 5 9 4.47 641/1674 4.12 4.25 4.23 4.16 4.	.12 4.25 4.23 4.16 4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 0 0 0 0 3 12 $4.80$ $203/1423$ $4.32$ $4.37$ $4.27$ $4.16$ $4$	.32 4.37 4.27 4.16 4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 9 0 0 1 0 5 4.67 312/1609 4.07 4.13 4.22 4.05 4.	.07 4.13 4.22 4.05 4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 2 2 2 1 3 4 3.42 1289/1585 3.82 3.96 3.88 3.	.82 3.96 3.96 3.88 3.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 8 0 0 1 2 3 4.33 578/1535 3.79 4.01 4.08 3.89 4.	.79 4.01 4.08 3.89 4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 2 0 0 0 2 1 11 4.64 351/1651 4.15 4.33 4.18 4.10 4.	.15 4.33 4.18 4.10 4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness $4$ 0 0 1 0 5 6 4.33 615/1656 3.82 4.02 4.07 3.96 4.	.82 4.02 4.07 3.96 4.33
Lecture	
	.43 4.53 4.43 4.37 4.71
	.65 3.77 3.94 3.78 4.20
Discussion	
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10 0 2 1 0 1 2 3.00 1353/1520 3.65 3.80 4.01 3.76 3.	.65 3.80 4.01 3.76 3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10 0 1 0 1 1 3 3.83 1167/1515 3.84 4.05 4.24 3.97 3.	.84 4.05 4.24 3.97 3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10 0 1 0 1 0 4 4.00 1050/1511 3.94 4.12 4.27 4.00 4.	.94 4.12 4.27 4.00 4.00
4. Were special techniques successful 9 5 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 994 3.44 3.64 3.94 3.73 **	.44 3.64 3.94 3.73 ****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	4	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

Instructor: CARROLL, KATHLE

Enrollment: 39
Questionnaires: 24

Title

39

Fall 2005

Page 529 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

		Questions	5		NR	NA	Fr	_	ncies	5 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did	vou gain	new insights, skil	_	m this course	0	0	0	2	3	6	13	4.25	954/1674	3.99	4.22	4.27	4.07	4.25
	_	ructor make clear			1	0	0	2	2	8	11	4.22	980/1674		4.25	4.23	4.16	4.22
		questions reflect			1	0	1	1	1	5	15	4.39	707/1423		4.37	4.27	4.16	4.39
		aluations reflect			1	10	1	1	2	1	8		1048/1609		4.13	4.22	4.05	4.08
		readings contribu			0	1	1	3	3	7	9	3.87	946/1585		3.96	3.96	3.88	3.87
6. Did	written	assignments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	10	0	0	5	2	7	4.14	787/1535	3.79	4.01	4.08	3.89	4.14
7. Was	the grad	ing system clearly	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	4	7	13	4.38	713/1651	4.15	4.33	4.18	4.10	4.38
8. How	many tim	es was class cance	elled		0	1	0	0	1	0	22	4.91	635/1673	4.48	4.66	4.69	4.67	4.91
9. How	would yo	u grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	3	0	0	1	5	7	8	4.05	930/1656	3.82	4.02	4.07	3.96	4.05
		Lecture	9															
1. Wer	e the ins	tructor's lectures	s well	prepared	0	0	0	1	1	4	18	4.63	723/1586	4.43	4.53	4.43	4.37	4.63
2. Did	the inst	ructor seem intere	ested i	n the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	19	4.75	917/1585	4.62	4.68	4.69	4.60	4.75
3. Was	lecture	xplained clearly	0	0	1	0	4	8	11	4.17	1025/1582	4.06	4.24	4.26	4.17	4.17		
4. Did	d the lectures contribute to what you learned d audiovisual techniques enhance your understand.					1	0	2	1	5	15	4.43	780/1575	4.27	4.38	4.27	4.17	4.43
5. Did	audiovis	our understanding	0	14	0	1	2	1	6	4.20	540/1380	3.65	3.77	3.94	3.78	4.20		
		Discus																
		scussions contrib			8	0	1	1	3	1	10	4.13	760/1520	3.65	3.80	4.01	3.76	4.13
		dents actively end			8	0	2	1	0	2	11	4.19	949/1515		4.05	4.24	3.97	4.19
				d open discussion	8	0	2	1	4	0	9		1188/1511		4.12	4.27	4.00	3.81
4. Wer	e special	techniques succes	ssful		8	13	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 994	3.44	3.64	3.94	3.73	****
		Field V																
2. Did	you clea	rly understand you	ır eval	uation criteria	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.42	****
		Self I	Paced															
1. Did	self-pac	ed system contribu	ıte to	what you learned	22	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.87	****
		Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio:	n											
Credit	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad							Re	asons	3			Ty	pe			Majors	5
00-27	00-27 5 0.00-0.99 1 A 5						anir	 ed f	or Ma			9	 Graduat		0	Majo		2
	28-55 1 1.00-1.99 1 B 7					1/6/	quil	cu I	OI 1416	בטנ ג	D	,	Graduat	_	U	Ma JC	) <u>+</u>	4
56-83						Ger	nera	1				1	Under-q	rad 2	24	Non-	-major	22
	84-150 1 3.00-3.49 2 D 4						c. a	_				-	onder 9		-	1,011		22
Grad.		3.50-4.00	F 0		El	ecti	ves				1	#### - 3	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh	

Other

11

Ρ

I

0

Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

Instructor: KORNILOV, GUERM

Enrollment: 32
Questionnaires: 25

GUERM Fall

University of Maryland Page 530
Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006
Fall 2005 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncie: 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	-	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	1	9	13	4.42	751/1674	3.99	4.22	4.27	4.07	4.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	3	18	4.58	483/1674		4.25	4.23	4.16	4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	4	17	4.65	390/1423	4.32	4.37	4.27	4.16	4.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	3	7	12	4.41	645/1609	4.07	4.13	4.22	4.05	4.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	6	3	13	4.22	593/1585	3.82	3.96	3.96	3.88	4.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	3	2	1	5	4	7	3.68	1196/1535	3.79	4.01	4.08	3.89	3.68
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	7	16	4.70	298/1651	4.15	4.33	4.18	4.10	4.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	13	11	4.46	1257/1673	4.48	4.66	4.69	4.67	4.46
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	11	8	4.35	588/1656	3.82	4.02	4.07	3.96	4.35
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	192/1586	4.43	4.53	4.43	4.37	4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1585	4.62	4.68	4.69	4.60	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	366/1582	4.06	4.24	4.26	4.17	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	1	19	4.81	279/1575	4.27	4.38	4.27	4.17	4.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	3	0	18	4.71	167/1380	3.65	3.77	3.94	3.78	4.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	4	5	12	4.38	529/1520	3.65	3.80	4.01	3.76	4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	420/1515	3.84	4.05	4.24	3.97	4.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	402/1511	3.94	4.12	4.27	4.00	4.76
4. Were special techniques successful	5	11	2	0	2	1	4	3.56	715/ 994	3.44	3.64	3.94	3.73	3.56
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	3.97	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	3.97	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.41	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.20	4.00	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.88	4.41	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	1	0	2		****/ 101	****	4.88	4.48	4.18	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.71	4.31	3.99	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 99	****	4.75	4.39	4.10	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.88	4.14	3.69	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	3.32	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.87	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	3.91	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	3.88	****

Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

Instructor: KORNILOV, GUERM

Enrollment: 32
Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 530 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	11	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	В	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	3	Under-grad	25	Non-major	24
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	1						

Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

Instructor: KAIKAI, ALPHA

Enrollment: 40 Questionnaires: 21

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 531 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	13	5	4.05	1163/1674	3.99	4.22	4.27	4.07	4.05
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	9	10	4.33	830/1674		4.25	4.23	4.16	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	11	7	4.14	929/1423	4.32	4.37	4.27	4.16	4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	16	0	0	1	3	1		****/1609	4.07	4.13	4.22	4.05	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	2	8	5	4.06	728/1585	3.82	3.96	3.96	3.88	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	18	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/1535	3.79	4.01	4.08	3.89	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	3	6	9	3.95	1162/1651	4.15	4.33	4.18	4.10	3.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	17	4	4.19	1463/1673	4.48	4.66	4.69	4.67	4.19
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	2	0	3	3	5	3.69	1280/1656	3.82	4.02	4.07	3.96	3.69
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	9	8		1024/1586		4.53	4.43	4.37	4.39
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	6	11		1183/1585	4.62	4.68	4.69	4.60	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	1	9	7	4.22	967/1582		4.24	4.26	4.17	4.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	3	4	10	4.28	940/1575	4.27	4.38	4.27	4.17	4.28
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	10	1	0	0	3	2	3.83	845/1380	3.65	3.77	3.94	3.78	3.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	2	5	6	4.14	743/1520		3.80	4.01	3.76	4.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	2	5	6		1002/1515	3.84	4.05	4.24	3.97	4.07
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1 1	2	2 1	9	4.36	798/1511		4.12	4.27	4.00	4.36
4. Were special techniques successful	6	13	U	Т	U	Τ	U	3.00	****/ 994	3.44	3.64	3.94	3.73	* * * *
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	3.97	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	3.97	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	2	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.41	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	1	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.20	4.00	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	3	0	0	2	0	0		****/ 103	***	4.88	4.41	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 101	****	4.88	4.48	4.18	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	2	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 95	****	4.71	4.31	3.99	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18 18	1 2	0	0	1 1	1	0	3.50	****/ 99 ****/ 97	****	4.75 4.88	4.39 4.14	4.10 3.69	****
5. Were criteria for grading made crear	10	۷	U	U	1	U	U	3.00	/ 9/		4.00	4.14	3.09	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.00	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	3.32	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	1	0	2	0	0		****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	1	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.87	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	3.91	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.92	***
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	3.88	****

Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

Instructor: KAIKAI, ALPHA

Enrollment: 40
Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 531 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	2	General	3	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

Instructor:

KAIKAI, ALPHA

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2005

Page 532 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 39
Questionnaires: 26

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Ouestion	<b>a</b>		ND	NA	Fre	eque:	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Quescion										Mean					Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
		w insights,ski			0	0	1	2	5	10	8	3.85	1359/1674	3.99	4.22	4.27	4.07	3.85
		tor make clear			0	0	1	1	2	7	15	4.31	870/1674	4.12	4.25	4.23	4.16	4.31
	_	estions reflec		_	0	0	0	0	2	8	16	4.54	540/1423	4.32	4.37	4.27	4.16	4.54
		ations reflect			0	18	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	852/1609	4.07	4.13	4.22	4.05	4.25
	_	_		what you learned	0	2	1	1	4	6	12	4.13	682/1585	3.82	3.96	3.96	3.88	4.13
		-		what you learned	0	19	2	1	0	1	3		1374/1535	3.79	4.01	4.08	3.89	3.29
		system clearl		ined	0	0	0	1	0	7	18		382/1651	4.15	4.33	4.18	4.10	4.62
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	19	7		1412/1673	4.48	4.66	4.69	4.67	4.27
9. How wo	uld you g	rade the overa	ll teac	ning effectiveness	3	2	0	3	1	13	4	3.86	1162/1656	3.82	4.02	4.07	3.96	3.86
		Lectur																
1. Were t			2	0	1	0	0	8	15	4.50	858/1586		4.53	4.43	4.37	4.50		
		n the subject	2	0	0	1	1	5	17		1158/1585	4.62	4.68	4.69	4.60	4.58		
		xplained clearly	2	0	0	1	3	9	11	4.25	935/1582	4.06	4.24	4.26	4.17	4.25		
		you learned	2	0	0	1	1	6	16	4.54	646/1575	4.27	4.38	4.27	4.17	4.54		
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques en	our understanding	2	17	0	2	0	0	5	4.14	585/1380	3.65	3.77	3.94	3.78	4.14	
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	11	0	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	635/1520	3.65	3.80	4.01	3.76	4.27
2. Were a	ll studen	ts actively en	courage	d to participate	11	0	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	827/1515	3.84	4.05	4.24	3.97	4.33
3. Did th	e instruc	tor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	358/1511	3.94	4.12	4.27	4.00	4.80
4. Were s	pecial te	chniques succe	ssful		11	9	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	****/ 994	3.44	3.64	3.94	3.73	* * * *
		Labora	tory															
1. Did th	e lab inc	rease understa	nding o	f the material	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	3.97	****
2. Were y	ou provid	ed with adequa	te back	ground information	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	3.97	****
		Frequ	iency	, Dist	trib	utio	n											
Credits E	arned	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	S			Ту	pe			Majors	\$		
		Cum. GPA																
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	1	A 12		Red	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s	6	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	1
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В 8														
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C 4		Ger	nera	1				8	Under-g	rad 2	26	Non-	-major	25
84-150															_			
Grad.	. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0						ecti	ves				1	#### - 1				_	jh
				I O		Otl	her				1	.1	T CPPOILE		c bign	LILICAL		

?

Course-Section: ECON 101 1401 University of Maryland
Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS Baltimore County

Instructor: DASGUPTA, NANDI

Enrollment: 30
Questionnaires: 14

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Fall 2005

Page 533 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	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	0	1	0	5	8	4.43	735/1674	3.99	4.22	4.27	4.07	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	406/1674	4.12	4.25	4.23	4.16	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	167/1423	4.32	4.37	4.27	4.16	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	312/1609	4.07	4.13	4.22	4.05	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	4	3	4	3.62	1156/1585	3.82	3.96	3.96	3.88	3.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	131/1535	3.79	4.01	4.08	3.89	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	643/1651	4.15	4.33	4.18	4.10	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	10	3	4.07	1537/1673	4.48	4.66	4.69	4.67	4.07
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	381/1656	3.82	4.02	4.07	3.96	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	Λ	Λ	0	2	1.0	4.83	336/1586	4.43	4.53	4.43	4.37	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	737/1585	4.62	4.68	4.69	4.60	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	1	2	8	4.33	850/1582		4.24	4.26	4.17	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	692/1575	4.27	4.38	4.27	4.17	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	7	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	489/1380	3.65	3.77	3.94	3.78	
J. Did additional techniques childree your anderstanding	5	,	U	U	_	_		1.25	105/1500	3.03	3.77	3.71	3.70	1.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1520	3.65	3.80	4.01	3.76	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1515	3.84	4.05	4.24	3.97	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1511	3.94	4.12	4.27	4.00	****
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 994	3.44	3.64	3.94	3.73	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	11	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

101 1501 University of Maryland

Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

Instructor: Cobb, Vincent

Enrollment: 34
Questionnaires: 22

Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 534 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	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	2	4	7	6	3		1599/1674		4.22	4.27	4.07	3.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	2	9	4	3		1608/1674	4.12	4.25	4.23	4.16	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	5	5	5	4		1354/1423		4.37	4.27	4.16	3.09
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	5	3	1	2	2	2.46	1604/1609	4.07	4.13	4.22	4.05	2.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	4	2	1	8	5		1297/1585	3.82	3.96	3.96	3.88	3.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	11	1	3	5	1		1521/1535	3.79	4.01	4.08	3.89	2.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	9	4	1	4			1608/1651	4.15	4.33	4.18	4.10	2.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	19	3		1504/1673	4.48	4.66	4.69	4.67	4.14
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	2	4	2	8	1	0	2.40	1627/1656	3.82	4.02	4.07	3.96	2.40
Lecture	_		_	_		_	_							
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	6	3	3	7	1		1565/1586	4.43	4.53	4.43	4.37	2.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	2	3	1	2	11		1507/1585	4.62	4.68	4.69	4.60	3.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	5	5	6	3	1		1564/1582	4.06		4.26	4.17	2.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	1	5	3	7		1402/1575	4.27	4.38	4.27	4.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	8	6	2	1	2	1	2.17	1353/1380	3.65	3.77	3.94	3.78	2.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	3	3	1	3	3	3 00	1353/1520	3.65	3.80	4.01	3.76	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	2	1	3	2	4		1337/1515	3.84	4.05	4.24	3.70	3.42
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	2	3	2	0	5		1371/1511	3.94	4.12	4.27	4.00	3.25
4. Were special techniques successful	9	7	1	1	0	2	2	3.50	732/ 994	3.44	3.64			3.50
1. Note special deciminates successful		,	-	_	Ü	-	_	3.30	,52, 551	3.11	3.01	3.71	3.75	3.30
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	3.97	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	3.97	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00		****	****	4.46	4.41	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.20	4.00	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 103	****	4.88	4.41	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.88	4.48	4.18	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.71	4.31	3.99	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 99	****	4.75	4.39	4.10	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.88	4.14	3.69	****
miald Mank														
Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	3.32	****
	21		0		0	0	_		****/ 77	****	****			****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0			1	3.00		****	****	3.93	3.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21 21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53 ****/ 48	****	****	4.45	4.34	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	0	1 1		****/ 49	****	****	4.12	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	U	U	U	U	U	Τ	5.00	/ 49			4.27	4.30	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.87	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	3.91	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****		3.88	***

Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

Instructor: Cobb, Vincent

Enrollment: 34
Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 534 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	2	A	2	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	10	General	1	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	3						

Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

Instructor: Coomber, Willia

Enrollment: 40

Enrollment: 40
Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2005

Page 535 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	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	1	8	13	3		1474/1674		4.22	4.27	4.07	3.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	8	8	9		1196/1674	4.12	4.25	4.23	4.16	3.96
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	8	8	9		1052/1423		4.37	4.27	4.16	3.96
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	2	8	11	2		1427/1609		4.13		4.05	3.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	7	9	7	3.84	966/1585		3.96	3.96	3.88	3.84
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	7	8	8		1162/1535	3.79	4.01	4.08	3.89	3.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	4	2	2	4	7	7		1368/1651		4.33	4.18	4.10	3.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	1	15	8		1390/1673		4.66	4.69	4.67	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	6	11	3	3.76	1230/1656	3.82	4.02	4.07	3.96	3.76
Lecture	0	0	0	^	_	0		4 00	1200/1506	4 42	4 52	4 42	4 27	4 00
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	8	8 7	8		1300/1586		4.53	4.43	4.37	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	•	5	, 5	12		1378/1585		4.68	4.69	4.60	4.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0		0	12		6		1314/1582		4.24	4.26	4.17	3.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1 3	1 4	2	3 7	11	6		1254/1575		4.38	4.27	4.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	4	3	/	5	2	2.90	1270/1380	3.65	3.77	3.94	3.78	2.90
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	6	6	8	4.00	810/1520	3.65	3.80	4.01	3.76	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	2	1	7	10	4.25	898/1515	3.84	4.05	4.24	3.70	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	3	7	9	4.20	955/1511	3.94	4.12	4.27	4.00	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	6	13	0	2	2	1	2	3.43	773/ 994		3.64	3.94		3.43
1. Were special ecciniques successivi	O	13	O	2	2	_	2	3.13	113/ 331	3.11	3.01	3.71	3.73	3.13
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	3.97	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	3.97	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	0	0	0	0	1	0			****	****	4.46	4.41	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 233	****	****	4.20	4.00	****
									,					
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 103	****	4.88	4.41	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 101	****	4.88	4.48	4.18	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 95	****	4.71	4.31	3.99	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 99	****	4.75	4.39	4.10	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	****	4.88	4.14	3.69	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	3.32	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.87	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	3.91	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35		****	4.36	3.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	3.88	****

Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

Instructor: Coomber, Willia

Enrollment: 40
Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 535 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	 5	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1	В	15						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	26	Non-major	26
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 101 1801 University of Maryland

Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS Baltimore County
Instructor: Coomber, Willia Fall 2005

Enrollment: 39

Questionnaires: 22

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 536

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

			Fr	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	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	1	0	2	8	10	4.24	979/1674	3.99	4.22	4.27	4.07	4.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	2	2	15	4.43	705/1674	4.12	4.25	4.23	4.16	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	5	13	4.43	672/1423	4.32	4.37	4.27	4.16	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	5	11	4.29	812/1609	4.07	4.13	4.22	4.05	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	6	12	4.38	432/1585	3.82	3.96	3.96	3.88	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	4	6	10	4.14	787/1535	3.79	4.01	4.08	3.89	4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	5	1	14	4.29	832/1651	4.15	4.33	4.18	4.10	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	9	11		1235/1673	4.48	4.66	4.69	4.67	4.48
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	1	0	1	9	6	4.12	882/1656	3.82	4.02	4.07	3.96	4.12
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	2	0	3	13	4.32	1094/1586	4.43	4.53	4.43	4.37	4.32
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	1	16	4.74	960/1585	4.62	4.68	4.69	4.60	4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	2	2	3	11	4.11	1079/1582	4.06	4.24	4.26	4.17	4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	3	0	3	13	4.37	857/1575	4.27	4.38	4.27	4.17	4.37
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	4	4	0	5	3	1	2.77	1288/1380	3.65	3.77	3.94	3.78	2.77
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	1	1	3	9	4.20	700/1520	3.65	3.80	4.01	3.76	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	0	3	11	4.60	543/1515	3.84	4.05	4.24	3.97	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	3	4	7	4.13	997/1511	3.94	4.12	4.27	4.00	4.13
4. Were special techniques successful	7	10	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/ 994	3.44	3.64	3.94	3.73	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	 А	11	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	В	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8	_			
				?	0						

Title PRIN OF MICROECON-HONO

Instructor: MCCONNELL, VIRG

Enrollment: 27
Questionnaires: 23

Fall 2005

Page 537 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

		Questior	ıs		NR	NA	Fre	eque: 2	ncie	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Ran	_	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1 541		Genera		F1-1	0	0	0	_	1	-	1.0	4 25	0.41./1	C 7 4	4 25	4 00	4 07	4 07	4 25
_	_	insights,ski or make clear			0	0	0	2	1 6	13	13 4	4.35	841/1 1258/1		4.35 3.91	4.22 4.25	4.27 4.23	4.07 4.16	4.35 3.91
		stions reflec	_	_	0	0	0	0	5	12	6	4.04	992/1		4.04	4.25	4.23	4.16	4.04
	_	tions reflect			1	1	1	3	3	7	7		1313/1		3.76	4.13	4.22	4.05	3.76
			_	hat you learned	0	0	2	0	3	7	11	4.09	715/1		4.09	3.96	3.96	3.88	4.09
				what you learned	0	0	3	2	5	8	5		1320/1		3.43	4.01	4.08	3.89	3.43
		system clearl		-	0	0	1	2	4	10	6		1303/1		3.78	4.33	4.18	4.10	3.78
8. How mar	ny times w	as class cand	celled		1	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1	L673	5.00	4.66	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How wou	ıld you gr	ade the overa	all teach	ing effectiveness	2	0	0	1	10	7	3	3.57	1344/1	L656	3.57	4.02	4.07	3.96	3.57
		Lectur																	
		tor's lecture			0	0	0	1	2	7	13		1014/1		4.39	4.53	4.43	4.37	4.39
		or seem inter		_	0	0	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	853/1		4.78	4.68	4.69	4.60	4.78
				plained clearly	0	0	0	2	4	12	5		1239/1		3.87	4.24	4.26	4.17	3.87
		contribute t	_		0	0	1 2	1	4 2	9 2	8 0		1177/1		3.96	4.38	4.27	4.17	3.96 2.57
5. DIG auc	ilovisual	techniques er	mance yo	ur understanding	U	16	2	1	2	2	U	2.5/	1314/1	1380	2.57	3.77	3.94	3.78	2.57
		Discus																	
				hat you learned	16	0	0	3	4	0	0		1466/1		2.57	3.80	4.01	3.76	2.57
				to participate	16	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	873/1		4.29	4.05	4.24	3.97	4.29
				open discussion	16	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	865/1		4.29	4.12	4.27	4.00	4.29
4. Were sp	pecial tec	hniques succe	essiul		16	0	1	2	0	3	Τ	3.14	863/	994	3.14	3.64	3.94	3.73	3.14
! - 6!		Field					_						,						
	_			at you learned	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	76	****	****	3.98	3.32	****
		or available ould you disc			22 22	0	0	0 1	0	1	0	4.00	****/	53 48	****	****	4.45 4.12	4.34	****
4. 10 WHat	degree c	ouid you disc	uss your	evaluations	22	U	U	1	U	U	U	2.00	,	40			4.12	4.00	
		Self																	
				hat you learned	21	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/	61	****	****	4.09	3.87	****
		ons make clea			21	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/	52	****	****	4.26	3.91	****
_		ts with the i		-	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/	50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****
		/tutoring by h proctors fo	_	_	21 21	1 1	0	0	0	1	0 1	4.00	****/	35 31	****	****	4.36 4.34	3.92 3.88	****
	3	-		Frequ	onar	. Dia	- ri bı	1+10	n										
				riequ	lency	DIS	LIID	ucio.	11										
Credits Ea	arned 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	ason	s 				Тур	pe 			Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 12		Red	quire	ed f	or M	ajor	s	7	Grad	duate	9	0	Majo	or	2
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B 8		~	_	,				2			, ,	. 2			0.1
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C 1 D 0		Gei	nera!	T				3	Unde	er-gi	rad 2	13	Non-	major	21
84-150 Grad.	4 0	3.00-3.49 3.50-4.00	1 11	D 0 F 0		רק.	ectiv	700				2	####	+ _ 1	Means t	here a	re not	enous	rh
Grau.	U	3.30-4.00	T.T.	P 1		ът¢	\	v C D				_			es to b			_	111
				I O		Ot.1	ner				1	0	T CDF	- 0110	-5 CO L	.c bign			
				? 0		0.01					_	-							

Course-Section: ECON 102 0101 University of Maryland Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS Baltimore County

Instructor: THOMAS, MARK S 37

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 16

Fall 2005 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 538

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncie	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	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	2	2	9	2	3.73	1415/1674	4.17	4.22	4.27	4.07	3.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	9	4	4.13	1051/1674	4.23	4.25	4.23	4.16	4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	7	5	4.13	936/1423	4.29	4.37	4.27	4.16	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	1	6	4	2	3.36	1495/1609	4.01	4.13	4.22	4.05	3.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	2	1	1	4	1	3.11	1419/1585	3.67	3.96	3.96	3.88	3.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	1229/1535	3.89	4.01	4.08	3.89	3.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	8	2	4	3.60	1403/1651	4.10	4.33	4.18	4.10	3.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	12	2	4.14	1497/1673	4.44	4.66	4.69	4.67	4.14
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	5	6	2	3.77	1230/1656	4.00	4.02	4.07	3.96	3.77
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	Ω	Λ	Λ	2	Δ	q	4.47	916/1586	4.61	4.53	4.43	4.37	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	3	9		1309/1585	4.57	4.68	4.69	4.60	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	7	5		1052/1582	4.22	4.24	4.26	4.17	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	4	8		1010/1575	4.41	4.38	4.27	4.17	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	0	0	5	3	3	3.82	,		3.77	3.94	3.78	
5. Dia dadiovidadi ecomilyaco emanee jour anderbeanding	_	•	O	0	,	3	5	3.02	033/1300	3.02	3.77	3.71	3.70	3.02
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	810/1520	3.68	3.80	4.01	3.76	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	4	1	1	3.50	1303/1515	3.97	4.05	4.24	3.97	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1177/1511	4.15	4.12	4.27	4.00	3.83
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	732/ 994	3.50	3.64	3.94	3.73	3.50
<del>-</del>														

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	6	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 102 0201 University of Maryland Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006

THOMAS, MARK S

Instructor: Enrollment: 28

Questionnaires: 17

# Fall 2005 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 539

Job IRBR3029

			Fr	eque	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	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	2	1	1	7	6	3.82	1372/1674	4.17	4.22	4.27	4.07	3.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	2	6	6	3.76	1364/1674	4.23	4.25	4.23	4.16	3.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	0	8	6	3.88	1116/1423	4.29	4.37	4.27	4.16	3.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	1	4	4	5	3.56	1427/1609	4.01	4.13	4.22	4.05	3.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	3	1	3	2	3	3.08	1426/1585	3.67	3.96	3.96	3.88	3.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	1	2	0	2	1	3.00	1435/1535	3.89	4.01	4.08	3.89	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	1	1	6	6	3.65	1385/1651	4.10	4.33	4.18	4.10	3.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	1	0	0	7	7	4.27	1412/1673	4.44	4.66	4.69	4.67	4.27
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	3	0	6	3	3	3.20	1494/1656	4.00	4.02	4.07	3.96	3.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	0	1	13	4.50	858/1586	4.61	4.53	4.43	4.37	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	3	6	6	4.00	1472/1585	4.57	4.68	4.69	4.60	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	2	1	4	7	3.75	1302/1582	4.22	4.24	4.26	4.17	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	1	5	8	4.33	886/1575	4.41	4.38	4.27	4.17	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	4	4	3	2	3.07	1210/1380	3.62	3.77	3.94	3.78	3.07
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	0	1	3	4	3.70	1068/1520	3.68	3.80	4.01	3.76	3.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	2	1	2	4	3.60	1274/1515	3.97	4.05	4.24	3.97	3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	1	1	2	5	3.90	1139/1511	4.15	4.12	4.27	4.00	3.90
4. Were special techniques successful	7	7	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 994	3.50	3.64	3.94	3.73	****
Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ty	pe			Majors	;
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 3		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	 `s	1	Graduat	 e	0	 Majo	 or	0

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	1	В	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	1						

PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS

Title Instructor: FRANCIS, JOHANN

Enrollment:

36 Questionnaires: 22 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 540 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	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	0	0	2	11	9	4.32	878/1674		4.22	4.27	4.07	4.32
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	10	9	4.27	906/1674		4.25	4.23	4.16	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	7	9	4.14	936/1423	4.29	4.37	4.27	4.16	4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	1	5	4	6		1185/1609	4.01	4.13	4.22	4.05	3.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	7	5	6		1260/1585	3.67	3.96	3.96	3.88	3.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	7	4	5		1048/1535	3.89	4.01	4.08	3.89	3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	4	6	10		1037/1651	4.10	4.33	4.18	4.10	4.09
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	8			1124/1673	4.44	4.66	4.69	4.67	4.62
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	3	13	1	3.88	1139/1656	4.00	4.02	4.07	3.96	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	496/1586	4.61	4.53	4.43	4.37	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	917/1585	4.57	4.68	4.69	4.60	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	9	9	4.30	882/1582	4.22	4.24	4.26	4.17	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	8	9	4.30	915/1575	4.41	4.38	4.27	4.17	4.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	12	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	585/1380			3.94	3.78	4.14
J. Did addiovisual techniques emiance your understanding	5	12	U	U	2	2	J	7.17	303/1300	3.02	3.77	3.91	3.70	1.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	2	2	1	1		1419/1520	3.68	3.80	4.01	3.76	2.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	971/1515	3.97	4.05	4.24	3.97	4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	990/1511	4.15	4.12	4.27	4.00	4.14
4. Were special techniques successful	15	3	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 994	3.50	3.64	3.94	3.73	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	3.97	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.41	****
Combinati														
Seminar	0.1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 103	****	4 00	1 11	1 22	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	,	****	4.88	4.41	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	1	0	•	4.00	****/ 101	****	4.88	4.48	4.18	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21 21	0	0	0	0	1	0	3.00 4.00	****/ 95	****	4.71	4.31	3.99	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned		0	0	0	0	U T	-		****/ 99 ****/ 97	****	4.75	4.39	4.10	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	U	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.88	4.14	3.69	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	3.32	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	***
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.87	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	3.91	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 31	****	****	4.34	3.88	****
J. Here energy proceeds for all the students	21	U	U	J	U	_	J	1.00	, 51			1.51	3.00	

Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS

Instructor: FRANCIS, JOHANN

Enrollment: 36
Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 540 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	10	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	3	С	2	General	1	Under-grad	22	Non-major	19
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 102 0401 University of Maryland Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS

Baltimore County Fall 2005

Instructor: FRANCIS, JOHANN

Enrollment: 39 Questionnaires: 23

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 541 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

							Fr	eque:	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	1	0	0	1	3	11	7	4.09	1123/1674	4.17	4.22	4.27	4.07	4.09
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	7	7	8		1118/1674	4.23	4.25	4.23	4.16	4.05
		uestions reflec			1	0	0	3	3	8	8	3.95	1061/1423	4.29	4.37	4.27	4.16	3.95
	_	uations reflect		_	1	6	0	3	3	6	4		1366/1609	4.01	4.13	4.22	4.05	3.69
				what you learned	1	0	1	2	6	8	5		1142/1585	3.67	3.96	3.96	3.88	3.64
				o what you learned	1	4	2	3	3	7	3	3.33	1355/1535	3.89	4.01	4.08	3.89	3.33
		g system clearl		-	1	0	1	0	7	9	5	3.77	1310/1651	4.10	4.33	4.18	4.10	3.77
		was class cand			1	1	0	0	0	11	10	4.48	1235/1673	4.44	4.66	4.69	4.67	4.48
				hing effectiveness	5	1	0	0	3	12	2		1056/1656	4.00	4.02	4.07	3.96	3.94
		Lectur	Δ.															
1 Were t	he instr	actor's lecture	_	nrenared	2	0	0	0	2	10	9	4 33	1074/1586	4.61	4.53	4.43	4.37	4.33
		ctor seem inter			2	0	1	0	2	7	11		1383/1585	4.57	4.68	4.69	4.60	4.29
				xplained clearly	2	0	1	1	5	9			1296/1582	4.22	4.24	4.26	4.17	3.76
		es contribute t			2	1	0	0	3	9	8		958/1575			4.27	4.17	4.25
				our understanding	3	12	2	0	2	4	0		1217/1380		3.77	3.94		3.00
1 - 1		Discus			- 1 4	0	-	_	2	_	-	2 00	1252/1500	2 60	2 00	4 01	2 56	2 00
				what you learned	14	0	1	2	3	2	1		1353/1520		3.80	4.01	3.76	3.00
				d to participate	15	0	1	1	3	2	1		1409/1515	3.97	4.05	4.24	3.97	3.13
				d open discussion	15	0	1	0	3	2	2		1308/1511		4.12	4.27	4.00	3.50
4. Were s	pecial to	echniques succe	sstul		15	7	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 994	3.50	3.64	3.94	3.73	****
				Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	 1	 A 8		Re	guir	ed f	 or M	aior		5	Graduat	 e	1	Majo		3
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В 8		1,00	darr.	ca I	J 1 1 1	⊥∪ر ت		_	Graduat	_	_	1.10 ) (		5
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 2		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-q	rad 2	2	Non-	-major	20
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0		061	c.a	-				•	onaci -g.	Luu Z		14011		20
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		E14	ecti <sup>.</sup>	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enous	rh
orua.	-	3.33 1.00	-	P 0		111		v CD				_	respons				_	)++
				I 0		O+1	her				1	.3	I CSPOIIS		c bign	. I I I Car	10	
				? 1		001					_							

Course-Section: ECON 102 0601 University of Maryland Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS

Baltimore County

Instructor: FALCON, JAIME

Enrollment: 31 Ques

Fall 2005

Page 542

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

stionnaires: 9	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
----------------	---

							Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did y	ou gain n	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	703/1674	4.17	4.22	4.27	4.07	4.44
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	830/1674	4.23	4.25	4.23	4.16	4.33
		uestions reflec			1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	153/1423	4.29	4.37	4.27	4.16	4.88
4. Did o	ther eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	1	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	408/1609	4.01	4.13	4.22	4.05	4.57
5. Did a	ssigned r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	682/1585	3.67	3.96	3.96	3.88	4.13
6. Did w	ritten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	373/1535	3.89	4.01	4.08	3.89	4.50
7. Was t	he gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	1	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	866/1651	4.10	4.33	4.18	4.10	4.25
8. How m	any times	was class cand	elled		1	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	1511/1673	4.44	4.66	4.69	4.67	4.13
9. How w	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	331/1656	4.00	4.02	4.07	3.96	4.57
		Lectur	е															
1. Were	the instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	663/1586	4.61	4.53	4.43	4.37	4.67
2. Did t	he instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	737/1585	4.57	4.68	4.69	4.60	4.83
3. Was 1	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly						0	0	0	3	3	4.50	632/1582	4.22	4.24	4.26	4.17	4.50
4. Did t	he lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	692/1575	4.41	4.38	4.27	4.17	4.50
5. Did a	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding					5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1380	3.62	3.77	3.94	3.78	****
		Discus	sion															
1. Did c	lass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1520	3.68	3.80	4.01	3.76	****
2. Were	all stude	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	7	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1515	3.97	4.05	4.24	3.97	***
3. Did t	he instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1511	4.15	4.12	4.27	4.00	****
		Labora	tory															
2. Were	you provi	ded with adequa	te back	ground information	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	3.97	****
				Frequ	ıency	7 Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	2			Ту	ne			Majors	
										, 								
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 6		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajors		2	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	в 1														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 1	General					1	Under-g	rad	9	Non-	major	8		
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D 0										_				
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives						1	#### - 1				_	h	
				P 0	Other							respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt		
			I 0									4						
				? 0														

Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS

Instructor: GINDLING, THOMA

Enrollment: 40
Questionnaires: 9

Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 543 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

General    Did you gain new insights, skills from this course   0   0   0   1   1   7   4.67   406/1674   4.17   4.22   4.27   4.07   4.67   4.07   4						Fr	emiei	ncies	3		Tna	tructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect
1. Did you gain new Insights, skills from this course   0		Questions		NR	NA		_			5				_			
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did ansigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. Did void the instructor's lectures well prepared 9. Did would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How any times was class cancelled 9. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 9. Did daddovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9. Did addivibual techniques enhance your understanding 9. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Did class discussions 9. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9. Did presentations contribut		General															
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did ansigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. Dod would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. Did the instructor's leeful read of explained oleanly 9. O 0 0 0 1 0 8 4.79 169/1586 4.61 4.53 4.43 4.37 4.78 6.81 1.00 4.70 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1	1. Did you gain new	insights, skills fr	rom this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	406/1674	4.17	4.22	4.27	4.07	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 0 1 1 0 7 4.75 222/1609 4.01 4.13 4.22 4.05 4.75 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 1 1 1 6 4.33 482/1885 3.67 3.96 3.96 3.88 4.33 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 0 2 6 4.75 169/1835 3.89 4.01 4.08 3.89 4.75 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 8 4.89 742/1673 4.44 4.66 4.69 4.67 4.89 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 1 8 4.89 742/1673 4.44 4.66 4.69 4.67 4.89 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 1 0 8 4.71 214/1656 4.00 4.02 4.07 3.96 4.71 1. Where the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 8 4.89 742/1673 4.44 4.66 4.69 4.67 4.89 3. Was lecture material prepared 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 8 4.89 615/1856 4.61 4.53 4.43 4.37 4.78 1. Was lecture material prepared 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 8 4.89 615/1856 4.61 4.53 4.43 4.37 4.78 1. Did class discours interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 0 7 4.56 578/1852 4.57 4.68 4.69 4.60 4.89 3. Was lecture material prepared 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 0 7 4.56 578/1852 4.22 4.24 4.26 4.17 4.56 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 3 4.00 666/1860 3.62 3.77 3.94 3.78 4.00 1. Did class discoussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1550 3.68 3.80 4.01 3.76 5.00 2. Were all students actively encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/994 3.50 3.64 3.94 3.73 ***  Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/994 3.50 3.64 3.94 3.73 ***  Laboratory 2. Were pour provided with adequate background information 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/994 3.50 3.64 3.94 3.73 ***  Laboratory 2. Were pour provided with adequate background information 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/994 3.50 3.64 3.94 3.73 ***  Laboratory 3. Were recreasing available for lab activities 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/994 3.50 3.64 3.94 3.73 ***  Laboratory 4. Did greater projects contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/994 3.50 3.64 3.94 3.79 5.00 ***  Laborator				0	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	519/1674	4.23	4.25	4.23	4.16	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 0 1 1 0 7 4.75 222/1609 4.01 4.13 4.22 4.05 4.75 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 0 1 1 1 6 4.33 482/1895 3.67 3.96 3.96 3.88 4.32 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 0 2 6 4.75 169/1895 3.89 4.01 4.08 3.89 4.75 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 8 4.89 742/1673 4.44 4.66 4.69 4.67 4.89 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 1 8 4.89 742/1673 4.44 4.66 4.69 4.67 4.89 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 1 0 8 4.73 214/1656 4.00 4.02 4.07 3.96 4.71 1. Where the instructor's lactures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 8 4.78 453/1586 4.61 4.53 4.43 4.37 4.78 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 8 4.89 615/1585 4.57 4.68 4.69 4.60 4.89 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 2 0 7 4.56 578/1582 4.22 4.24 4.26 4.17 4.56 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 3 4.00 666/1380 3.62 3.77 3.94 3.78 4.00 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1550 3.68 3.80 4.01 3.76 5.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1551 3.97 4.05 4.22 4.24 4.27 4.00 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1551 3.97 4.05 4.27 4.00 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1551 3.97 4.05 4.27 4.00 5.00 3. Did the instructor available for lab activities 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1551 3.97 4.05 4.43 4.37 4.78 4.78 4.79 4.70 4.70 4.70 4.70 4.70 4.70 4.70 4.70				0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	376/1423	4.29	4.37	4.27	4.16	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 6 6 4.33 482/1885 3.67 3.96 3.96 3.88 4.33 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 0 2 7 4.78 208/1651 4.10 4.33 4.18 4.10 4.78 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 7 4.78 208/1651 4.10 4.33 4.18 4.10 4.78 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 1 0 6 4.71 214/1655 4.00 4.02 4.07 3.96 4.71 Lecture  Lecture  Lecture  Lecture  Lecture  Lecture  Lecture  Lecture  Louis interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 8 4.78 453/1586 4.61 4.53 4.43 4.37 4.78 4.10 d.10 d.10 d.10 d.10 d.10 d.10 d.10 d	4. Did other evaluat	tions reflect the e	expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	222/1609	4.01	4.13	4.22	4.05	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 0 2 6 4.75 169/1535 3.89 4.01 4.08 3.89 4.75  1. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 8 4.89 742/1673 4.44 4.66 4.69 4.67 4.89  9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 1 0 8 4.89 742/1673 4.44 4.66 4.69 4.67 4.89  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 8 4.78 453/1586 4.61 4.53 4.43 4.37 4.78  2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 8 4.89 615/1585 4.57 4.68 4.69 4.60 4.89  3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 8 8 4.89 615/1585 4.57 4.68 4.69 4.60 4.89  3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0				0	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	482/1585		3.96	3.96	3.88	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 7 4.78 208/1651 4.10 4.33 4.18 4.10 4.78 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 6 4.71 214/1636 4.00 4.02 4.07 3.96 4.71 Lecture Lecture Lecture Lecture Lecture Seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 8 4.78 453/1586 4.61 4.53 4.43 4.37 4.78 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 1 8 4.89 615/1585 4.57 4.68 4.69 4.60 4.89 3.83 1.84 1.84 1.84 1.84 1.84 1.84 1.84 1.84	_	_	_	0	1	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	169/1535	3.89	4.01	4.08	3.89	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 1 8 4.98 742/1673 4.44 4.66 4.69 4.67 4.89 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 1 0 1 8 4.98 742/1673 4.44 4.66 4.69 4.67 4.89 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 1 0 1 8 4.98 1.214/1656 4.00 4.02 4.07 3.96 4.71 4.71 4.72 4.72 4.72 4.72 4.72 4.72 4.72 4.72	-	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	208/1651	4.10	4.33	4.18	4.10	4.78
How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness   2   0   0   0   1   0   6   4.71   214/1656   4.00   4.02   4.07   3.96   4.71				0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	742/1673	4.44	4.66	4.69	4.67	4.89
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 4. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 8. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6. D. O.			aching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	214/1656	4.00	4.02	4.07	3.96	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 1 8 4.89 615/1585 4.57 4.68 4.69 4.60 4.89 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 2 0 7 4.56 578/1582 4.22 4.24 4.26 4.17 4.78 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 4 1 0 0 0 3 4.00 666/1380 3.62 3.77 3.94 3.78 4.00 Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1510 3.68 3.80 4.01 3.76 5.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1511 3.97 4.05 4.24 3.97 5.00 4.00 Discussion 4.00 Discussion 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0		Lecture															
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 1 8 4.89 615/1585 4.57 4.68 4.69 4.60 4.89 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 0 7 4.56 578/1582 4.22 4.24 4.26 4.17 4.78 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 4 1 0 0 0 3 4.00 666/1380 3.62 3.77 3.94 3.78 4.00 Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1510 3.68 3.80 4.01 3.76 5.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1511 3.97 4.05 4.24 3.97 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 6 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/94 3.50 3.64 3.94 3.73 ****  Laboratory  2. Were you provided with adequate background information 8 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/278 **** 4.46 4.41 ****  Seminar  2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/260 **** 4.48 4.18 4.***  3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/95 **** 4.71 4.31 3.99 ****  4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/95 **** 4.71 4.31 3.99 ****  5. Were criteria for grading made clear  Field Work  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/95 **** 4.71 4.81 3.69 ****  Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/97 **** 4.88 4.14 3.69 ****  Polid study questions make clear the expected goal 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/52 **** 4.24 4.39 3.87 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/52 **** 4.24 4.39 3.87 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/55 **** 4.26 3.91 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/55 **** 4.26 3.91 ****  5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/55 **** 4.26 3.91 ****  Frequency Distribution	1. Were the instruct		l prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	453/1586	4.61	4.53	4.43	4.37	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 2 0 7 4.56 578/1582 4.22 4.24 4.26 4.17 4.56 5. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 7 4.78 327/1575 4.41 4.38 4.27 4.17 4.58 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 4 1 0 0 0 3 4.00 666/1380 3.62 3.77 3.94 3.78 4.00  Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1520 3.68 3.80 4.01 3.76 5.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1515 3.97 4.05 4.24 3.97 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1515 3.97 4.05 4.24 3.97 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful  Laboratory  2. Were you provided with adequate background information 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/994 3.50 3.64 3.94 3.73 ****  Seminar  2. Was the instructor available for lab activities 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/260 **** 4.46 4.41 ****  Seminar  3. Was the instructor available for individual attention 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/95 **** 4.71 4.31 3.99 ****  4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/95 **** 4.74 4.31 3.99 ****  Field Work  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/97 **** 4.88 4.14 3.69 ****  Field Work  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/97 **** 4.88 4.14 3.69 ****  Pid goard for the instructor helpful 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 61 **** 4.09 3.87 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.26 3.91 ****  5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.26 3.91 ****  Frequency Distribution				0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	,					4.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 7 4 .78 327/1575 4 .41 4 .38 4 .27 4 .17 4 .78 5 .Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 4 1 0 0 0 0 3 4 .00 666/1380 3 .62 3.77 3 .94 3.78 4 .00   Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5 .00 1/1520 3 .68 3 .80 4 .01 3 .76 5 .00 2 .00 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0			-							7							
Discussion		_								7							
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1520 3.68 3.80 4.01 3.76 5.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1515 3.97 4.05 4.24 3.97 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1511 4.15 4.12 4.27 4.00 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 6 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 994 3.50 3.64 3.94 3.73 ****  Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 278 **** 4.19 3.97 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 260 **** 4.46 4.41 ****    Seminar 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 95 **** 4.71 4.31 3.99 ****   4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 95 **** 4.71 4.31 3.99 ****   5. Were criteria for grading made clear 8 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 97 **** 4.88 4.14 3.69 ****    Field Work 2. Did sourcearly understand your evaluation criteria 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 61 **** 4.88 4.14 3.69 ****    Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.77 **** 4.88 4.14 3.69 ****    Self Paced 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.77 **** 4.88 4.14 3.69 ****    Self Paced 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 50 **** 4.75 4.39 4.10 ****    Serious Self Paced 9.00 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 50 **** 4.75 4.39 4.10 ****    Self Paced 9.00 0 0 0 1 5.00 0 0 0 1 5.00 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0			-	1	4	1	0	0	0	3							
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1520 3.68 3.80 4.01 3.76 5.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1515 3.97 4.05 4.24 3.97 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1511 4.15 4.12 4.27 4.00 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 6 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 994 3.50 3.64 3.94 3.73 ****  Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 278 **** 4.19 3.97 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 260 **** 4.46 4.41 ****    Seminar 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 95 **** 4.71 4.31 3.99 ****   4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 95 **** 4.71 4.31 3.99 ****   5. Were criteria for grading made clear 8 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 97 **** 4.88 4.14 3.69 ****    Field Work 2. Did sourcearly understand your evaluation criteria 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 61 **** 4.88 4.14 3.69 ****    Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.77 **** 4.88 4.14 3.69 ****    Self Paced 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.77 **** 4.88 4.14 3.69 ****    Self Paced 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 50 **** 4.75 4.39 4.10 ****    Serious Self Paced 9.00 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 50 **** 4.75 4.39 4.10 ****    Self Paced 9.00 0 0 0 1 5.00 0 0 0 1 5.00 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0		Discussion															
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1515 3.97 4.05 4.24 3.97 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1511 4.15 4.12 4.27 4.00 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 6 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 994 3.50 3.64 3.94 3.73 ****  Laboratory  2. Were you provided with adequate background information 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 278 **** 4.19 3.97 ****  3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 260 **** **** 4.46 4.41 ****  Seminar  2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 260 **** 4.88 4.48 4.18 ****  3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 95 **** 4.71 4.31 3.99 ****  4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 97 **** 4.88 4.14 3.69 ****  5. Were criteria for grading made clear 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 97 **** 4.88 4.14 3.69 ****  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 97 **** 4.88 4.14 3.69 ****  2. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 97 **** 4.88 4.14 3.69 ****  2. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 50 **** 4.09 3.87 ****  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 50 **** 4.44 4.39 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 50 **** 4.44 4.39 ****  5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 8 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 31 **** 4.44 4.39 ****  5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 31 **** 4.44 4.34 3.88 ****  5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	1. Did class discuss					0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1520	3.68	3.80	4.01	3.76	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion																	
Laboratory  2. Were you provided with adequate background information						-			-								
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 278 **** **** 4.19 3.97 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 260 **** **** 4.46 4.41 ****    Seminar   2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 101 **** 4.88 4.48 4.18 ****  3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 95 **** 4.71 4.31 3.99 ****  4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 97 **** 4.75 4.39 4.10 ****  5. Were criteria for grading made clear 8 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 97 **** 4.88 4.14 3.69 ****  Field Work  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 8 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 77 **** **** 3.93 3.42 ****    Self Paced   1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.26 3.91 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.26 3.91 ****  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 53 **** **** 4.44 4.39 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 31 **** **** 4.34 3.88 ****  Frequency Distribution		_							0								
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 278 **** **** 4.19 3.97 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 260 **** **** 4.46 4.41 ****    Seminar   2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 101 **** 4.88 4.48 4.18 ****  3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 95 **** 4.71 4.31 3.99 ****  4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 97 **** 4.88 4.14 3.69 ****  5. Were criteria for grading made clear 8 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 97 **** 4.88 4.14 3.69 ****  Field Work  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 8 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 77 **** **** 3.93 3.42 ****    Self Paced   1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.26 3.91 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 52 **** *** 4.26 3.91 ****  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 53 **** *** 4.44 4.39 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 31 **** *** 4.34 3.88 ****  Frequency Distribution		Laboratory															
Seminar  2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2. Were you provided	-	ckground information	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	3.97	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention		_	_		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.41	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 95 **** 4.71 4.31 3.99 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 97 **** 4.75 4.39 4.10 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 97 **** 4.88 4.14 3.69 ****  Field Work  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 77 **** **** 3.93 3.42 ****  Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 61 **** **** 4.09 3.87 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.26 3.91 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 50 **** **** 4.44 4.39 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 35 **** **** 4.36 3.92 **** 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 8 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 31 **** **** 4.34 3.88 ****  Frequency Distribution		Seminar															
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 95 **** 4.71 4.31 3.99 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 99 **** 4.75 4.39 4.10 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 97 **** 4.88 4.14 3.69 ****  Field Work  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 77 **** **** 3.93 3.42 ****  Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 61 **** **** 4.09 3.87 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.26 3.91 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 50 **** 4.44 4.39 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 35 **** **** 4.36 3.92 **** 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 8 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 31 **** **** 4.34 3.88 ****  Frequency Distribution	2. Was the instructo	or available for in	ndividual attention	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.88	4.48	4.18	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned				8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.71	4.31		****
Field Work  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 97 **** 4.88 4.14 3.69 ****  Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 61 **** **** 4.09 3.87 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.26 3.91 ****  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 50 **** **** 4.44 4.39 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 35 **** **** 4.36 3.92 ****  5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 8 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 31 **** **** 4.34 3.88 ****		-	_	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.75		4.10	****
Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 77 **** **** 4.09 3.87 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.26 3.91 ****  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 50 **** **** 4.44 4.39 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 35 **** **** 4.36 3.92 ****  5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 8 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 31 **** **** 4.34 3.88 ****  Frequency Distribution	_		-	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.88	4.14	3.69	****
Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 61 **** **** 4.09 3.87 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.26 3.91 ****  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 50 **** **** 4.44 4.39 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 35 **** **** 4.36 3.92 ****  5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 8 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 31 **** **** 4.34 3.88 ****  Frequency Distribution		Field Work															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 61 **** **** 4.09 3.87 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.26 3.91 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 50 **** **** 4.44 4.39 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 35 **** **** 4.36 3.92 **** 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 8 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 31 **** **** 4.34 3.88 ****  Frequency Distribution	2. Did you clearly w	understand your eva	aluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.42	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 52 **** **** 4.26 3.91 ****  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 50 **** *** 4.44 4.39 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 35 **** **** 4.36 3.92 ****  5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 8 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 **** 31 **** **** 4.34 3.88 ****  Frequency Distribution		Self Paced															
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 52 **** **** 4.26 3.91 ****  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 50 **** *** 4.44 4.39 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 35 **** **** 4.36 3.92 ****  5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 8 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 **** 31 **** **** 4.34 3.88 ****  Frequency Distribution	1. Did self-paced sy	ystem contribute to	o what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.87	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 50 *** *** 4.44 4.39 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 8 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 35 *** *** 4.36 3.92 **** 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 8 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 **** 31 *** *** 4.34 3.88 ****  Frequency Distribution				8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	3.91	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 8 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 31 **** **** 4.34 3.88 ****  Frequency Distribution				8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****
Frequency Distribution	<u>-</u>				0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.92	****
	5. Were there enough	n proctors for all	the students	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	3.88	****
Credita Farned Cum CDA Francted Credea Beasans Time			Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
CLEUIS BACUEU COM GPA BADECLEO GLADES REASONS IVOE M2707C	Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re:	agone	3			ጥላን	ne			Majors	ı

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	9	Non-major	8
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	

I 0 Other 6 ?

Course-Section: ECON 102 0801 University of Maryland Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS Baltimore County

Instructor: Gindling, Tim

Enrollment: 30 Questionnaires: 24

# Fall 2005 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 544

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncie	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	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	0	1	4	10	9	4.13	1095/1674	4.17	4.22	4.27	4.07	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	16	4.50	578/1674	4.23	4.25	4.23	4.16	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	7	14	4.38	728/1423	4.29	4.37	4.27	4.16	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	1	2	7	7	4.18	952/1609	4.01	4.13	4.22	4.05	4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	4	3	6	10	3.96	838/1585	3.67	3.96	3.96	3.88	3.96
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	2	0	2	4	11	4.16	777/1535	3.89	4.01	4.08	3.89	4.16
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	2	19	4.58	419/1651	4.10	4.33	4.18	4.10	4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	9	14	4.54	1175/1673	4.44	4.66	4.69	4.67	4.54
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	3	14	1	3.89	1139/1656	4.00	4.02	4.07	3.96	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	0	1	19	4.81	389/1586	4.61	4.53	4.43	4.37	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	689/1585	4.57	4.68	4.69	4.60	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	1	5	14	4.52	610/1582	4.22	4.24	4.26	4.17	4.52
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	5	14	4.52	669/1575	4.41	4.38	4.27	4.17	4.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	12	1	2	0	2	4	3.67	962/1380	3.62	3.77	3.94	3.78	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	3	0	3	3	5	3.50	1169/1520	3.68	3.80	4.01	3.76	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate		0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	733/1515	3.97	4.05	4.24	3.97	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	642/1511	4.15	4.12	4.27	4.00	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful		10	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/ 994	3.50	3.64	3.94	3.73	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	2	Under-grad	24	Non-major	22
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 121 0101 Univ

Instructor: ST MARTIN, JEAN

Enrollment: 40
Questionnaires: 26

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 545 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course	${\tt Evaluation}$	Questionnaire
----------------	--------------------	---------------

			Fre	equer	ncie	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	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	0	1	2	4	19	4.58	521/1674	4.48	4.22	4.27	4.07	4.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	16	4.46	641/1674	4.56	4.25	4.23	4.16	4.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	18	4.65	390/1423	4.58	4.37	4.27	4.16	4.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	1	1	3	12	4.53	466/1609	4.38	4.13	4.22	4.05	4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	2	8	13	4.24	575/1585	4.09	3.96	3.96	3.88	4.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	328/1535	4.23	4.01	4.08	3.89	4.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	4	21	4.73	254/1651	4.64	4.33	4.18	4.10	4.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	6	18	4.75	958/1673	4.81	4.66	4.69	4.67	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness			0	0	0	12	9	4.43	493/1656	4.21	4.02	4.07	3.96	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	6	20	4.77	474/1586	4.75	4.53	4.43	4.37	4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	24	4.92	453/1585	4.78	4.68	4.69	4.60	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	4	18	4.56	567/1582	4.58	4.24	4.26	4.17	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	22	4.77	343/1575	4.62	4.38	4.27	4.17	4.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	17	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	96/1380	4.03	3.77	3.94	3.78	4.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	3	2	7	4.15	734/1520	4.14	3.80	4.01	3.76	4.15
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	4	2	9	4.33	827/1515	3.99	4.05	4.24	3.97	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	2	1	11	4.47	685/1511	4.25	4.12	4.27	4.00	4.47
4. Were special techniques successful	10	14	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 994	3.88	3.64	3.94	3.73	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	Α	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1	В	8						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	5	C	7	General	1	Under-grad	26	Non-major	24
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	24				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ECON 121 0201 Title

PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I

Instructor: ST MARTIN, JEAN

Fall 2005

Page 546 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	42
Ouestionnaires:	22

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

			Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	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	Λ	Λ	0	7	15	4.68	380/1674	4.48	4.22	4.27	4.07	4.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	352/1674	4.56	4.25	4.23	4.16	4.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	g g	14	4.64	417/1423	4.58	4.37	4.27	4.16	4.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	353/1609	4.38	4.13	4.22	4.05	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	1	3	4	9	4.06	735/1585	4.09	3.96	3.96	3.88	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	715/1535	4.23	4.01	4.08	3.89	4.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	382/1651	4.64	4.33	4.18	4.10	4.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	16		1001/1673	4.81	4.66	4.69	4.67	4.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	2	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	310/1656		4.02	4.07		4.60
J. now would fou grade one overdir bedoming circoorveness		_	·	ŭ	Ü	Ū		1.00	310,1030		1.02	1.07	5.70	1.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	1	19	4.81	389/1586	4.75	4.53	4.43	4.37	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	567/1585	4.78	4.68	4.69	4.60	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	19	4.86	199/1582	4.58	4.24	4.26	4.17	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	279/1575	4.62	4.38	4.27	4.17	4.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	10	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	341/1380	4.03	3.77	3.94	3.78	4.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	Ο	0	2	10	4.83	173/1520	4.14	3.80	4.01	3.76	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	186/1515	3.99	4.05	4.24	3.97	4.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	323/1511	4.25	4.12	4.27	4.00	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	2	0	1	2	6	3.91	568/ 994		3.64	3.94		3.91
1. Here special econniques successful		_	_	O	-	-	O	3.71	3007 331	3.00	3.01	3.71	3.75	3.71
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material			0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	3.97	****
_			,											

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	•	Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	7	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	17
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	7	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	16	-			
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 121 0301 University of Maryland PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I

Baltimore County Fall 2005

Title Instructor: CROTEAU, MARCIA

4. Were special techniques successful

Enrollment: 39 Ouestionnaires: 25

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 547

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions 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 7 15 4.48 639/1674 4.48 4.22 4.27 4.07 4.48 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 9 15 4.56 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 1 2 6 16 4.48 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 7 1 1 5 10 4.22 507/1674 4.56 4.25 4.23 4.16 4.56 599/1423 4.58 4.37 4.27 4.16 4.48 892/1609 4.38 4.13 4.22 4.05 4.22 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 1 7 5 11 4.08 715/1585 4.09 3.96 3.96 3.88 4.08 870/1535 4.23 4.01 4.08 3.89 4.00 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 2 0 3 20 4.64 351/1651 4.64 4.33 4.18 4.10 4.64 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 3 22 4.88 742/1673 4.81 4.66 4.69 4.67 4.88 680/1656 4.21 4.02 4.07 3.96 4.29 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 Ω Ω Ω 3 20 4.87 284/1586 4.75 4.53 4.43 4.37 4.87 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2 0 0 0 0 6 17 4.74 960/1585 4.78 4.68 4.69 4.60 4.74 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 8 14 4.52 610/1582 4.58 4.24 4.26 4.17 4.52 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 3 5 15 4.52 669/1575 4.62 4.38 4.27 4.17 4.52 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 9 1 1 2 5 3 3.67 962/1380 4.03 3.77 3.94 3.78 3.67 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 12 0 1 0 2 5 5 4.00 810/1520 4.14 3.80 4.01 3.76 4.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 12 0 1 1 5 3 3 3.46 1318/1515 3.99 4.05 4.24 3.97 3.46 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 12 0 0 0 2 3 8 4.46 685/1511 4.25 4.12 4.27 4.00 4.46

#### Frequency Distribution

12 8 1 1 1 0 2 3.20 \*\*\*\*/ 994 3.88 3.64 3.94 3.73 \*\*\*\*

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	Α	14	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	5	C	4	General	2	Under-grad	25	Non-major	25
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	19	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 121 0401 Title

PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I

Instructor: CROTEAU, MARCIA

Enrollment: 46 Questionnaires: 34

# Fall 2005 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 548 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

			Frequencies		Inst	ructor	Course Dept		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	0	0	2	8	2.4	4.65	432/1674	4.48	4.22	4.27	4.07	4.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	11	21	4.56	519/1674	4.56	4.25	4.23	4.16	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	8	23	4.53	551/1423	4.58	4.37	4.27	4.16	4.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	2	9	17	4.54	455/1609	4.38	4.13	4.22	4.05	4.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	1	6	10	13	4.17	642/1585	4.09	3.96	3.96	3.88	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	1	2	9	15	4.41	508/1535	4.23	4.01	4.08	3.89	4.41
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	1	7	23	4.52	510/1651	4.64	4.33	4.18	4.10	4.52
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	5	26	4.84	832/1673	4.81	4.66	4.69	4.67	4.84
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	3	11	15	4.30	655/1656	4.21	4.02	4.07	3.96	4.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	7	26	4.74	538/1586	4 75	4.53	4 43	4.37	4 74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	31	4.88	615/1585	4.78	4.68	4.69	4.60	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	10	23	4.65	467/1582	4.58	4.24	4.26	4.17	4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	3	7	22	4.48	717/1575	4.62	4.38	4.27	4.17	4.48
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding		12	2	0	5	10	5	3.73	923/1380	4.03		3.94	3.78	3.73
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	2	1	3	5	7		1010/1520	4.14		4.01	3.76	3.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	3	1	2	7	5		1288/1515	3.99	4.05	4.24	3.97	3.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	1	1	Τ	9	5		1103/1511	4.25	4.12	4.27	4.00	3.94
4. Were special techniques successful	16	12	Τ	1	0	1	3	3.67	****/ 994	3.88	3.64	3.94	3.73	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 103	****	4.88	4.41	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	33	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 101	****	4.88	4.48	4.18	***
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	33	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 95	****	4.71	4.31	3.99	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	33	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 99	****	4.75	4.39	4.10	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	33	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 97	****	4.88	4.14	3.69	***
Frequ	encv	Dist	ribi	ıtior	1									

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	А	19	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	6	C	6	General	4	Under-grad	34	Non-major	29
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	27	_		_	
				2	0						

PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I

Title Instructor:

Enrollment: 41 Questionnaires: 25

Baltimore County Fall 2005 COLE, RICHARD

Page 549 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
---------	--------	------------	---------------

University of Maryland

	Frequencie		ncies			Instructor		Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	5	7	12	4.29	903/1674		4.22	4.27	4.07	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	9	14	4.48	609/1674	4.56	4.25	4.23	4.16	4.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	7	16	4.52	,	4.58	4.37	4.27	4.16	4.52
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	5	6	9	4.20	930/1609	4.38	4.13	4.22	4.05	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	6	7	9	3.92	893/1585	4.09	3.96	3.96	3.88	3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	737/1535	4.23	4.01	4.08	3.89	4.20
<ol> <li>Was the grading system clearly explained</li> </ol>	1	0	0	0	2	7		4.54		4.64	4.33	4.18	4.10	4.54
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92		4.81	4.66	4.69	4.67	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	2	0	2	9	2	3.60	1330/1656	4.21	4.02	4.07	3.96	3.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	0	7	15	4.52	837/1586	4.75	4.53	4.43	4.37	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	981/1585	4.78	4.68	4.69	4.60	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	4	4		4.45	704/1582		4.24	4.26	4.17	4.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	3	5	14	4.39	828/1575		4.38	4.27	4.17	4.39
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	1	0	4	4	7	4.00	666/1380	4.03	3.77	3.94	3.78	4.00
Discussion	1.0	•	0	0	-	_		2 55	1005/1500	4 14	2 00	4 01	2 56	2 55
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	2	0	1 5	5 2	4		1027/1520	4.14	3.80	4.01	3.76	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	-	2			3		1303/1515	3.99	4.05	4.24	3.97	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13 13	0 6	0	2 1	2 1	5 1	3		1221/1511 ****/ 994	4.25	4.12	4.27	4.00	3.75 ****
4. Were special techniques successful	13	ь	U	Τ	Т	1	3	4.00	^^^^/ 994	3.88	3.64	3.94	3.73	* * * *
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	3.97	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	3.97	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.41	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.20	4.00	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.88	4.41	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.88	4.48	4.18	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.71	4.31	3.99	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.75	4.39	4.10	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.88	4.14	3.69	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.00	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	3.32	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.42	***
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	***
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.87	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	3.91	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.92	***
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	3.88	***

Course-Section: ECON 121 0501

Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I

Instructor: COLE, RICHARD

Enrollment: 41
Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 549 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	А	4	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	11						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	2	С	4	General	2	Under-grad	25	Non-major	24
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ECON 121 0601 University of Maryland

Questionnaires: 26

Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 550

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I

Instructor: COLE, RICHARD Fall 2005 Enrollment: 39

			Fr	equei	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sec
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mea
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	13	9	4.19	1026/1674	4.48	4.22	4.27	4.07	4.1
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	17	4.62	446/1674	4.56	4.25	4.23	4.16	4.6
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	18	4.64	404/1423	4.58	4.37	4.27	4.16	4.
1. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	8	2	1	0	2	11	4.19	941/1609	4.38	4.13	4.22	4.05	4.
Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	1	6	4	10	4.10	708/1585	4.09	3.96	3.96	3.88	4.
. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	d 1	7	1	2	3	2	10	4.00	870/1535	4.23	4.01	4.08	3.89	4.
. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	5	21	4.81	175/1651	4.64	4.33	4.18	4.10	4.
3. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	19	4.73	987/1673	4.81	4.66	4.69	4.67	4.
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	s 4	0	1	0	2	13	6	4.05	930/1656	4.21	4.02	4.07	3.96	4.
Lecture														
. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	20	4.79	410/1586	4.75	4.53	4.43	4.37	4.
. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	2	5	17	4.48	1241/1585	4.78	4.68	4.69	4.60	4
. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	3	3	17	4.46	704/1582	4.58	4.24	4.26	4.17	4
. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	21	4.77	343/1575	4.62	4.38	4.27	4.17	4
. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	10	2	0	7	1	5	3.47	1059/1380	4.03	3.77	3.94	3.78	3 .
Discussion														
. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	589/1520	4.14	3.80	4.01	3.76	4
. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	2	6	8	4.18	955/1515	3.99	4.05	4.24	3.97	4
. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	2	1	4	9	4.06	1034/1511	4.25	4.12	4.27	4.00	4
. Were special techniques successful	9	10	1	1	0	1	4	3.86	591/ 994	3.88	3.64	3.94	3.73	3
Seminar														
. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.71	4.31	3.99	* *
Fred	quency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades	3			Rea	ason	.s			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 1 A 5 28-55 7 1.00-1.99 1 B 14		Re	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s	1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Ĺ	Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	1	В	14						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	8	C	5	General	1	Under-grad	26	Non-major	25
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	23				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ECON 122 0101

Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING II

GREENE, RICHARD

Instructor:

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 10

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 551 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	4	2	3 80	1385/1674	3.97	4.22	4.27	4.07	3.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	2		1077/1674	4.12	4.25	4.23	4.16	4.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	894/1423	4.16		4.27	4.16	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	6	1	3.60	1411/1609	3.90	4.13	4.22	4.05	3.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	4	5	4.20	612/1585	4.07	3.96	3.96	3.88	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	2	4	1	3.33	1355/1535	3.81	4.01	4.08	3.89	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	5	1	3.50	1442/1651	4.26	4.33	4.18	4.10	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1673	4.74	4.66	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	5	4	0	3.30	1455/1656	3.56	4.02	4.07	3.96	3.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	6	2	4.00	1300/1586	4.28	4.53	4.43	4.37	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	8	1		1451/1585	4.49	4.68	4.69	4.60	4.11
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	5			1290/1582	4.07		4.26	4.17	3.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	5			1138/1575	4.17	4.38	4.27	4.17	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	2	0	0	2	0	2.50	1324/1380	3.42	3.77	3.94	3.78	2.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	5	0	3.63	1116/1520	3.66	3.80	4.01	3.76	3.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	1024/1515	4.03	4.05	4.24	3.97	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	1004/1511	4.09	4.12	4.27	4.00	4.13
4. Were special techniques successful	2	6	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 994	3.00	3.64	3.94	3.73	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	3.97	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	4.88	4.41	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	4.88	4.48	4.18	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 95	****	4.71	4.31	3.99	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	1.00	****/ 99	****	4.75	4.39	4.10	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	4.88	4.14	3.69	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	3.32	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.87	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 52	****	****	4.26	3.91	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.92	***
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	3.88	****

Course-Section: ECON 122 0101

Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING II

Instructor: GREENE, RICHARD

Enrollment: 25
Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 551 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	10
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 122 0201 University of Maryland Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING II Baltimore County

Baltimore County
Fall 2005

Page 552

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: GREENE, RICHARD
Enrollment: 35
Questionnaires: 24

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

					Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	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 fro	m this course	0	0	0	1	4	9	10	4.17	1056/1674	3.97	4.22	4.27	4.07	4.17
1 5	or make clear the ex		0	0	0	1	3	7	13	4.33	830/1674	4.12	4.25	4.23	4.16	4.33
3. Did the exam que	stions reflect the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	2	1	9	12	4.29	811/1423	4.16	4.37	4.27	4.16	4.29
4. Did other evalua	tions reflect the ex	pected goals	0	0	1	1	3	9	10	4.08	1042/1609	3.90	4.13	4.22	4.05	4.08
5. Did assigned rea	dings contribute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	6	13	4.33	482/1585	4.07	3.96	3.96	3.88	4.33
6. Did written assi	gnments contribute t	o what you learned	0	2	1	1	5	10	5	3.77	1132/1535	3.81	4.01	4.08	3.89	3.77
7. Was the grading	system clearly expla	ined	0	0	0	0	1	3	20	4.79	186/1651	4.26	4.33	4.18	4.10	4.79
8. How many times w	as class cancelled		0	0	1	0	0	10	13	4.42	1300/1673	4.74	4.66	4.69	4.67	4.42
9. How would you gr	ade the overall teac	hing effectiveness	5	1	0	0	5	11	2	3.83	1177/1656	3.56	4.02	4.07	3.96	3.83
	Lecture															
1. Were the instruc	Lecture Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	5	18	4.78	431/1586	4.28	4.53	4.43	4.37	4.78
	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						2	3	18	4.70	1035/1585	4.49	4.68	4.69	4.60	4.70
	erial presented and e	•	1	0	0	0	3	7	13	4.43	733/1582	4.07	4.24	4.26	4.17	4.43
4. Did the lectures	contribute to what	you learned	1	0	1	0	1	10	11	4.30	915/1575	4.17	4.38	4.27	4.17	4.30
5. Did audiovisual	techniques enhance y	our understanding	2	9	2	2	3	2	4	3.31	1142/1380	3.42	3.77	3.94	3.78	3.31
	Discussion															
1. Did class discus	ssions contribute to	what vou learned	11	0	1	1	2	7	2	3.62	1122/1520	3.66	3.80	4.01	3.76	3.62
	s actively encourage	-	11	0	0	1	2	2	8	4.31	857/1515	4.03	4.05	4.24	3.97	4.31
3. Did the instruct		11	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	845/1511	4.09	4.12	4.27	4.00	4.31	
4. Were special tec	-	11	6	2	0	2	2	1	3.00	881/ 994	3.00	3.64	3.94	3.73	3.00	
	F															
		-	_													
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Туј	pe			Majors	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	8	C	8	General	1	Under-grad	24	Non-major	22
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	19	-			
				2	0						

Course-Section: ECON 122 0301 University of Maryland Title

PRIN OF ACCOUNTING II Baltimore County Instructor: DAVIS, MARY B Fall 2005

Enrollment: 36 Questionnaires: 23

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

					Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	2	9	12	4.43	719/1674	3.97	4.22	4.27	4.07	4.43
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	6	16	4.65	392/1674	4.12	4.25	4.23	4.16	4.65
		estions reflec			0	0	0	0	3	5	15	4.52	551/1423	4.16	4.37	4.27	4.16	4.52
4. Did otl	her evalu	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	7	0	1	1	6	8	4.31	771/1609	3.90	4.13	4.22	4.05	4.31
5. Did ass	signed re	adings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	3	0	0	5	5	9	4.21	593/1585	4.07	3.96	3.96	3.88	4.21
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	1	9	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	528/1535	3.81	4.01	4.08	3.89	4.38
7. Was the	e grading	system clearl	y expla	ined	1	0	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	169/1651	4.26	4.33	4.18	4.10	4.82
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1673	4.74	4.66	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	10	8	4.24	744/1656	3.56	4.02	4.07	3.96	4.24
		Lectur	9															
1 Were th	he instri	ctor's lecture		prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	354/1586	4.28	4 53	4.43	4.37	4.83
		n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	664/1585	4.49	4.68	4.69	4.60	4.87		
		xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	8	15	4.65	452/1582	4.07	4.24	4.26	4.17	4.65		
			0	0	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	311/1575	4.17	4.38	4.27	4.17	4.78		
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understar						1	0	3	3	8	4.13	594/1380			3.94		4.13
		-	-	3														
		Discus																
				what you learned	16	0	0	1	2	2	2		1059/1520	3.66	3.80	4.01		3.71
				d to participate	16	0	0	0	3	3	1		1233/1515	4.03	4.05	4.24	3.97	3.71
		_		d open discussion	16	0	0	0	3	2	2		1166/1511	4.09	4.12	4.27	4.00	3.86
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		16	5	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 994	3.00	3.64	3.94	3.73	****
				Frequ	iency	, Dist	tribu	utio	n									
				_	_													
Credits Ea	arned	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	S			Туј	pe			Majors	<b>;</b>		
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 11							ed f	or M	ajor	`s	0	Graduate	≘	0	Majo	r	0
28-55																		
56-83							nera:	L				0	Under-g	rad 2	13	Non-	major	23
84-150																		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - 1				_	ſh
				P 0									response	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
	I 0						ner				2	1						
	? 0																	

Page 553

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Course-Section: ECON 122 0401

Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING II

Instructor: GERKIN, ELIZABE

Enrollment:

40 Questionnaires: 27 Fall 2005

Page 554 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Quagtiana	MD	NT 70	Fre	_	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	cructor	Course	Dept Mean		Level	Sect
Questions		NA						Mean	Rank 		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	4	0	8	8	6	3.46	1524/1674	3.97	4.22	4.27	4.07	3.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	3	6	9	5	3.38	1544/1674	4.12	4.25	4.23	4.16	3.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	1	5	12	6	3.63	1237/1423	4.16	4.37	4.27	4.16	3.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	9	2	2	2	6	5	3.59	1419/1609		4.13	4.22	4.05	3.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	3	1	5	4	7		1193/1585		3.96	3.96	3.88	3.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	3	1	2	7	8		1140/1535		4.01	4.08	3.89	3.76
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	0	4	8	11		1201/1651		4.33	4.18	4.10	3.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	9	17		1169/1673		4.66	4.69	4.67	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	4	2	9	./	0	2.86	1585/1656	3.56	4.02	4.07	3.96	2.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	2	1	8	7	5		1476/1586		4.53	4.43	4.37	3.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	2	0	2	5	15		1378/1585		4.68	4.69	4.60	4.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	2	1	10	5	5		1431/1582		4.24	4.26	4.17	3.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	2	3	5	5	8		1350/1575		4.38	4.27	4.17	3.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	13	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	902/1380	3.42	3.77	3.94	3.78	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	1	0	5	4	3.67	1092/1520		3.80	4.01	3.76	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	0	2	3	6	4.08	999/1515	4.03	4.05	4.24	3.97	4.08
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	0	2	3	6		1024/1511		4.12	4.27	4.00	4.08
4. Were special techniques successful	15	9	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 994	3.00	3.64	3.94	3.73	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.88	4.48	4.18	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,		4.71	4.31	3.99	***
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 99		4.75	4.39	4.10	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.88	4.14	3.69	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	3.32	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.42	***
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 53		****	4.45	4.34	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 48		****	4.12	4.00	***
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	***	****	4.27	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.87	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 52		****	4.26	3.91	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 50		****	4.44	4.39	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.92	****
Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	L.	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	9	C	8	General	0	Under-grad	27	Non-major	27
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sid	nificant	
				I	0	Other	25	-	-	,	

? 1

Baltimore County

University of Maryland Fall 2005

Page 555

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Instructor:	COATES, DENNIS	Fall 2005
Enrollment:	33	
Questionnaires:	11	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: ECON 263 0101

SPORTS ECONOMICS

Title

84-150

Grad.

2

0

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00 2

						Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
		Question	ıs		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1															
1. Did vou	gain ne	ew insights,ski		om this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	233/1674	4.82	4.22	4.27	4.32	4.82
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	530/1674	4.55	4.25	4.23	4.26	4.55
		estions reflec			0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	298/1423	4.73	4.37	4.27	4.36	4.73
	_	ations reflect		_	0	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	941/1609	4.18	4.13	4.22	4.23	4.18
				what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	769/1585	4.00	3.96	3.96	3.91	4.00
	_	_		o what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	828/1535	4.10	4.01	4.08	4.03	4.10
		system clearl			0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	169/1651	4.82	4.33	4.18	4.20	4.82
	-	was class cand		.11104	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.66	4.69	4.67	5.00
	-			hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	794/1656	4.20	4.02	4.07	4.10	4.20
J. 11011 1100	11 / Ou 3	jiado ono overo		211119 0110001 011000	_	ŭ	·	Ü	_	·		1.20	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	1.20	1.02	1.07	1.10	1.20
		Lectur																
1. Were th	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared							0	1	0	8	4.78	453/1586	4.78	4.53	4.43	4.48	4.78
2. Did the								0	1	0	8	4.78	874/1585	4.78	4.68	4.69	4.76	4.78
3. Was led	cture mat	erial presente	ed and e	explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	935/1582	4.25	4.24	4.26	4.35	4.25
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	495/1575	4.67	4.38	4.27	4.39	4.67
5. Did aud	diovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	2	5	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	1324/1380	2.50	3.77	3.94	4.03	2.50
		_																
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	810/1520	4.00	3.80	4.01	4.03	4.00
2. Were al	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	7	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1303/1515	3.50	4.05	4.24	4.28	3.50
3. Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair ar	d open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	896/1511	4.25	4.12	4.27	4.28	4.25
4. Were sp	ecial te	echniques succe	essful		7	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 994	****	3.64	3.94	3.98	****
				_														
	Frequ	ıency	Dist	trib	utior	1												
Credits Ea	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	;			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A 6		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	S	1	Graduat	9	0	Majo	r	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 3														
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C 1		Ger	nera:	1				7	Under-g	rad 1	1	Non-	major	8

Electives

Other

D

Ρ

I

?

0

1

0

Course-Section: ECON 280 0101 University of Maryland INTERNATIONAL ECONOMY

Baltimore County

Title Instructor: TAKACS, WENDY E

Enrollment: 13 Questionnaires: 9

JAN 21, 2006 Fall 2005 Job IRBR3029

Page 556

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	luation Questionnaire
---	-----------------------

			Fre	equei	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	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	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	167/1674	4.89	4.22	4.27	4.32	4.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.25	4.23	4.26	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	490/1609	4.50	4.13	4.22	4.23	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	1	3	3.75	1049/1585	3.75	3.96	3.96	3.91	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	667/1535	4.25	4.01	4.08	4.03	4.25
<ol> <li>Was the grading system clearly explained</li> </ol>	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	372/1651	4.63	4.33	4.18	4.20	4.63
. How many times was class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.66	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness		0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	118/1656	4.88	4.02	4.07	4.10	4.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	453/1586	4.78	4.53	4.43	4.48	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	286/1582	4.78	4.24	4.26	4.35	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.38	4.27	4.39	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	426/1380	4.33	3.77	3.94	4.03	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1520	5.00	3.80	4.01	4.03	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	432/1515	4.71	4.05	4.24	4.28	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	301/1511	4.86	4.12	4.27	4.28	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	2	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 994	****	3.64	3.94	3.98	****

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	1	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	4	Under-grad	9	Non-major	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 301 0101 University of Maryland INTERMED ACCOUNTING I Baltimore County

Title Instructor: GERKIN, ELIZABE Fall 2005

Enrollment: 22

Questionnaires: 19

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 557

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	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	2	1	8	4	4	3.37	1555/1674	3.92	4.22	4.27	4.26	3.37
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	6	6	3		1565/1674	3.89	4.25	4.23	4.21	3.32
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	5	3	8		1135/1423	4.33	4.37	4.27	4.27	3.84
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	3	4	4	4	3.44	1474/1609	3.88	4.13	4.22	4.27	3.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	6	3	7	3.78	1032/1585	4.02	3.96	3.96	3.95	3.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	3	4	3	3	3.13	1421/1535	3.60	4.01	4.08	4.15	3.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained		0	0	2	4	5	8	4.00	1097/1651	4.44	4.33	4.18	4.16	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled		0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	814/1673	4.92	4.66	4.69	4.68	4.84
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness		0	0	4	5	5	3	3.41	1416/1656	3.96	4.02	4.07	4.07	3.41
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	5	4	6	3.82	1394/1586	4.35	4.53	4.43	4.42	3.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	1300/1585	4.68	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	2	5	7	2	3.41	1438/1582	4.03	4.24	4.26	4.26	3.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	2	5	4	4	3.35	1417/1575	4.03	4.38	4.27	4.25	3.35
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	8	2	2	3	1	1	2.67	1304/1380	3.23	3.77	3.94	4.01	2.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	2	3	Δ	2	3 33	1252/1520	3.53	3.80	4.01	4.09	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	2	1	6	2		1227/1515	3.91	4.05	4.24	4.32	3.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	1	4	4	1		1366/1511	3.50	4.12	4.27	4.34	3.73
4. Were special techniques successful	8	5	1	2	0	2	1	3.00	881/ 994	3.00	3.64	3.94	3.96	3.00

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 301 0201 University of Maryland INTERMED ACCOUNTING I Baltimore County

Page 558 Title JAN 21, 2006 Instructor: CROTEAU, MARCIA Fall 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	24			
Questionnaires:	18	Student Cours	e Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fr	eque	ncie	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	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	2	5	10	4.47	655/1674	3.92	4.22	4.27	4.26	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	625/1674	3.89	4.25	4.23	4.21	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	188/1423	4.33	4.37	4.27	4.27	4.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	9	6	4.31	771/1609	3.88	4.13	4.22	4.27	4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	548/1585	4.02	3.96	3.96	3.95	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	7	5	4.06	844/1535	3.60	4.01	4.08	4.15	4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	133/1651	4.44	4.33	4.18	4.16	4.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1673	4.92	4.66	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	381/1656	3.96	4.02	4.07	4.07	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	249/1586	4.35	4.53	4.43	4.42	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	340/1585		4.68	4.69	4.66	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	467/1582	4.03	4.24	4.26	4.26	4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	440/1575	4.03	4.38	4.27	4.25	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	0	3	7	3	3.79	880/1380		3.77	3.94	4.01	3.79
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	4	3	3	3.73	1051/1520	3.53	3.80	4.01	4.09	3.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	2	0	0	2	7		996/1515		4.05	4.24	4.32	4.09
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7		2	0	2	2	5		1238/1511		4.12	4.27	4.34	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	9	1	0	1	0	0		****/ 994				3.96	
Fred	uency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
	_					-			m				Mo i on -	
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				ке:	ason	5 			Ту:	pe 			Majors	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 6		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	0

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	1	Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 301H 0101 University of Maryland Page 559
Title Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006

Instructor: CROTEAU, MARCIA (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 1
Questionnaires: 1

Fall 2005 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncies	5		Instr	uctor	Course	Dept	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	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.22	4.27	4.26	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.25	4.23	4.21	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.27	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.13	4.22	4.27	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1585	5.00	3.96	3.96	3.95	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1535	5.00	4.01	4.08	4.15	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1651	5.00	4.33	4.18	4.16	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.66	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1656	5.00	4.02	4.07	4.07	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.53	4.43	4.42	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.66	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.24	4.26	4.26	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.38	4.27	4.25	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1380	5.00	3.77	3.94	4.01	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	3.80	4.01	4.09	5.00

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	1	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 301H 0101 University of Maryland Page 560
Title Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006

Instructor: CROTEAU, MARCIA (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 1
Ouestionnaires: 1

Fall 2005
Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1674 5.00 4.22 4.27 4.26 5.00 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1674 5.00 4.25 4.23 4.21 5.00 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1423 5.00 4.37 4.27 4.27 5.00 1/1609 5.00 4.13 4.22 4.27 5.00 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.001/1585 5.00 3.96 3.96 3.95 5.00 1/1535 5.00 4.01 4.08 4.15 5.00 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1651 5.00 4.33 4.18 4.16 5.00 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1673 5.00 4.66 4.69 4.68 5.00 1/1656 5.00 4.02 4.07 4.07 5.00 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 Ω Ω 0 0 1 5.00 1/1586 5.00 4.53 4.43 4.42 5.00 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1585 5.00 4.68 4.69 4.66 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1582 5.00 4.24 4.26 4.26 5.00 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 5.00 0 0 0 1/1575 5.00 4.38 4.27 4.25 5.00 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1380 5.00 3.77 3.94 4.01 5.00 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1520 5.00 3.80 4.01 4.09 5.00

#### ribace to what you rearried 0 0 0

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

Course-Section: ECON 309 0101 SUR OF ECON/FIN Instructor: THOMAS, MARK S

Title

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 14

17

University of Maryland Page 561 Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006 Fall 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
---------	--------	------------	---------------

	Questions						Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 ı															
1 Did vo	u gain na	Genera. w insights,skil	_	n this source	2	0	0	4	2	4	2	3 33	1563/1674	3.33	4.22	4.27	4.26	3.33
		ctor make clear			2	0	0	3	3	3	2		1499/1674	3.50	4.25	4.23	4.21	3.50
		lestions reflect			2	0	0	0	1	7	4		845/1423		4.37	4.27	4.27	4.25
	_	ations reflect		_	2	1	0	2	2	4	3 -		1341/1609		4.13	4.22	4.27	3.73
			_	what you learned	2	0	1	1	4	5			1329/1585		3.96	3.96	3.95	3.33
	_	_		what you learned what you learned		2	1	2	1	3			1295/1535		4.01	4.08	4.15	3.50
		g system clearly		-	2	0	0	1	4	4			1324/1651		4.33	4.18	4.16	3.75
		was class cance		inea	3	0	0	0	0	9			1470/1673		4.66	4.69	4.68	4.18
				ning effectiveness	9	0	0	1	0	4			1330/1656		4.02	4.07	4.07	
9. HOW WO	uiu you g	grade the overa.	LI LEACI	iing effectiveness	9	U	U	_	U	4	U	3.00	1330/1030	3.00	4.02	4.07	4.07	3.00
		Lecture	_															
1. Were th	he instr	actor's lectures		prepared	5	0	1	1	1	6	0	3.33	1510/1586	3.33	4.53	4.43	4.42	3.33
		ctor seem inter			5	0	0	2	0	4	3		1509/1585		4.68	4.69	4.66	3.89
				plained clearly	5	0	2	1	1	5	0		1504/1582		4.24	4.26	4.26	3.00
	ne lectures contribute to what you learned				5	0	3	0	2	4	0		1530/1575		4.38	4.27	4.25	2.78
	d audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding				7	•	2	0	1	2	-		1149/1380			3.94	4.01	
J. Dia au	.diovisua.	r cecinitques em	lance yo	our understanding	,	U	2	U		2	2	3.29	1149/1300	3.23	3.77	3.94	7.01	3.29
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contribu	ite to v	what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1520	****	3.80	4.01	4.09	****
				d to participate	12	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/1515	****	4.05	4.24	4.32	****
		-	_	d open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/1511	****	4.12	4.27	4.34	****
		echniques succes		open dibodbion	12	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 994	****	3.64	3.94	3.96	****
	_	1											,					
				Freq	uency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			ТУ	pe			Majors	1		
00-27							guire		 or Ma			1	Graduat		0	Majc		0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 3		1/6/	darre	Lu I	J_ 110	י זייין	,	_	Graduat	_	J	Ma JC	, <u> </u>	U
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 1		Ger	nera:	1				3	Under-q	rad 1	.4	Non-	major	14
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D 0		GC.	с.а.	-				5	onaci -g	Luu I		14011		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		EJ.	ecti	7es				0	#### - 1	Means +	here a	re not	enoug	h
oraa.	Ü	3.30 1.00	3	P 0		51.	CCCI	v CD				0	respons				_	
				I O		O+1	her					6	T CSPOIIS		,c 5191.	LLLCai		
				2 0		OC.	TTCT					J						
				: U														

Course-Section: ECON 311 0101 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County

INTERM MICROECON ANALY

Instructor: COATES, DENNIS

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 23

Fall 2005 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 562

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

							Fre	eque	ncie	5		Inst	cructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	om this course	0	0	1	1	0	8	13	4.35	841/1674	4.21	4.22	4.27	4.26	4.35
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	2	6	14	4.43	689/1674	4.31	4.25	4.23	4.21	4.43
		estions reflec			0	0	0	1	2	3	17	4.57	505/1423	4.26	4.37	4.27	4.27	4.57
	_	uations reflect		_	0	8	1	0	3	5	6	4.00	1094/1609	4.24	4.13	4.22	4.27	4.00
				what you learned	1	9	0	0	4	6	3	3.92	879/1585	3.61	3.96	3.96	3.95	3.92
	_	-		o what you learned	1	15	0	2	1	2	2	3.57	1256/1535	3.85	4.01	4.08	4.15	3.57
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	1	1	1	4	16	4.43	628/1651	4.39	4.33	4.18	4.16	4.43
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1673	4.96	4.66	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	3	0	1	0	5	10	4	3.80	1200/1656	3.92	4.02	4.07	4.07	3.80
1 77		Lectur			_	0	^	0	0	2	1.0	4 70	610/1506	4 56	4 52	4 42	4 40	4 70
		uctor's lecture			0	0	0	0	2	3	18	4.70			4.53	4.43	4.42	4.70
		ctor seem inter		3	0	0	0	0	3		17		1142/1585	4.66	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.61
	s lecture material presented and explained clear d the lectures contribute to what you learned				0	0	0	2	2	6	13	4.30	882/1582		4.24	4.26	4.26	4.30
	<u>-</u>				0	0	0	2	1	7	13		876/1575	4.31	4.38	4.27	4.25	4.35
5. Did aud	oid audiovisual techniques enhance your understand				0	17	2	0	1	2	1	3.00	1217/1380	2.75	3.77	3.94	4.01	3.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	15	0	1	1	2	3	1	3.25	1284/1520	4.00	3.80	4.01	4.09	3.25
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	15	0	2	0	2	1	3	3.38	1349/1515	4.15	4.05	4.24	4.32	3.38
3. Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	14	0	0	1	3	1	4	3.89	1150/1511	4.33	4.12	4.27	4.34	3.89
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		14	8	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 994	****	3.64	3.94	3.96	****
				Frequ	iency	7 Dist	trib	utio	n									
		Cum. GPA		-	-													
Credits Ea	arned	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3		
00-27	-27 1 0.00-0.99 1 A 7					Red	guir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s	1	Graduat	e	1	Majo	or	3
28-55				в 6			-			,						3 -		
56-83	83 3 2.00-2.99 5 C 4			C 4		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 2	22	Non-	-major	20
84-150	-150 4 3.00-3.49 3 D 0																	
Grad.						Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enous	<sub>j</sub> h
				P 1									respons				_	-
	I O					Ot1	her				1	.8	-					

I ?

0

Course-Section: ECON 311 0201 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County INTERM MICROECON ANALY

Instructor: TAKACS, WENDY E Enrollment: 39

Questionnaires: 31

Fall 2005 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 563

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncie	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	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	3	11	16	4.43	719/1674	4.21	4.22	4.27	4.26	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	10	18	4.48	609/1674	4.31	4.25	4.23	4.21	4.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	8	20	4.66	390/1423	4.26	4.37	4.27	4.27	4.66
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	21	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	892/1609	4.24	4.13	4.22	4.27	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	4	1	6	9	6	3.46	1252/1585	3.61	3.96	3.96	3.95	3.46
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	15	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	373/1535	3.85	4.01	4.08	4.15	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	3	6	20	4.59	419/1651	4.39	4.33	4.18	4.16	4.59
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	27	4.90	706/1673	4.96	4.66	4.69	4.68	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	3	8	13	4.42	507/1656	3.92	4.02	4.07	4.07	4.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	7	20	4.74	517/1586	4.56	4.53	4.43	4.42	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	4	24	4.86	689/1585	4.66	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	1	8	18	4.54	599/1582	4.33	4.24	4.26	4.26	4.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	6	20	4.67	495/1575	4.31	4.38	4.27	4.25	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	21	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	****/1380	2.75	3.77	3.94	4.01	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	355/1520	4.00	3.80	4.01	4.09	4.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	432/1515	4.15	4.05	4.24	4.32	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	525/1511	4.33	4.12	4.27	4.34	4.64
4. Were special techniques successful	17	10	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 994	****	3.64	3.94	3.96	****
Post 10		D	1		_									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	12						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	5	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	31	Non-major	23
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	26	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 311 0301

Title INTERM MICROECON ANALY

Instructor: TAKACS, WENDY E

Enrollment: 37
Questionnaires: 32

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 564 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
---------	--------	------------	---------------

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General	_	^	-1	0	4	1.0	1 -	4 07	041/1674	4 01	4 00	4 07	4 06	4 07
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	T	0	4 0	10 14	15 15	4.27	941/1674 566/1674		4.22 4.25	4.27 4.23	4.26 4.21	4.27 4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	6	21	4.60	459/1423	4.26	4.25	4.23	4.21	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	18	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	629/1609	4.24	4.13	4.22	4.27	4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	7	2	2	5	6	7		1142/1585	3.61	3.96	3.96	3.95	3.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	17	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	578/1535	3.85	4.01	4.08	4.15	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	3	7	19	4.55	458/1651	4.39	4.33	4.18	4.16	4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	0	2	26	4.93	565/1673	4.96	4.66	4.69	4.68	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	11	14	4.44	465/1656	3.92	4.02	4.07	4.07	4.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	3	24	4.82	354/1586	4.56	4.53	4.43	4.42	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	0	27	4.93	453/1585	4.66	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	0	4	22	4.74	326/1582	4.33	4.24	4.26	4.26	4.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	8	21	4.72	407/1575	4.31	4.38	4.27	4.25	4.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	21	1	0	1	3	2	3.71	****/1380	2.75	3.77	3.94	4.01	***
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	709/1520	4.00	3.80	4.01	4.09	4.18
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	798/1515	4.15	4.05	4.24	4.32	4.36
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	696/1511	4.33	4.12	4.27	4.34	4.45
4. Were special techniques successful	21	10	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 994	****	3.64	3.94	3.96	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	4.24	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	30	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 103	****	4.88	4.41	4.10	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.88	4.48	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.20	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	3.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	3.82	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.29	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	4.29	****
Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ıtior	ı									

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	11	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	11						
56-83	10	2.00-2.99	5	C	5	General	1	Under-grad	32	Non-major	25
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	21				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 311 0401 University of Maryland
Title INTERM MICROECON ANALY Baltimore County

Title INTERM MICROECON ANA Instructor: COATES, DENNIS

Enrollment: 25

Questionnaires: 5

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland Page 565
Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006
Fall 2005 Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies					3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	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	0	2	2	3.80	1385/1674	4.21	4.22	4.27	4.26	3.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1340/1674	4.31	4.25	4.23	4.21	3.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	1342/1423	4.26	4.37	4.27	4.27	3.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	743/1609	4.24	4.13	4.22	4.27	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1297/1585	3.61	3.96	3.96	3.95	3.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	1435/1535	3.85	4.01	4.08	4.15	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	1097/1651	4.39	4.33	4.18	4.16	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1673	4.96	4.66	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1540/1656	3.92	4.02	4.07	4.07	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1300/1586	4.56	4.53	4.43	4.42	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	1		1397/1585	4.66	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1302/1582	4.33	4.24	4.26	4.26	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	1367/1575	4.31	4.38	4.27	4.25	3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1324/1380	2.75	3.77	3.94	4.01	2.50
Discussion														
	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/1520	4.00	3.80	4.01	4.09	****
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4 4	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/1515	4.00	4.05	4.01	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/1511	4.13	4.12	4.24	4.34	***
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	1	0	0	U	0		****/ 994	****	3.64	3.94	3.96	***
i. Were apeciar techniques auccessiui	4	U	1	U	U	U	U	1.00	/ 994		3.04	3.94	3.90	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	5	Non-major	5
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	5	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 312 0101 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County INTERM MACROECON ANALY

Instructor: Cinyabuguma, Ma

Enrollment: 39 Questionnaires: 17

# Fall 2005 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 566

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	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	4	1	6	1	5	3.12	1613/1674	3.60	4.22	4.27	4.26	3.12
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	3	3	4	2	2.71	1650/1674	3.30	4.25	4.23	4.21	2.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	3	4	3	4	3.12	1352/1423	3.52	4.37	4.27	4.27	3.12
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	2	0	1	0	2	3.00	1557/1609	3.28	4.13	4.22	4.27	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	3	0	4	5	3.92	893/1585	3.92	3.96	3.96	3.95	3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1066/1535	3.89	4.01	4.08	4.15	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	6	3	2	2	2.53	1609/1651	3.49	4.33	4.18	4.16	2.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	7	4.41	1300/1673	4.67	4.66	4.69	4.68	4.41
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	4	3	4	3	0	2.43	1625/1656	2.97	4.02	4.07	4.07	2.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	1	6	1	5	3 40	1499/1586	3.94	4.53	4.43	4.42	3.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	5	1	8		1472/1585		4.68	4.69	4.66	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	4	3	4	1	3		1550/1582		4.24	4.26	4.26	2.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	3	3	4	1	3		1522/1575		4.38	4.27	4.25	2.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	12	0	0	0	0	2		****/1380			3.94	4.01	****
1									,					
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	1	0	0	2	2.80	1424/1520	3.49	3.80	4.01	4.09	2.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	1393/1515	3.70	4.05	4.24	4.32	3.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	1383/1511	3.81	4.12	4.27	4.34	3.20
4. Were special techniques successful	12	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 994	3.50	3.64	3.94	3.96	****
Frequ	ıency	Dist	trib	utio	n									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	14
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ECON 312 0201 University of Maryland Title INTERM MACROECON ANALY Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006

Instructor: Cinyabuguma, Ma

Enrollment: 27 Questionnaires: 23

# Fall 2005 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 567

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	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	2	4	1	10	6	3.61	1480/1674	3.60	4.22	4.27	4.26	3.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	6	3	6	7	3.52	1489/1674	3.30	4.25	4.23	4.21	3.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	1	5	7	7	3.73	1184/1423	3.52	4.37	4.27	4.27	3.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	3	3	4	2	3.42	1480/1609	3.28	4.13	4.22	4.27	3.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	0	4	8	6	3.80	1006/1585	3.92	3.96	3.96	3.95	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	1	3	5	4	3.92	991/1535	3.89	4.01	4.08	4.15	3.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	4	3	9	6	3.77	1310/1651	3.49	4.33	4.18	4.16	3.77
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	8	14	4.64	1103/1673	4.67	4.66	4.69	4.68	4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	2	1	3	5	3	0	2.83	1588/1656	2.97	4.02	4.07	4.07	2.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	Ο	Ο	1	5	7	10	4 13	1230/1586	3.94	4.53	4.43	4.42	4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	3	9	10		1415/1585	4.27	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.22
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	3	6	7	5		1431/1582	3.31	4.24	4.26	4.26	3.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	4	3	7	6		1405/1575	3.37	4.38	4.27	4.25	3.39
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	9	2	1	2	3	3		1113/1380	3.74	3.77	3.94	4.01	3.36
1									,					
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	5	4	4	3.71	1059/1520	3.49	3.80	4.01	4.09	3.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	2	3	3	5	3.64	1260/1515	3.70	4.05	4.24	4.32	3.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	4	5	4	3.79	1205/1511	3.81	4.12	4.27	4.34	3.79
4. Were special techniques successful	10	5	1	0	3	2	2	3.50	732/ 994	3.50	3.64	3.94	3.96	3.50

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	2	А	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	11						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	19
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	19	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 312 0401

Title INTERM MACROECON ANALY

CARPENTER, ROBE

Instructor:

Enrollment: 56 Questionnaires: 39

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 568 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Frequencie				Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	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	2	3	4	11	19	4.08	1139/1674	3.60	4.22	4.27	4.26	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	3	7	17	9	3.67	1421/1674	3.30	4.25	4.23	4.21	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	3	7	11	14	3.72	1188/1423	3.52	4.37	4.27	4.27	3.72
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	27	2	2	1	3	4	3.42	1480/1609	3.28	4.13	4.22	4.27	3.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	5	4	11	16	4.06	735/1585	3.92	3.96	3.96	3.95	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	33	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	****/1535	3.89	4.01	4.08	4.15	***
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	5	13	17	4.16	977/1651	3.49	4.33	4.18	4.16	4.16
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	36	4.95	424/1673	4.67	4.66	4.69	4.68	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	3	0	7	19	4	3.64	1313/1656	2.97	4.02	4.07	4.07	3.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	5	10	21	4.29	1120/1586	3.94	4.53	4.43	4.42	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	4	8	26	4.58	1166/1585	4.27	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	6	6	13	12	3.76	1296/1582	3.31	4.24	4.26	4.26	3.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	5	1	6	8	18	3.87	1235/1575	3.37	4.38	4.27	4.25	3.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	3	5	12	15	4.11	612/1380	3.74	3.77	3.94	4.01	4.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	1	2	10	6	3.95	867/1520	3.49	3.80	4.01	4.09	3.95
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	1	3	6	10	4.25	898/1515	3.70	4.05	4.24	4.32	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	1	1	6	12	4.45	707/1511		4.12	4.27	4.34	4.45
4. Were special techniques successful	19	17	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 994		3.64		3.96	****
1000									,					
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	4.24	****
									,					
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	37	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 101	****	4.88	4.48	4.30	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	37	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 99	****	4.75	4.39	4.29	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	37	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 97	****			3.48	****
	-	_	-		_	-			,					
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	4.03	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	38	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.70	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	37	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	3.87	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	38	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 48	****	****	4.12	3.67	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	38	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 49	****	****	4.27	3.27	****
J. Did conferences help you early out little detivities	50	O	U	_	O	U	O	2.00	, 10			1.2/	3.27	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.20	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	38	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	3.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	37	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	3.82	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	37	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.29	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	37	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 31	****	****	4.34	4.29	****
5. Here there chaugh proceeds for all the stauchts	۱ ر	_	5	5	_	U	U	5.00	, 51			1.51	1.27	

Course-Section: ECON 312 0401

Title INTERM MACROECON ANALY

Instructor: CARPENTER, ROBE

Enrollment: 56
Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 568 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GP	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	16						
56-83	12	2.00-2.99	11	C	9	General	1	Under-grad	39	Non-major	28
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	10	D	3						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	31				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 320 0101 University of Maryland Title QUANT MTHDS: MANAGEMENT Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006

Instructor: PALMATEER, JASO

Enrollment: 79 Questionnaires: 24

# Fall 2005 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 569

Job IRBR3029

			Frequencies				Instructor		Course	Dept	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	1	1	3	8	10	4.09	1131/1674	4.26	4.22	4.27	4.26	4.09
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals		0	0	0	2	10	11	4.39	750/1674	4.50	4.25	4.23	4.21	4.39
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals		0	1	2	4	3	13	4.09	968/1423	4.43	4.37	4.27	4.27	4.09
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals			1	1	1	6	12	4.29	812/1609	4.49	4.13	4.22	4.27	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	2	2	4	3	7	3.61	1156/1585	3.81	3.96	3.96	3.95	3.61
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	1	2	2	5	7	3.88	1039/1535	4.22	4.01	4.08	4.15	3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	8	12	4.39	686/1651	4.54	4.33	4.18	4.16	4.39
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	11	11	4.50	1200, 10,0	4.36	4.66	4.69	4.68	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	1	4	6	5	3.94	1073/1656	4.15	4.02	4.07	4.07	3.94
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	1	4	15	4.45	931/1586	4.60	4.53	4.43	4.42	4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	9	12	4.45	1267/1585	4.47	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.45
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	1	7	12	4.32	871/1582	4.46	4.24	4.26	4.26	4.32
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	2	0	8	11	4.33	886/1575	4.45	4.38	4.27	4.25	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	220/1380	4.61	3.77	3.94	4.01	4.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	0	0	5	2	3.56	1149/1520	3.93	3.80	4.01	4.09	3.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	857/1515	4.40	4.05	4.24	4.32	4.30
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	927/1511	4.16	4.12	4.27	4.34	4.22
4. Were special techniques successful	14	4	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	408/ 994	4.17	3.64	3.94	3.96	4.17

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	11	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	19	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 320 0201 University of Maryland Baltimore County

Title QUANT MTHDS: MANAGEMENT

Instructor: PALMATEER, JASO

Enrollment: 38 Ouestionnaires: 24

# Fall 2005 Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 570

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions 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 11 11 4.43 719/1674 4.26 4.22 4.27 4.26 4.43 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 0 0 1 7 15 4.61 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 2 0 0 0 1 3 18 4.77 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 7 0 0 5 11 4.69 460/1674 4.50 4.25 4.23 4.21 4.61 238/1423 4.43 4.37 4.27 4.27 4.77 292/1609 4.49 4.13 4.22 4.27 4.69 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 9 0 2 2 3 6 4.00 769/1585 3.81 3.96 3.96 3.95 4.00 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 4 0 0 1 6 11 4.56 328/1535 4.22 4.01 4.08 4.15 4.56 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 2. 0 0 0 2 3 17 4.68 309/1651 4.54 4.33 4.18 4.16 4.68 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 0 0 0 2 13 7 4.23 1442/1673 4.36 4.66 4.69 4.68 4.23 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0 0 0 1 9 7 4.35 588/1656 4.15 4.02 4.07 4.07 4.35 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 Ω 0 6 17 4.74 538/1586 4.60 4.53 4.43 4.42 4.74 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 2 8 13 4.48 1250/1585 4.47 4.68 4.69 4.66 4.48 1 0 0 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 2 5 16 4.61 525/1582 4.46 4.24 4.26 4.26 4.61 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 2 6 15 4.57 624/1575 4.45 4.38 4.27 4.25 4.57 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 4 0 0 2 4 13 4.58 259/1380 4.61 3.77 3.94 4.01 4.58 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 0 3 1 6 4.30 598/1520 3.93 3.80 4.01 4.09 4.30 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 14 0 0 0 1 3 6 4.50 629/1515 4.40 4.05 4.24 4.32 4.50 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 14 0 0 1 1 4 4 4.10 1018/1511 4.16 4.12 4.27 4.34 4.10 4. Were special techniques successful 14 5 1 1 1 1 3.00 \*\*\*\*/ 994 4.17 3.64 3.94 3.96 \*\*\*\*

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	5
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	23	Non-major	19
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	20	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 374 0101 University of Mary Title FUND FINANCIAL MGMT Baltimore Count Instructor: ANORUO, EMMANUE Fall 2005

Ρ

I

0

0

1

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 29

37

University of Maryland Page 571
Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006
Fall 2005 Job IRBR3029

25

responses to be significant

Student	Course	Erraluation	Ouestionnaire
Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

				Frequencies				Inst	tructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect			
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General															
1. Did vo	nı gain ne	ew insights,skills f	rom this course	1	0	2	1	6	7	12	3.93	1296/1674	3.93	4.22	4.27	4.26	3.93
_	_	ctor make clear the		1	0	3	1	4	9	11		1305/1674	3.86	4.25	4.23	4.21	3.86
		uestions reflect the		1	0	1	0	2	3	22		459/1423	4.61	4.37	4.27	4.27	4.61
	_	uations reflect the		1	11	1	0	4	3	9		1018/1609	4.12	4.13	4.22	4.27	4.12
		eadings contribute t		1	9	3	0	4	4	8		1066/1585		3.96	3.96	3.95	3.74
	_	3	to what you learned	1	7	2	1	4	6	8		1110/1535		4.01	4.08	4.15	3.81
		g system clearly exp	-	1	0	2	1	4	4	17		956/1651	4.18	4.33	4.18	4.16	4.18
		was class cancelled		2	1	0	0	0	5	21	4.81	887/1673	4.81	4.66	4.69	4.68	4.81
			aching effectiveness	6	0	0	2	10	8	3	3.52	1367/1656	3.52	4.02	4.07	4.07	3.52
		Lecture	,	-	0	-	-	-	_	1.0	4 20	1014/1506	4 20	4 50	4 42	4 40	4 20
		uctor's lectures wel		1	0	Ţ	Ţ	Τ	8	17		1014/1586		4.53	4.43	4.42	4.39
		in the subject	1	0	0	3	6	10	12		1472/1585	4.00	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.00	
		terial presented and		2	0	1	2	3	10	11		1114/1582		4.24	4.26	4.26	4.04
		es contribute to wha	-	1	Ţ	-	3	4	6	14		1060/1575	4.15	4.38	4.27	4.25	4.15
5. Did au	udiovisua.	l techniques enhance	your understanding	2	2	3	0	-7	3	12	3.84	838/1380	3.84	3.77	3.94	4.01	3.84
		Discussion															
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contribute t	o what you learned	18	0	1	1	3	2	4	3.64	1110/1520	3.64	3.80	4.01	4.09	3.64
2. Were a	all stude	nts actively encoura	ged to participate	18	0	1	0	2	1	7	4.18	949/1515	4.18	4.05	4.24	4.32	4.18
3. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage fair	and open discussion	18	0	2	1	0	3	5	3.73	1238/1511	3.73	4.12	4.27	4.34	3.73
4. Were s	special te	echniques successful		18	8	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 994	***	3.64	3.94	3.96	****
			Frequ	iency	/ Dist	trib	utio	n									
			Frequency Distribution														
Credits E	Expected Grades	s Reasons Type							Majors	3							
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 1	A 17		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	В 8														
56-83	7	2.00-2.99 4	C 0	General					0 Under-gi			rad 2	.9	Non-	-major	27	
84-150	10	3.00-3.49 10	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives						1 #### - Means there are not					enoug	jh	

Other

Course-Section: ECON 408 0101

Title MANAGERIAL ECONOMICS

Instructor: DASGUPTA, NANDI

Enrollment: 27
Questionnaires: 17

Baltimore County Fall 2005

University of Maryland

Page 572 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
---------	--------	------------	---------------

Frequencies Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4					_		tructo:	_		e Dept		Level	Sect						
		Question 	s 		NR 	NA	1	2	3	4 	5	Mean	Rai	nk 	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1																
1. Did you	u gain ne	w insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	4	6	7	4.18	1046/	1674	4.18	4.22	4.27	4.42	4.18
_		ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	0	5	11	4.53	554/		4.53		4.23	4.31	4.53
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	404/	1423	4.65	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.65
	_	ations reflect		_	0	11	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	490/	1609	4.50	4.13	4.22	4.30	4.50
				what you learned	0	2	1	1	4	3	6	3.80	1006/	1585	3.80	3.96	3.96	4.01	3.80
				o what you learned	0	9	0	3	1	0	4		1229/		3.63	4.01	4.08	4.18	3.63
		g system clearl			0	0	0	0	3	0	14	4.65	351/	1651	4.65	4.33	4.18	4.23	4.65
		was class canc			1	0	0	0	0	11	5	4.31	1375/	1673	4.31	4.66	4.69	4.67	4.31
	_			hing effectiveness	4	1	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	615/	1656	4.33	4.02	4.07	4.19	4.33
		Lectur	е																
1. Were th	he instru	actor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	1	0	7	9	4.41	989/	1586	4.41	4.53	4.43	4.46	4.41
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	397/	1585	4.94	4.68	4.69	4.76	4.94
3. Was led	cture mat	erial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	409/	1582	4.69	4.24	4.26	4.31	4.69
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	551/	1575	4.63	4.38	4.27	4.35	4.63
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	8	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	817/	1380	3.88	3.77	3.94	4.04	3.88
		Discus																	
			what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	4	4	4.11	768/	1520	4.11	3.80	4.01	4.18	4.11	
		d to participate	8 8	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	827/	1515	4.33	4.05	4.24	4.40	4.33		
	. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion							1	0	3	5	4.33	816/	1511	4.33	4.12	4.27	4.45	4.33
4. Were sp	4. Were special techniques successful						1	0	1	1	3	3.83	600/	994	3.83	3.64	3.94	4.19	3.83
_		Labora	_																
2. Were yo	ou provid	ded with adequa	te back	ground information	15	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/	278	****	****	4.19	4.21	****
		Field	Work																
1. Did fie	eld exper	rience contribu	te to w	hat you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	76	****	****	3.98	4.86	****
2. Did you	u clearly	understand yo	ur eval	uation criteria	15	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/	77	****	****	3.93	4.24	****
3. Was the	e instruc	ctor available	for con	sultation	14	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	53	****	****	4.45	4.86	****
4. To what	t degree	could you disc	uss you	r evaluations	14	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	48	****	****	4.12	4.13	****
5. Did con	nferences	s help you carr	y out f	ield activities	14	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	49	****	****	4.27	4.48	****
		Self	Paced																
1. Did se	lf-paced	system contrib	ute to	what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	61	****	****	4.09	5.00	****
2. Did st	udy quest	cions make clea	r the e	xpected goal	14	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	52	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
3. Were yo	our conta	acts with the i	nstruct	or helpful	14	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	50	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
4. Was the	e feedbad	ck/tutoring by	proctor	s helpful	14	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	35	****	****	4.36	5.00	****
5. Were th	1. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students					2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	31	****	****	4.34	5.00	****
Fre						Dis	trib	utio	n										
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	S				Тур	pe			Majors	5
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 A 7		Red	 quir	ed fo	or Ma	 ajor		1	Gra	 duate	 e	0	 Мај	 or	 5
28-55							_			-							3		
56-83 2 2.00-2.99 2 C 0						Gei	nera	1				2	Und	er-gi	rad	17	Non-	-major	12
84-150 5 3.00-3.49 6 D 0				GCHCLGI															
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0				Electives					0	###	# - 1	Means	there a	are not	enoug	gh			
Р 0				responses to be significant															
				I 0		Other				11									
				0 0															

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Fall 2005

Page 573 JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	16	
Questionnaires:	8	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: ECON 410 0101

TOPICS IN FIN ECON

GRIBBIN, JOSEPH

Title

Instructor:

			Fr	eque	ncies	<b>.</b>		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.22	4.27	4.42	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	161/1674	4.88	4.25	4.23	4.31	4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	262/1423	4.75	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	147/1609	4.86	4.13	4.22	4.30	4.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	101/1585	4.88	3.96	3.96	4.01	4.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	169/1535	4.75	4.01	4.08	4.18	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1651	5.00	4.33	4.18	4.23	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.66	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	127/1656	4.86	4.02	4.07	4.19	4.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	266/1586	4.88	4.53	4.43	4.46	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	180/1582	4.88	4.24	4.26	4.31	4.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	203/1575	4.88	4.38	4.27	4.35	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	143/1380	4.75	3.77	3.94	4.04	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	397/1520	4.50	3.80	4.01	4.18	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	384/1515	4.75	4.05	4.24	4.40	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	414/1511	4.75	4.12	4.27	4.45	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	205/ 994	4.50	3.64	3.94	4.19	4.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	35/ 103	4.88	4.88	4.41	4.42	4.88
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	39/ 101	4.88	4.88	4.48	4.65	4.88
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	35/ 95	4.71	4.71	4.31	4.60	4.73
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	38/ 99	4.75	4.75	4.39	4.57	4.75
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	27/ 97	4.88	4.88	4.14	4.46	4.88
Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	asons	;			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 4					 or Ma			0	Graduat		3	 Maio		 1

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	3	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	5	Non-major	7
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0	HICCEIVED		responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	5	_			
				2	0						

Course-Section: ECON 415 0101

Title PRPRTY RIGHTS, ORGAN, MG

Instructor:

Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 11

Baltimore County CARROLL, KATHLE Fall 2005

Page 574 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

							Fre	equei	ncies	;		Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1 Did vo	ou dain ne	ew insights,skil	-	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4 91	148/1674	4 91	4 22	4.27	4.42	4.91
_	-	ctor make clear			0	0	1	0	1	3	6		1009/1674	4.18	4.25	4.23	4.31	4.18
		uestions reflect			0	0	1	0	0	4	6	4.27	828/1423	4.27		4.27	4.34	4.27
	_	ations reflect			0	1	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	645/1609	4.40	4.13	4.22	4.30	4.40
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0		4.82		4.82	3.96	3.96	4.01	4.82
	-	-		o what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	- 8	4.55	337/1535	4.55	4.01	4.08	4.18	4.55
		g system clearly		_	0	0	0	1	1	1	8		598/1651	4.45	4.33	4.18	4.23	4.45
		was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	3	8		1001/1673		4.66	4.69	4.67	4.73
				hing effectiveness	1	1	0	0	2	2	5		615/1656	4.33		4.07	4.19	4.33
		Lecture	ż															
1. Were t	the instru	actor's lectures		prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	371/1586	4.82	4.53	4.43	4.46	4.82
		ctor seem intere			0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.76	5.00
				explained clearly	0	0	0	2	0	4	5	4.09	1084/1582	4.09	4.24	4.26	4.31	4.09
		es contribute to			0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	171/1575	4.91	4.38	4.27	4.35	4.91
5. Did au	udiovisual	l techniques enh	nance y	our understanding	0	6	1	0	2	1			1178/1380		3.77	3.94	4.04	3.20
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did cl	lass discu			what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	397/1520	4.50	3.80	4.01	4.18	4.50
				d to participate	3	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	898/1515	4.25	4.05	4.24	4.40	4.25
		_	_	d open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	1		4.38	779/1511	4.38	4.12	4.27	4.45	4.38
		echniques succes			3	6	0	0	1	0			****/ 994		3.64		4.19	****
		Seminar	•															
1. Were a	assigned t			announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	4.88	4.41	4.42	****
		Field W	Jork															
1. Did fi	ield exper	rience contribut	e to w	hat you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	4.86	****
				uation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	4.24	****
3. Was th	he instruc	ctor available f	or con	sultation	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.86	****
		Self F	aced															
1. Did se	elf-paced	system contribu	ite to	what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	5.00	****
3. Were y	your conta	acts with the in	struct	or helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits I	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	;			Туј	oe			Majors	3
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	S	0	Graduat	е	1	Majo	or	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 4		_							1	, .				_
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 2		Gei	nera	Τ				4	Under-g	rad 1	LO	Non-	-major	6
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D 1								0			1			.1-
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	jn
				P 0		O+ 1						_	respons	es to k	be sign	niicar	1C	
				I 0		Utl	ner					6						
				? 1														

#### Course-Section: ECON 421 0101 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County INTRO TO ECONOMETRICS

Instructor: FARROW, SCOTT

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 19

Fall 2005 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 575

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

General								Fre	_	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 5 0 1 1 1 1 5 6 4.00 1196/1674 4.00 4.22 4.27 4.42 4.00 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 5 0 0 1 1 3 4 5 4 3.86 1305/1674 3.86 4.25 4.23 4.31 3.86 3.00 10 dthe exam questions reflect the expected goals 5 0 1 1 1 3 4 5 4 3.86 1305/1674 3.86 4.25 4.23 4.31 3.86 3.00 10 dther evaluations reflect the expected goals 5 0 1 1 1 3 4 5 3.79 162/1423 3.79 4.37 4.27 4.34 3.79 4.00 dthere evaluations reflect the expected goals 5 0 1 0 1 1 3 9 4.36 462/1585 4.36 3.79 3.96 3.96 4.01 4.36 6. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 5 0 1 0 1 5 7 4.21 715/1535 4.21 4.01 4.08 4.18 4.21 7.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00			Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 5 0 1 1 1 1 5 6 4.00 1196/1674 4.00 4.22 4.27 4.42 4.00 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 5 0 0 1 1 3 4 5 4 3.86 1305/1674 3.86 4.25 4.23 4.31 3.86 3.00 10 dthe exam questions reflect the expected goals 5 0 1 1 1 3 4 5 4 3.86 1305/1674 3.86 4.25 4.23 4.31 3.86 3.00 10 dther evaluations reflect the expected goals 5 0 1 1 1 3 4 5 3.79 162/1423 3.79 4.37 4.27 4.34 3.79 4.00 dthere evaluations reflect the expected goals 5 0 1 0 1 1 3 9 4.36 462/1585 4.36 3.79 3.96 3.96 4.01 4.36 6. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 5 0 1 0 1 5 7 4.21 715/1535 4.21 4.01 4.08 4.18 4.21 7.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00			Genera	 1															
2 Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 5 0 0 1 4 5 4 3.86 1305/1674 3.86 4.25 4.23 4.31 3.86 3.01 the exam questions reflect the expected goals 5 0 1 1 3 4 5 3.79 1162/1423 3.79 4.37 4.27 4.34 3.86 3.10 the exam questions reflect the expected goals 5 0 1 1 1 1 1 6 4 3.85 1260/1609 3.85 4.13 4.22 4.30 3.85 5.01 dassigned readings contribute to what you learned 5 0 1 0 1 3 9 4.36 462/1585 4.36 3.96 3.96 4.01 4.36 6.01 written assignments contribute to what you learned 5 0 1 0 1 5 7 4.21 715/1535 4.21 4.01 4.08 4.18 4.21 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 5 0 0 1 0 1 3 1 9 4.29 832/1651 4.29 4.33 4.18 4.23 4.29 8.10 was the grading system clearly explained 5 0 0 0 1 3 1 4 7.9 915/1673 4.79 4.66 4.69 4.67 4.79 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 1 0 0 0 3 5 2 3.90 1124/1656 3.90 4.02 4.07 4.19 3.90 May learned 5 0 0 0 0 3 8 4.73 560/1586 4.73 4.53 4.43 4.46 4.73 4.84 4.85 4.73 4.84 4.85 4.73 4.84 4.85 4.73 4.85 4.85 4.85 4.85 4.85 4.85 4.85 4.85	1 Did vo	u gain ne			m this course	5	0	1	1	1	5	6	4 00	1196/1674	4 00	4 22	4 27	4 42	4 00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 5 0 1 1 1 3 4 5 3.79 1162/1423 3.79 4.27 4.34 3.79 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5 1 1 1 1 6 4 3.85 1260/1609 3.85 4.13 4.22 4.30 3.85 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 5 0 1 0 1 3 9 4.36 462/1585 4.36 3.96 3.96 4.01 4.36 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 5 0 1 0 1 3 1 9 4.29 832/1651 4.29 4.33 4.18 4.23 4.29 8. How many times was class cancelled 5 0 0 0 0 3 3 11 4.79 915/1673 4.79 4.66 4.69 4.67 4.79 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 1 0 0 0 0 3 5 2 3.90 1124/1656 3.90 4.02 4.07 4.19 3.90    Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 8 0 0 0 0 0 3 8 8 4.73 560/1586 4.73 4.53 4.43 4.46 4.73 3.88 lecture material presented and explained clearly 8 0 0 0 0 1 1 9 4.73 981/1585 4.21 4.73 4.68 4.69 4.76 4.73 3. Was lectures contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 0 1 4 6 4.45 755/1575 4.45 4.38 4.27 4.35 4.45 4.55 Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 0 1 4 6 4.45 755/1575 4.45 4.38 4.27 4.35 4.45 4.55 Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 8 4 0 0 0 1 4 6 4.45 755/1575 4.45 4.38 4.27 4.35 4.45 4.56 4.59 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5							-	0	1	4	5			,					
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5							0	1	1	3	4	_		,					
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 5 0 1 0 1 3 9 4.36 462/1585 4.36 3.96 3.96 4.01 4.36 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 5 0 1 0 1 5 7 4.21 715/1535 4.21 4.01 4.08 4.18 4.21 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 5 0 1 0 1 3 1 9 4.29 832/1651 4.29 4.33 4.18 4.23 4.29 8. How many times was class cancelled 5 0 0 0 0 3 11 4.79 915/1673 4.79 4.66 4.69 4.67 4.79 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 1 0 0 0 3 5 2 3.90 1124/1656 3.90 4.02 4.07 4.19 3.90							1	1	1			4		- ,					
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 5 0 1 0 1 5 7 4.21 715/1535 4.21 4.01 4.08 4.18 4.21 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 5 0 0 0 1 3 1 9 4.29 832/1651 4.29 4.33 4.18 4.23 4.29 8. How many times was class cancelled 5 0 0 0 0 3 11 4.79 915/1673 4.79 4.66 4.69 4.67 4.79 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 1 0 0 0 3 5 2 3.90 1124/1656 3.90 4.02 4.07 4.19 3.90 Electure  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 8 0 0 0 0 0 3 8 4.73 560/1586 4.73 4.53 4.43 4.46 4.73 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 8 0 0 0 0 1 1 9 4.73 981/1585 4.73 4.68 4.69 4.76 4.73 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 8 0 0 0 3 4 4 4.09 1084/1582 4.09 4.24 4.26 4.31 4.09 4.01 did he lectures contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 1 4 6 4.45 755/1575 4.45 4.38 4.27 4.35 4.55 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 8 4 0 1 2 1 3 3.86 831/1380 3.86 3.77 3.94 4.04 3.86 Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 0 0 1 4 0 3.80 986/1520 3.80 3.80 4.01 4.18 3.80 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 14 0 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 563/1511 4.60 4.12 4.27 4.45 4.60 4.00 4.00 5.00 6.00 6.00 6.00 6.00 6.00 6.00 6							_		0			_							
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 5 0 0 1 3 1 9 4.29 832/1651 4.29 4.33 4.18 4.23 4.29 8. How many times was class cancelled 5 0 0 0 0 0 3 11 4.79 915/1673 4.79 4.66 4.69 4.67 4.79 915/1673 4.79 4.66 4.69 4.67 4.79 915/1673 4.79 4.66 4.69 4.67 4.79 915/1673 4.79 4.66 4.69 4.67 4.79 915/1673 4.79 4.66 4.69 4.67 4.79 915/1673 4.79 4.66 4.69 4.67 4.79 915/1673 4.79 4.66 4.69 4.67 4.79 915/1673 4.79 4.66 4.69 4.67 4.79 915/1673 4.79 4.66 4.69 4.67 4.79 915/1673 4.79 4.66 4.69 4.67 4.79 915/1673 4.79 915/1673 4.79 4.66 4.69 4.67 4.79 915/1673 4.79 4.66 4.69 4.67 4.79 915/1673 4.79 4.66 4.69 4.67 4.79 915/1673 4.79 4.66 4.69 4.69 4.69 4.69 4.69 4.69 4.6							0	_	0					. ,					
8. How many times was class cancelled 5 0 0 0 0 3 11 4.79 915/1673 4.79 4.66 4.69 4.67 4.79 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 1 0 0 0 3 5 2 3.90 1124/1656 3.90 4.02 4.07 4.19 3.90  Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 8 0 0 0 0 0 3 8 4.73 560/1586 4.73 4.53 4.43 4.46 4.73 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 8 0 0 0 1 1 9 4.73 981/1585 4.73 4.68 4.69 4.76 4.73 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 8 0 0 0 3 4 4 4.09 1084/1582 4.09 4.24 4.26 4.31 4.09 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 0 1 4 6 4.45 755/1575 4.45 4.38 4.27 4.35 4.45 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 8 4 0 1 2 1 3 3.86 831/1380 3.86 3.77 3.94 4.04 3.86  Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 0 1 4 0 3.80 986/1520 3.80 3.80 4.01 4.18 3.80 4.01 4.04 3.04 3.00 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4			_		-		0	0	1					- ,					
Lecture   Lect							0	0	0	0	3			,					
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 8 0 0 0 0 3 8 4.73 560/1586 4.73 4.53 4.43 4.46 4.73 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 8 0 0 0 1 1 9 4.73 981/1585 4.73 4.68 4.69 4.76 4.73 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 8 0 0 0 3 4 4 4.09 1084/1582 4.09 4.24 4.26 4.31 4.09 4.04 4.05 4.04 4.05 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 8 4 0 1 2 1 3 3.86 831/1380 3.86 3.77 3.94 4.04 3.86 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 8 4 0 1 2 1 3 3.86 831/1380 3.86 3.77 3.94 4.04 3.86 6. Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 0 0 1 4 0 3.80 986/1520 3.80 3.80 4.01 4.18 3.80 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 14 0 0 0 0 3 2 4.40 759/1515 4.40 4.05 4.24 4.40 4.40 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 14 0 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 563/1511 4.60 4.12 4.27 4.45 4.60 4. Were special techniques successful 14 2 0 1 1 1 0 3.00 ****/ 994 **** 3.64 3.94 4.19 ****  **Frequency Distribution**  **Frequency Distribution**  **Frequency Distribution**  **Credits Earned***  **Cum. GPA***  **Expected Grades**  **Frequency Distribution**  **Frequency Distribution**  **Frequency Distribution**  **General**  **Type**  **Majors**  **One-rand**  **Majors**  **One-rand**  **One		-			ning effectiveness	8	1	0	0	3	5								
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 8 0 0 0 0 3 8 4.73 560/1586 4.73 4.53 4.43 4.46 4.73 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 8 0 0 0 1 1 9 4.73 981/1582 4.09 4.24 4.26 4.31 4.09 4.76 4.73 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 8 0 0 0 0 1 1 9 4.73 981/1582 4.09 4.24 4.26 4.31 4.09 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 0 1 4 6 4.45 755/1575 4.45 4.38 4.27 4.35 4.45 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 8 4 0 1 2 1 3 3.86 831/1380 3.86 3.77 3.94 4.04 3.86    Discussion  Discussion  Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 0 0 1 4 0 3.80 986/1520 3.80 3.80 4.01 4.18 3.80 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 14 0 0 0 0 3 2 4.40 759/1515 4.40 4.05 4.24 4.40 4.40 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 14 0 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 563/1511 4.60 4.12 4.27 4.45 4.60 4. Were special techniques successful  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors O Graduate O Major 6 Reasons Type Majors  Frequency Distribution Distribution Distribution Reasons Type Majors O Graduate O Major 6 Reasons D Graduate O Ma		-			3														
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject			Lecture	е															
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 8 0 0 0 3 4 4 4.09 1084/1582 4.09 4.24 4.26 4.31 4.09 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 1 4 6 4.45 755/1575 4.45 4.38 4.27 4.35 4.45 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 8 4 0 1 2 1 3 3.86 831/1380 3.86 3.77 3.94 4.04 3.86  Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 0 1 4 0 3.80 986/1520 3.80 3.80 4.01 4.18 3.80 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 14 0 0 0 0 3 2 4.40 759/1515 4.40 4.05 4.24 4.40 4.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 14 0 0 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 563/1511 4.60 4.12 4.27 4.45 4.60 4. Were special techniques successful 14 0 0 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 563/1511 4.60 4.12 4.27 4.45 4.60 4. Were special techniques successful 14 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 563/1511 4.60 4.12 4.27 4.45 4.60 4. Were special techniques successful 14 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 563/1511 4.60 4.12 4.27 4.45 4.60 4. Were special techniques successful 14 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 563/1511 4.60 4.12 4.27 4.45 4.60 4.00 4.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.0	1. Were th	he instru	actor's lecture	s well j	prepared	8	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	560/1586	4.73	4.53	4.43	4.46	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 1 4 6 4.45 755/1575 4.45 4.38 4.27 4.35 4.45 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 8 4 0 1 2 1 3 3.86 831/1380 3.86 3.77 3.94 4.04 3.86   Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 0 1 4 0 3.80 986/1520 3.80 3.80 4.01 4.18 3.80 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 14 0 0 0 0 3 2 4.40 759/1515 4.40 4.05 4.24 4.40 4.40 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 14 0 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 563/1511 4.60 4.12 4.27 4.45 4.60 4. Were special techniques successful 14 2 0 1 1 1 0 3.00 ****/ 994 **** 3.64 3.94 4.19 ****  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  OO-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 3 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 6 28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 7 General 2 Under-grad 19 Non-major 13 84-150 4 3.00-2.99 0 C 2 General 2 Under-grad 19 Non-major 13 84-150 4 3.00-3.49 3 D 0 Gradu. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	2. Did the	e instruc	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	8	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	981/1585	4.73	4.68	4.69	4.76	4.73
Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 0 1 4 0 3.80 986/1520 3.80 3.80 4.01 4.18 3.80  2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 14 0 0 0 0 1 4 0 3.80 986/1520 3.80 3.80 4.01 4.18 3.80  3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 14 0 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 563/1511 4.60 4.12 4.27 4.45 4.60  4. Were special techniques successful 14 2 0 1 1 1 0 3.00 ****/994 **** 3.64 3.94 4.19 ****  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors	3. Was le	cture mat	erial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	8	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	1084/1582	4.09	4.24	4.26	4.31	4.09
Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 0 1 4 0 3.80 986/1520 3.80 3.80 4.01 4.18 3.80  2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 14 0 0 0 0 3 2 4.40 759/1515 4.40 4.05 4.24 4.40 4.40  3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 14 0 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 563/1511 4.60 4.12 4.27 4.45 4.60  4. Were special techniques successful 14 2 0 1 1 1 0 3.00 ****/ 994 **** 3.64 3.94 4.19 ****  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 3 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 6 28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 7 56-83 3 2.00-2.99 0 C 2 General 2 Under-grad 19 Non-major 13 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 responses to be significant  I 0 Other 11	4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute to	o what	you learned	8	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	755/1575	4.45	4.38	4.27	4.35	4.45
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 0 1 4 0 3.80 986/1520 3.80 3.80 4.01 4.18 3.80 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 14 0 0 0 0 3 2 4.40 759/1515 4.40 4.05 4.24 4.40 4.40 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 14 0 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 563/1511 4.60 4.12 4.27 4.45 4.60 4. Were special techniques successful 14 2 0 1 1 1 0 3.00 ****/994 **** 3.64 3.94 4.19 ****  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 3 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 6 28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 7 56-83 3 2.00-2.99 0 C 2 General 2 Under-grad 19 Non-major 13 84-150 4 3.00-3.49 3 D 0 Graduate 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant I 0 Other 11	5. Did au	diovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	8	4	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	831/1380	3.86	3.77	3.94	4.04	3.86
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 0 1 4 0 3.80 986/1520 3.80 3.80 4.01 4.18 3.80 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 14 0 0 0 0 3 2 4.40 759/1515 4.40 4.05 4.24 4.40 4.40 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 14 0 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 563/1511 4.60 4.12 4.27 4.45 4.60 4. Were special techniques successful 14 2 0 1 1 1 0 3.00 ****/994 **** 3.64 3.94 4.19 ****  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 3 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 6 28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 7 56-83 3 2.00-2.99 0 C 2 General 2 Under-grad 19 Non-major 13 84-150 4 3.00-3.49 3 D 0 Graduate 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant I 0 Other 11																			
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 14 0 0 0 0 3 2 4.40 759/1515 4.40 4.05 4.24 4.40 4.40 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 14 0 0 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 563/1511 4.60 4.12 4.27 4.45 4.60 4. Were special techniques successful 14 2 0 1 1 1 0 3.00 ****/ 994 **** 3.64 3.94 4.19 ****  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors			Discus	sion															
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 14 0 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 563/1511 4.60 4.12 4.27 4.45 4.60 4. Were special techniques successful 14 2 0 1 1 1 0 3.00 ****/ 994 **** 3.64 3.94 4.19 ****  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors	1. Did cla	ass discu	assions contrib	ute to	what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	986/1520	3.80	3.80	4.01	4.18	3.80
4. Were special techniques successful  14 2 0 1 1 1 0 3.00 ****/ 994 **** 3.64 3.94 4.19 ****  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 3 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 6 28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 7 56-83 3 2.00-2.99 0 C 2 General 2 Under-grad 19 Non-major 13 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 responses to be significant  I 0 Other 11	2. Were a	.11 studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	14	0	-	-		3	2	4.40	759/1515	4.40	4.05	4.24	4.40	4.40
Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 3 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 6 28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 7 56-83 3 2.00-2.99 0 C 2 General 2 Under-grad 19 Non-major 13 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 responses to be significant  I 0 Other 11	3. Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage :	fair and	d open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	563/1511	4.60	4.12	4.27	4.45	4.60
Credits Earned         Cum. GPA         Expected Grades         Reasons         Type         Majors           00-27         0         0.00-0.99         0         A         3         Required for Majors         0         Graduate         0         Major         6           28-55         1         1.00-1.99         0         B         7         7         Under-grad         19         Non-major         13           56-83         3         2.00-2.99         0         C         2         General         2         Under-grad         19         Non-major         13           84-150         4         3.00-3.49         3         D         0         #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant           P         0         0         Other         11	4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		14	2	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 994	****	3.64	3.94	4.19	****
Credits Earned         Cum. GPA         Expected Grades         Reasons         Type         Majors           00-27         0         0.00-0.99         0         A         3         Required for Majors         0         Graduate         0         Major         6           28-55         1         1.00-1.99         0         B         7         7         Under-grad         19         Non-major         13           56-83         3         2.00-2.99         0         C         2         General         2         Under-grad         19         Non-major         13           84-150         4         3.00-3.49         3         D         0         #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant           P         0         0         Other         11																			
00-27					Frequ	ıency	7 Dist	trib	utio	n									
28-55	Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	;
28-55	00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Red	auir	ed f	or Ma	ior	 S	0	Graduat	 e	0	Maio	 or	6
56-83 3 2.00-2.99 0 C 2 General 2 Under-grad 19 Non-major 13 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 responses to be significant I 0 Other 11		1					110	-1			- ,	_	-	2_ 4444	-	-	- 100 ) 0	· <del>-</del>	ŭ
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 responses to be significant I 0 Other 11		3		-			Ger	nera	1				2	Under-a	rad 1	.9	Non-	-maior	13
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant 1 0 Other 11		-														-		5	
P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 11		=					Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enou	ıh
I 0 Other 11					P 0														•
					I O		Otl	her				1	.1	_		5			
: U					? 0														

Course-Section: ECON 439 0101 Title

ENVIRONMENTAL ECONOMIC

Instructor: MCCONNELL, VIRG

Enrollment: 33 Questionnaires: 27 Fall 2005

Page 576 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

					Fre	eque	ncie	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	Mean
	General															
1. Did you gain new	v insights, skills f	rom this course	1	0	0	2	2	5	17	4.42	735/1674	4.42	4.22	4.27	4.42	4.42
2. Did the instruct	or make clear the	expected goals	1	0	1	1	2	5	17	4.38	763/1674	4.38	4.25	4.23	4.31	4.38
3. Did the exam que	estions reflect the	expected goals	1	0	0	2	1	5	18	4.50	575/1423	4.50	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.50
4. Did other evalua	ations reflect the e	expected goals	1	2	0	1	3	5	15	4.42	629/1609	4.42	4.13	4.22	4.30	4.42
5. Did assigned rea	adings contribute to	o what you learned	2	0	2	2	2	5	14	4.08	715/1585	4.08	3.96	3.96	4.01	4.08
6. Did written assi	gnments contribute	to what you learned	2	0	3	0	4	5	13	4.00	870/1535	4.00	4.01	4.08	4.18	4.00
7. Was the grading	system clearly exp	lained	3	0	0	0	3	3	18	4.63	372/1651	4.63	4.33	4.18	4.23	4.63
8. How many times w	was class cancelled		3	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.66	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you gr	rade the overall tea	aching effectiveness	6	2	0	0	2	11	6	4.21	770/1656	4.21	4.02	4.07	4.19	4.21
	Lecture															
1. Were the instruc	ctor's lectures well	l prepared	1	0	1	1	0	3	21	4.62	738/1586	4.62	4.53	4.43	4.46	4.62
2. Did the instruct	or seem interested	in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	24	4.92	453/1585	4.92	4.68	4.69	4.76	4.92
3. Was lecture mate	erial presented and	explained clearly	1	0	2	0	2	7	15	4.27	924/1582	4.27	4.24	4.26	4.31	4.27
4. Did the lectures	s contribute to what	t you learned	1	0	0	2	2	3	19	4.50	692/1575	4.50	4.38	4.27	4.35	4.50
5. Did audiovisual	techniques enhance	your understanding	4	12	1	2	2	2	4	3.55	1020/1380	3.55	3.77	3.94	4.04	3.55
	Discussion															
1. Did class discus	ssions contribute to	o what you learned	19	0	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	810/1520	4.00	3.80	4.01	4.18	4.00
2. Were all student	s actively encourag	ged to participate	20	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	733/1515	4.43	4.05	4.24	4.40	4.43
3. Did the instruct	or encourage fair a	and open discussion	19	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	1050/1511	4.00	4.12	4.27	4.45	4.00
4. Were special ted	chniques successful		19	2	0	1	3	0	2	3.50	****/ 994	****	3.64	3.94	4.19	****
	Seminar															
1. Were assigned to	ppics relevant to the	ne announced theme	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.88	4.41	4.42	****
2. Was the instruct	or available for in	ndividual attention	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.88	4.48	4.65	****
3. Did research pro	ojects contribute to	o what you learned	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.71	4.31	4.60	****
4. Did presentation	ns contribute to wha	at you learned	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.75	4.39	4.57	****
5. Were criteria fo	or grading made clea	ar	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.88	4.14	4.46	****
		Frequ	ency	Dist	crib	utio	n									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	g			TΥ	ne			Maiors	3

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	14
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C	6	General	3	Under-grad	26	Non-major	13
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there a	are not enougl	n
				P	0			responses to	be sign	nificant	
				I	0	Other	16	-	_		
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 441 0101 University of Maryland Page 577 Title Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006 AMERICAN ECONOMIC HIST

Instructor: LORD, WILLIAM

Enrollment: 35 Questionnaires: 21

Fall 2005 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	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	0	0	4	10	7	4.14	1075/1674	4.14	4.22	4.27	4.42	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	7	5	8		1111/1674		4.25	4.23	4.31	4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	12	4.43	672/1423	4.43	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	0	6	4	5	3.75	1320/1609	3.75	4.13	4.22	4.30	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	5	3	11	4.15	652/1585	4.15	3.96	3.96	4.01	4.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	7	6	6	3.80	1110/1535	3.80	4.01	4.08	4.18	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	4	13	4.33	768/1651	4.33	4.33	4.18	4.23	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	1015/1673	4.71	4.66	4.69	4.67	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	3	10	3	4.00	955/1656	4.00	4.02	4.07	4.19	4.00
Lecture	_	_			_	_			0=0/4=06					
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	Ţ		13		858/1586					
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2		11		1275/1585		4.68	4.69	4.76	4.45
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0			7			777/1582			4.26	4.31	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	Ţ	0	0	1	2			4.45	,		4.38	4.27	4.35	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	392/1380	4.38	3.77	3.94	4.04	4.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	2	1	2	3	3.44	1200/1520	3.44	3.80	4.01	4.18	3.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	3	1	1			1303/1515			4.24	4.40	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	1050/1511	4.00	4.12	4.27	4.45	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	13	5	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 994	****	3.64	3.94	4.19	****
Frequ	lency	Dist	crib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	ason	ıs			Туј	pe			Majors	

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	12						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	6	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	21	Non-major	13
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	19	-			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: ECON 443 0101 University of Maryland Title HIST OF ECON THOUGHT I Baltimore County

THOUGHT I Baltimore County
AE Fall 2005

Ρ

I

?

0

0

Instructor: BRADLEY, MICHAE

Enrollment: 25
Questionnaires: 11

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 578 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

								_	ncies				ructor	Course	_	-	Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did you	gain new :		_	m this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	817/1674	4.36	4.22	4.27	4.42	4.36
				pected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	906/1674	4.27	4.25	4.23	4.31	4.27
				xpected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	528/1423	4.55	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.55
4. Did other	r evaluat:	ions reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	701/1609	4.36	4.13	4.22	4.30	4.36
5. Did assig	gned read:	ings contribu	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	0	7	4.27	539/1585	4.27	3.96	3.96	4.01	4.27
6. Did writt	ten assig	nments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	7	4.36	548/1535	4.36	4.01	4.08	4.18	4.36
7. Was the	grading sy	ystem clearly	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	471/1651	4.55	4.33	4.18	4.23	4.55
8. How many	times was	s class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	1103/1673	4.64	4.66	4.69	4.67	4.64
9. How would	d you grad	de the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	451/1656	4.45	4.02	4.07	4.19	4.45
		Lecture	_															
		or's lectures			1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	753/1586		4.53	4.43	4.46	4.60
				n the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	10		1/1585		4.68	4.69	4.76	5.00
				xplained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	5	4	4.20		4.20	4.24	4.26	4.31	4.20
		contribute to		-	1	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	579/1575	4.60	4.38	4.27		4.60
5. Did audio	ovisual te	echniques enl	nance y	our understanding	1	3	0	0	4	1	2	3.71	930/1380	3.71	3.77	3.94	4.04	3.71
1 541 -1		Discus			4	0	1	_	1	1	_	2 14	1201/1500	2 14	2 00	4 01	4 10	2 14
				what you learned	4	0	1	0	1	0		3.14 4.14	1321/1520 971/1515		3.80 4.05	4.01	4.18	3.14
				d to participate d open discussion	4	0	0	1	1	1	5 4	4.14	971/1515	4.14	4.12	4.24	4.40 4.45	4.14 4.14
		r encourage n niques succes		a open aiscussion	4	6	0	U T	1	U T	0		****/ 994		3.64	3.94	4.45	4.14 ****
4. Were spec	Ciai tecin	iiques succes	SSLUI		4	O	U	U	1	U	U	3.00	/ 994		3.04	3.94	4.19	
				Frequ	ency	Dist	cribu	ution	ı									
Credits Earr	ned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	<b>;</b>
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Rec	 quire	ed fo	or Ma	 ajor	 s	 1	Graduat	 e	0	 Majo	 r	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 6			_			-						3 -		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 3		Ger	nera!	1				2	Under-g	rad 1	1	Non-	major	4
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	2	D 0														
Grad.	0 3.50-4.00 4 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means th				here a	re not	enoug	rh										

Other

8

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Fall 2005

Page 579

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Ctudont	Conrac	Trraliiation	Ouestionnaire
Student	COULSE	Evaluation	Ouescrommarre

Course-Section: ECON 451 0101

39

LABOR ECONOMICS

GOLDFARB, MARSH

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

84-150

Grad.

16

4

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00 6

9

D

F

Ρ

I

0

1

0

0

Questionnaires: 35

							_					<b>-</b> .		~				a .
		Ouestion	_		NTD	3.7.7	Fre 1	eque: 2	ncie 3	s 4	_		ructor		Dept		Level	Sect
		Question	.s		NK	NA					5	Mean	Rank	mean	Mean	mean	Mean	mean
		Genera	.1															
1. Did you	ı gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	0	0	0	0	3	8	24	4.60	485/1674	4.60	4.22	4.27	4.42	4.60
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	26	4.69	352/1674	4.69	4.25	4.23	4.31	4.69
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflec	t the e	expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	8	24	4.60	459/1423	4.60	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.60
4. Did oth	ner evalu	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	12	0	2	3	5	13	4.26	839/1609	4.26	4.13	4.22	4.30	4.26
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	4	1	0	3	14	13	4.23	584/1585	4.23	3.96	3.96	4.01	4.23
6. Did wri	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	13	0	1	4	7	10	4.18	747/1535	4.18	4.01	4.08	4.18	4.18
7. Was the	grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	1	14	20	4.54	471/1651	4.54	4.33	4.18	4.23	4.54
8. How man	ny times	was class cand	elled		0	0	0	0	0	30	5	4.14	1497/1673	4.14	4.66	4.69	4.67	4.14
9. How wou	ıld you g	grade the overa	ll tead	hing effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	10	17	4.63	292/1656	4.63	4.02	4.07	4.19	4.63
11		Lectur			_	0	•	0	0	2	0.0	4 01	014/1506	4 01	4 50	4 42	4 46	4 01
		ctor's lecture			3	0	0	0	0	3	29	4.91	214/1586		4.53	4.43	4.46	4.91
		ctor seem inter		-	3	0	0	0	1	4	27	4.81	786/1585	4.81	4.68	4.69	4.76	4.81
		_		explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	4	26	4.81	246/1582		4.24	4.26	4.31	4.81
		es contribute t		-	4	0	0	0	1	6	24	4.74	375/1575		4.38	4.27	4.35	4.74
5. Did aud	liovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	6	17	3	1	2	0	6	3.42	1088/1380	3.42	3.77	3.94	4.04	3.42
		Discus	gion															
1. Did cla	ass discu			what you learned	19	0	2	0	3	3	8	3.94	889/1520	3.94	3.80	4.01	4.18	3.94
				ed to participate	19	0	0	1	2	3	10	4.38	788/1515		4.05	4.24	4.40	4.38
				d open discussion	19	0	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	642/1511	4.50	4.12	4.27	4.45	4.50
		chniques succe		a open arboabbien	19	10	1	0	1	2	2		****/ 994		3.64	3.94	4.19	****
ar		1000 0000											,					
		Self	Paced															
5. Were th	nere enou	igh proctors fo	r all t	he students	34	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	***	4.34	5.00	****
				Frequ	ency	, Dist	-rih	ıtioı	n									
				11040	circy	DID		2010										
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 11			quire		 or M	a ion		2	Graduat		4	Majo		11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 14		1000	1411	-u 1	J1 11	۱۰۰ ر ما		_	Graduat	_	1	ı ıa je	<i>,</i> _	11
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	7	C 6		Ger	nera:	1				6	Under-q	rad 3	31	Non-	major	24
30-03		2.00-2.99	,	C 0		Gei	icia.	L				U	onder -g.	Lau 3	, _	14011-	ilia JUI	24

Electives

Other

0

24

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

#### Course-Section: ECON 453 0101 University of Maryland Baltimore County HOUSEHOLD ECONOMICS

Title Instructor: LORD, WILLIAM Fall 2005

Enrollment: 47

Questionnaires: 26

Page 580 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	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	2	0	0	2	7	10	5	3.75	1407/1674	3.75	4.22	4.27	4.42	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	1	10	9	3	3.50	1499/1674	3.50	4.25	4.23	4.31	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	3	5	8	8	3.88	1121/1423	3.88	4.37	4.27	4.34	3.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	14	1	1	2	4	2	3.50	1452/1609	3.50	4.13	4.22	4.30	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	6	5	6	4	3.38	1306/1585	3.38	3.96	3.96	4.01	3.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	19	3	0	1	1	0	2.00	****/1535	****	4.01	4.08	4.18	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	3	2	6	13	4.21	924/1651	4.21	4.33	4.18	4.23	4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	10	14	4.58	1148/1673	4.58	4.66	4.69	4.67	4.58
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	2	6	5	5	3.72	1260/1656	3.72	4.02	4.07	4.19	3.72
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	0	3	5	13	4.32	1094/1586	4.32	4.53	4.43	4.46	4.32
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	6	18	4.75	917/1585	4.75	4.68	4.69	4.76	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	3	3	10	5	3.57	1385/1582	3.57	4.24	4.26	4.31	3.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	1	8	5	7	3.61	1350/1575	3.61	4.38	4.27	4.35	3.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	2	2	2	4	7	3.71	938/1380	3.71	3.77	3.94	4.04	3.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	2	2	1	3	4	3.42	1215/1520	3.42	3.80	4.01	4.18	3.42
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	384/1515	4.75	4.05	4.24	4.40	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	642/1511	4.50	4.12	4.27	4.45	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	14	8	2	0	1	1	0		****/ 994	****	3.64	3.94	4.19	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	26	Non-major	17
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 463 0101 University of Maryland Title THEORY OF PUBLIC FINAN

Baltimore County

Instructor: BRENNAN, TIMOTH Enrollment: 24

Questionnaires: 18

JAN 21, 2006 Fall 2005 Job IRBR3029

Page 581

Student	Course	Evaluatio	on Questio	nnaire
---------	--------	-----------	------------	--------

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	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	0	2	6	4	6	3.78	1398/1674	3.78	4.22	4.27	4.42	3.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	5	3	7		1358/1674		4.25	4.23	4.31	3.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	7	6	3.94	1070/1423	3.94	4.37	4.27	4.34	3.94
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	1	2	6	4	3.79	1299/1609	3.79	4.13	4.22	4.30	3.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	6	2	6		1211/1585		3.96	3.96	4.01	3.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	6	1	7	3.81	1101/1535	3.81	4.01	4.08	4.18	3.81
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	3	5	7	3.94	1175/1651	3.94	4.33	4.18	4.23	3.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	868/1673	4.81	4.66	4.69	4.67	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	1	4	5	3	3.57	1344/1656	3.57	4.02	4.07	4.19	3.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	2	6	7	4 00	1300/1586	4.00	4.53	4.43	4.46	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4	12		1094/1585		4.53	4.43	4.46	4.65
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	Τ.	-4	12		1333/1582		4.00	4.09	4.76	3.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	5	5	5		1225/1575		4.24	4.27	4.35	3.88
	2	0	2	1	2	0	5 1		-,				4.35	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	2	Τ	2	5	Τ	3.18	1184/1380	3.18	3.77	3.94	4.04	3.18
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	4	4	5	3.86	955/1520	3.86	3.80	4.01	4.18	3.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	6	2	6	4.00	1024/1515	4.00	4.05	4.24	4.40	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	4	2	8	4.29	865/1511	4.29	4.12	4.27	4.45	4.29
4. Were special techniques successful	5	7	0	2	1	1	2	3.50	732/ 994	3.50	3.64	3.94	4.19	3.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.88	4.41	4.42	***
Frequ	onar	Diat	-rih	ı+i oı	2									
rrequ	rency	DISI	LID	ucloi	.1									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	А	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	18	Non-major	16
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	15	_			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: ECON 467 0101 University of Maryland HEALTH ECONOMICS Baltimore County

Ouestionnaires: 1

Page 582 Title JAN 21, 2006 Instructor: COOPER, PHILIP Fall 2005 Job IRBR3029 Enrollment: 44

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	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	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1196/1674	4.00	4.22	4.27	4.42	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1146/1674	4.00	4.25	4.23	4.31	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.34	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	769/1585	4.00	3.96	3.96	4.01	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1651	5.00	4.33	4.18	4.23	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.66	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	955/1656	4.00	4.02	4.07	4.19	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1300/1586	4.00	4.53	4.43	4.46	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1129/1582	4.00	4.24	4.26	4.31	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.38	4.27	4.35	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Course-Section: ECON 474 0101 University of Maryland Title CASES IN CORPORATE FIN Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006 Fall 2005 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: LINGELBACH, DAV

Enrollment: 26 Questionnaires: 19

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 583

	Frequencies								tructor	Course	Dept	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	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	265/1674	4.79	4.22	4.27	4.42	4.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	3	14	4.67	379/1674	4.67	4.25	4.23	4.31	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.34	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	15	4.58	408/1609	4.58	4.13	4.22	4.30	4.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1585	5.00	3.96	3.96	4.01	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	2	2	1	2	8	3.80	1110/1535	3.80	4.01	4.08	4.18	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	2	0	3	2	9	4.00	1097/1651	4.00	4.33	4.18	4.23	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.66	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	178/1656	4.77	4.02	4.07	4.19	4.77
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.53	4.43	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0		18	4.95	91/1582		4.24	4.26	4.31	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	103/1575	4.95	4.38	4.27	4.35	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	107/1380	4.82	3.77	3.94	4.04	4.82
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	295/1520	4.67	3.80	4.01	4.18	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83		4.83	4.05	4.24	4.40	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0		16		266/1511	4.89	4.12	4.27	4.45	4.89
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	2			4.75	115/ 994			3.94		
Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	asons	S			Туј	pe			Majors	5
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 9 Required for									Graduat	 e	1	 Majo	 or	2

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	5	Under-grad	18	Non-major	17
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13	_			
				2	1						

Course-Section: ECON 477 0101 University of Maryland
Title DERIVATIVE SECURITIES Baltimore County

DERIVATIVE SECURITIES Baltimore County tor: GETTER, DARYL Fall 2005

Instructor: GETTER,
Enrollment: 47

Questionnaires: 27

84-150

Grad.

15

0

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

6

7

D

F

Р

I

?

0

0

0

0

1

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

rersity of Maryland Page 584
Saltimore County JAN 21, 2006
Fall 2005 Job IRBR3029

					Fre	equei	ncies	<b>;</b>		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Question	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did	vou gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	om this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	21	4.74	309/1674	4.74	4.22	4.27	4.42	4.74
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	4	23	4.85	176/1674	4.85	4.25	4.23	4.31	4.85
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	0	0	5	22	4.81	195/1423	4.81	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.81
4. Did	other eval	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	1	0	2	6	4	14	4.15	974/1609	4.15	4.13	4.22	4.30	4.15
5. Did	assigned re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	12	1	2	0	3	9	4.13	672/1585	4.13	3.96	3.96	4.01	4.13
6. Did	written as:	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	0	10	0	2	4	2	9	4.06	849/1535	4.06	4.01	4.08	4.18	4.06
7. Was	the grading	g system clearly	y expla	ained	0	0	0	0	1	2	24	4.85	145/1651	4.85	4.33	4.18	4.23	4.85
8. How	many times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.66	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How	would you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	8	11	4.50	381/1656	4.50	4.02	4.07	4.19	4.50
		Lectur	e															
1. Were	e the instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	22	4.81	389/1586	4.81	4.53	4.43	4.46	4.81
		ctor seem inter			1	0	0	0	0	1	25	4.96	227/1585	4.96	4.68	4.69	4.76	4.96
3. Was	lecture mat	terial presente	d and	explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	21	4.77	299/1582	4.77	4.24	4.26	4.31	4.77
4. Did	the lecture	es contribute to	o what	you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	25	4.96	69/1575	4.96	4.38	4.27	4.35	4.96
5. Did	audiovisua	l techniques en	nance y	our understanding	1	14	1	0	0	3	8	4.42	371/1380	4.42	3.77	3.94	4.04	4.42
		Discus	sion															
1. Did	class disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	17	0	2	0	3	1	4	3.50	1169/1520	3.50	3.80	4.01	4.18	3.50
				ed to participate	17	0	0	1	2	1	6	4.20	944/1515	4.20	4.05	4.24	4.40	4.20
3. Did	the instru	ctor encourage :	fair a	nd open discussion	17	0	1	0	2	1	6	4.10	1018/1511	4.10	4.12	4.27	4.45	4.10
4. Were	e special te	echniques succe	ssful	_	18	7	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 994	****	3.64	3.94	4.19	****
		Labora	torv															
2. Were	e you provi			ground information	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	4.21	****
				Frequ	ency	7 Dist	rib	ution	ı									
				_	_													
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad				Expected Grades				Rea	asons	;			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 9					Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jor	`s	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 9														
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C 3		Ger	nera:	1				4	Under-g	rad 2	7	Non-	-major	23

Electives

Other

0

18

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Course-Section: ECON 482 0101 University of Maryland Title INTERNATIONAL FINANCE Baltimore County Fall 2005

Instructor: MCINTYRE, KEVIN

Enrollment: 36 Questionnaires: 33

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 585

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncie	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	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	1	1	7	23	4.52	594/1674	4.52	4.22	4.27	4.42	4.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	8	21	4.53	542/1674	4.53	4.25	4.23	4.31	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	4	25	4.61	459/1423	4.61	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	1	1	4	14	4.55	432/1609	4.55	4.13	4.22	4.30	4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	3	1	6	1	19	4.07	728/1585	4.07	3.96	3.96	4.01	4.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	1	3	4	17	4.48	400/1535	4.48	4.01	4.08	4.18	4.48
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	5	26	4.73	265/1651	4.73	4.33	4.18	4.23	4.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	23		1040/1673		4.66	4.69	4.67	4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	2	10	15	4.48	409/1656	4.48	4.02	4.07	4.19	4.48
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	31	4.97	86/1586	4.97	4.53	4.43	4.46	4.97
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	31	4.97	227/1585	4.97	4.68	4.69	4.76	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	30	4.94	106/1582	4.94	4.24	4.26	4.31	4.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	31	4.97	69/1575	4.97	4.38	4.27	4.35	4.97
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	18	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	259/1380	4.57	3.77	3.94	4.04	4.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	598/1520	4.31	3.80	4.01	4.18	4.31
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	277/1515	4.85	4.05	4.24	4.40	4.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	618/1511	4.54	4.12	4.27	4.45	4.54
4. Were special techniques successful	20	11	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 994	****	3.64	3.94	4.19	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	8	General	0	Under-grad	33	Non-major	30
84-150	18	3.00-3.49	13	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	27	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 490 0101 University of Maryland Title ANALYTIC METHODS IN EC

Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 586

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: THOMAS, MARK S Enrollment: 34 Questionnaires: 18 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

					Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 l															
1. Did you	u gain ne	w insights,ski	lls from	m this course	1	0	1	1	3	6	6	3.88	1334/167	1 3.97	4.22	4.27	4.42	3.88
2. Did the	e instruc	tor make clear	the exp	pected goals	1	0	0	1	4	4	8	4.12	1068/167	4.24	4.25	4.23	4.31	4.12
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflect	the ex	kpected goals	1	0	1	0	4	1	11	4.24	861/1423	3 4.43	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.24
4. Did oth	her evalu	ations reflect	the exp	pected goals	1	3	1	1	5	2	5	3.64	1388/1609	3.74	4.13	4.22	4.30	3.64
5. Did ass	signed re	adings contribu	ate to v	what you learned	2	7	0	2	3	2	2	3.44	1267/158	3.22	3.96	3.96	4.01	3.44
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute to	what you learned	2	1	2	1	5	4	3	3.33	1355/153	3.55	4.01	4.08	4.18	3.33
7. Was the	e grading	system clearly	y expla:	ined	2	0	0	1	6	3	6	3.88	1246/1653	4.20	4.33	4.18	4.23	3.88
8. How man	ny times	was class cance	elled		2	1	0	0	0	11	4	4.27	1412/1673	3 4.26	4.66	4.69	4.67	4.27
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	2	1	1	0	2	10	2	3.80	1200/1656	3.90	4.02	4.07	4.19	3.80
		Lecture	e															
1. Were th	he instru	ctor's lectures	s well p	prepared	1	0	0	1	3	3	10	4.29	1112/1586	5 4.48	4.53	4.43	4.46	4.29
2. Did the	e instruc	tor seem intere	ested in	n the subject	1	0	1	0	0	4	12	4.53	1208/1589	4.49	4.68	4.69	4.76	4.53
3. Was led	cture mat	erial presented	d and ex	xplained clearly	2	0	0	1	3	3	9	4.25	935/1582	2 4.29	4.24	4.26	4.31	4.25
4. Did the	e lecture	s contribute to	what	you learned	1	0	1	0	0	8	8	4.29	923/157	4.42	4.38	4.27	4.35	4.29
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques enl	nance yo	our understanding	1	3	1	1	3	2	7	3.93	770/1380	4.07	3.77	3.94	4.04	3.93
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu			what you learned	11	0	1	1	0	1	4	3.86	955/1520	3.05	3.80	4.01	4.18	3.86
				d to participate	11	0	1	1	0	2	3	3.71	1233/151		4.05	4.24	4.40	3.71
				d open discussion	11	0	0	1	2	2	2		1243/1513		4.12	4.27	4.45	3.71
		chniques succes			11	4	1	0	1	0	1		****/ 99			3.94	4.19	****
		Field V	Mork															
3. Was the	e instruc	tor available		sultation	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.86	****
		Self I	Paced															
1. Did se	lf-paced			what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.09	5.00	****
				Frequ	encv	Dist	trib	ıtior	า									
				_	.01107	220												
Credits Ea	arned 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s 			T <u>y</u>	/pe 			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 7		Red	quire	ed fo	or M	ajor	s	1	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В 5														
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C 3		Ger	nera:	L				1	Under-	grad 1	L8	Non-	-major	15
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	D 0														
Grad.						Ele	ecti	<i>r</i> es				0		Means t			_	Jh
	P 0 responses to be si				oe sign	nifican	ıt											
				I 0		Otl	ner				1	4						
				? 1														

Course-Section: ECON 490 0201 University of Maryland Title ANALYTIC METHODS IN EC

Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 587 JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: THOMAS, MARK S

Enrollment: 32 Ouestionnaires: 19

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 2 2 8 7 4.05 1155/1674 3.97 4.22 4.27 4.42 4.05 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 1 1 7 10 4.37 790/1674 4.24 4.25 4.23 4.31 4.37 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 7 12 4.63 417/1423 4.43 4.37 4.27 4.34 4.63 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 1 2 2 7 6 3.83 1266/1609 3.74 4.13 4.22 4.30 3.83 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 6 5 0 2 2 4 3.00 1440/1585 3.22 3.96 3.96 4.01 3.00 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2 2 1 2 6 6 3.76 1140/1535 3.55 4.01 4.08 4.18 3.76 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 1 0 6 12 4.53 497/1651 4.20 4.33 4.18 4.23 4.53 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 14 5 4.26 1412/1673 4.26 4.66 4.69 4.67 4.26 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 3 8 3 4.00 955/1656 3.90 4.02 4.07 4.19 4.00 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 0 6 12 4.67 663/1586 4.48 4.53 4.43 4.46 4.67 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 1 1 5 11 4.44 1275/1585 4.49 4.68 4.69 4.76 4.44 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 1 2 5 10 4.33 850/1582 4.29 4.24 4.26 4.31 4.33 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 1 6 11 4.56 635/1575 4.42 4.38 4.27 4.35 4.56 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 4 0 0 2 7 5 4.21 522/1380 4.07 3.77 3.94 4.04 4.21 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11 0 1 1 1 2.25 1496/1520 3.05 3.80 4.01 4.18 2.25 2 2 1 3.00 1420/1515 3.36 4.05 4.24 4.40 3.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 12 0 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 12 0 2 0 1 3 1 3.14 1396/1511 3.43 4.12 4.27 4.45 3.14 4. Were special techniques successful 12 5 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 \*\*\*\*/ 994 \*\*\*\* 3.64 3.94 4.19 \*\*\*\* Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 18 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 \*\*\*\*/ 265 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.23 4.53 \*\*\*\* 0 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 18 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 \*\*\*\*/ 278 \*\*\*\* 4.19 4.21 \*\*\*\* 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 18 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 \*\*\*\* / 260 \*\*\*\* 4.46 4.24 \*\*\*\*

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	19	Non-major	15
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	16	-			
				2	Λ						

#### Course-Section: ECON 493 0501 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006 INDIV RESEARCH IN ECON Job IRBR3029

Page 588

Instructor: CARROLL, KATHLE Fall 2005

Enrollment:	1				
Questionnaires:	1	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

84-150

Grad.

1

0

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00 0

1

D

F

Ρ

I

?

0

0

0

1

							Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fr	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.22	4.27	4.42	5.00
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor make clear	the ex	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.25	4.23	4.31	5.00
6. Did wr	ritten ass	signments contr	ibute 1	to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1535	5.00	4.01	4.08	4.18	5.00
8. How ma	any times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.66	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1656	5.00	4.02	4.07	4.19	5.00
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	the instru	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.53	4.43	4.46	5.00
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor seem inter	ested :	in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.76	5.00
3. Was le	ecture mat	terial presente	d and	explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.24	4.26	4.31	5.00
4. Did th	ne lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.38	4.27	4.35	5.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	3.80	4.01	4.18	5.00
2. Were a	all studer	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.05	4.24	4.40	5.00
3. Did th	ne instruc	ctor encourage	fair a	nd open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.12	4.27	4.45	5.00
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 0		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	 3	0	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0			-			-								
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	1	Non-	major	1

Electives

Other

0

1

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Course-Section: ECON 600 0101 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County POLICY CONSQ: ECON ANAL

Instructor: BRENNAN, TIMOTH

Enrollment: 20

Questionnaires: 18

Fall 2005 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 589

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

General  1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How many times was class cancelled 1. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other orally with the same problem of the subject of the				Fr	equei	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 9 7 4.22 991/1674 4.22 4.22 4.27 4.44 4.22 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 1 1 1 8 8 8 4.28 906/1674 4.28 4.25 4.23 4.34 4.28 1.014 the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 1 0 3 7 7 4.06 986/1423 4.06 4.37 4.27 4.28 4.06 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 2 0 1 3 5 7 4.13 1007/1609 4.13 4.13 4.22 4.34 4.13 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 0 2 2 6 7 4.00 769/1585 4.00 3.96 3.96 4.23 4.00 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 2 2 6 7 4.00 849/1535 4.06 4.01 4.08 4.27 4.06 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 1 2 4 11 4.39 700/1651 4.39 4.33 4.18 4.32 4.39 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 16 4.89 742/1673 4.89 4.66 4.69 4.78 4.89 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 0 1 10 4 4.20 794/1656 4.20 4.02 4.07 4.15 4.20 794 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.0	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 9 7 4.22 991/1674 4.22 4.22 4.27 4.44 4.22 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 1 1 1 8 8 8 4.28 906/1674 4.28 4.25 4.23 4.34 4.28 1.014 the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 1 0 3 7 7 4.06 986/1423 4.06 4.37 4.27 4.28 4.06 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 2 0 1 3 5 7 4.13 1007/1609 4.13 4.13 4.22 4.34 4.13 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 0 2 2 6 7 4.00 769/1585 4.00 3.96 3.96 4.23 4.00 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 2 2 6 7 4.00 849/1535 4.06 4.01 4.08 4.27 4.06 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 1 2 4 11 4.39 700/1651 4.39 4.33 4.18 4.32 4.39 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 16 4.89 742/1673 4.89 4.66 4.69 4.78 4.89 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 0 1 10 4 4.20 794/1656 4.20 4.02 4.07 4.15 4.20 794 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.0	General														,
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 1 1 1 8 8 8 4.28 906/1674 4.28 4.25 4.23 4.34 4.28 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 1 0 3 7 7 4.06 986/1423 4.06 4.37 4.27 4.28 4.05 4.24 4.28 4.06 4.07 4.28 4.06 4.07 4.28 4.06 4.07 4.28 4.06 4.07 4.28 4.06 4.07 4.28 4.06 4.07 4.28 4.06 4.07 4.28 4.06 4.07 4.28 4.06 4.07 4.28 4.06 4.07 4.28 4.06 4.07 4.28 4.08 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 0 4 6 7 4.00 769/1585 4.00 3.96 3.96 4.23 4.00 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 2 2 6 7 4.06 849/1535 4.06 4.01 4.08 4.27 4.06 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 1 2 4 11 4.39 700/1651 4.39 4.33 4.18 4.32 4.39 9. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 2 16 4.89 742/1673 4.89 4.66 4.69 4.78 4.89 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 0 1 10 4 4.20 794/1656 4.20 4.02 4.07 4.15 4.20 4.02 4.07 4.15 4.20 4.02 4.07 4.15 4.20 4.02 4.07 4.15 4.20 4.02 4.07 4.15 4.20 4.02 4.07 4.15 4.20 4.02 4.02 4.07 4.15 4.20 4.02 4.02 4.07 4.15 4.20 4.02 4.02 4.07 4.15 4.20 4.02 4.02 4.02 4.07 4.15 4.20 4.02 4.02 4.02 4.02 4.07 4.15 4.20 4.02 4.02 4.02 4.02 4.07 4.15 4.20 4.02 4.02 4.02 4.02 4.07 4.15 4.20 4.02 4.02 4.02 4.02 4.02 4.02 4.02		0	0	0	1	1	9	7	4.22	991/1674	4.22	4.22	4.27	4.44	4.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals  0 2 0 1 3 5 7 4.13 1007/1609 4.13 4.13 4.22 4.34 4.13  5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0 0 1 0 4 6 7 4.00 769/1585 4.00 3.96 3.96 4.23 4.00  6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  0 1 0 2 2 6 7 4.06 849/1535 4.06 4.01 4.08 4.27 4.06  7. Was the grading system clearly explained  0 0 0 0 1 2 4 11 4.39 700/1651 4.39 4.33 4.18 4.32 4.39  8. How many times was class cancelled  0 0 0 0 0 1 2 16 4.89 742/1673 4.89 4.66 4.69 4.78 4.89  9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  3 0 0 0 1 10 4 4.20 794/1656 4.20 4.02 4.07 4.15 4.20  Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared  0 0 0 0 0 2 6 10 4.44 945/1586 4.44 4.53 4.43 4.50 4.44  2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 16 4.83 737/1585 4.83 4.68 4.69 4.79 4.83  3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  0 0 0 1 1 3 1 3 4.56 635/1575 4.56 4.38 4.27 4.30 4.56  5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  1. Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  0 0 0 1 2 5 7 3 3.50 1169/1520 3.50 3.80 4.01 4.19 3.50  2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  0 0 0 1 6 3 8 4.00 1024/1515 4.00 4.05 4.24 4.47 4.00  3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  1 0 0 0 4 3 10 4.35 798/1511 4.35 4.12 4.27 4.49 4.35		0	0	0	1	1	8	8	4.28	906/1674	4.28	4.25	4.23	4.34	4.28
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 0 4 6 7 4.00 769/1585 4.00 3.96 3.96 4.23 4.00 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 2 2 6 6 7 4.06 849/1535 4.06 4.01 4.08 4.27 4.06 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 1 2 4 11 4.39 700/1651 4.39 4.33 4.18 4.32 4.39 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 16 4.89 742/1673 4.89 4.66 4.69 4.78 4.89 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 1 10 4 4.20 794/1656 4.20 4.02 4.07 4.15 4.20 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1	3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	7	7	4.06	986/1423	4.06	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. 0 0 0 1 2 4 11 4.39 700/1651 4.39 4.33 4.18 4.32 4.39 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. 0 0 0 0 0 2 16 4.89 742/1673 4.89 4.66 4.69 4.78 4.89 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8. 0 0 0 0 1 10 4 4.20 794/1656 4.20 4.02 4.07 4.15 4.20 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1	4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	3	5	7	4.13	1007/1609	4.13	4.13	4.22	4.34	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 1 2 4 11 4.39 700/1651 4.39 4.33 4.18 4.32 4.39 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 16 4.89 742/1673 4.89 4.66 4.69 4.78 4.89 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 1 10 4 4.20 794/1656 4.20 4.02 4.07 4.15 4.20  Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 2 6 10 4.44 945/1586 4.44 4.53 4.43 4.50 4.44 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 1 1 16 4.83 737/1585 4.83 4.68 4.69 4.79 4.83 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 1 5 6 6 3.94 1181/1582 3.94 4.24 4.26 4.33 3.94 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 1 3 13 4.56 635/1575 4.56 4.38 4.27 4.30 4.56 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 11 2 2 0 2 1 2.71 1298/1380 2.71 3.77 3.94 3.85 2.71  Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 2 5 7 3 3.50 1169/1520 3.50 3.80 4.01 4.19 3.50 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 1 6 3 8 4.00 1024/1515 4.00 4.05 4.24 4.47 4.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 4 3 10 4.35 798/1511 4.35 4.12 4.27 4.49 4.35	5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	6	7	4.00	769/1585	4.00	3.96	3.96	4.23	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 2 16 4.89 742/1673 4.89 4.66 4.69 4.78 4.89 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 1 10 4 4.20 794/1656 4.20 4.02 4.07 4.15 4.20  Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 2 6 10 4.44 945/1586 4.44 4.53 4.43 4.50 4.44 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 1 1 16 4.83 737/1585 4.83 4.68 4.69 4.79 4.83 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 1 5 6 6 3.94 1181/1582 3.94 4.24 4.26 4.33 3.94 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 1 3 13 4.56 635/1575 4.56 4.38 4.27 4.30 4.56 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 11 2 2 0 2 1 2.71 1298/1380 2.71 3.77 3.94 3.85 2.71  Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 2 5 7 3 3.50 1169/1520 3.50 3.80 4.01 4.19 3.50 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 1 6 3 8 4.00 1024/1515 4.00 4.05 4.24 4.47 4.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 4 3 10 4.35 798/1511 4.35 4.12 4.27 4.49 4.35	6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	2	6	7	4.06	849/1535	4.06	4.01	4.08	4.27	4.06
Lecture   Lect	7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	4	11	4.39	700/1651	4.39	4.33	4.18	4.32	4.39
Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared  2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned  5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  6. Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  7. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  8. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  8. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  9. Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  9. Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  9. Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to material participate  9. Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to material participate  9. Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to material participate  9. Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to material participate  9. Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to material participate  9. Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to material participate  9. Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to material participate  1. Did class discussions contribute to material participate  1. Did class discussions contribute to material prepared  1. Did class discussions contribute to material participate  1. Did class discussions contribute  1. Did class discussions contribute  1. Did class discussions contribute  1. Did class discussions  2. Ti de d. 4.44	8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	742/1673	4.89	4.66	4.69	4.78	4.89
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 2 6 10 4.44 945/1586 4.44 4.53 4.43 4.50 4.44 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 16 4.83 737/1585 4.83 4.68 4.69 4.79 4.83 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 1 5 6 6 3.94 1181/1582 3.94 4.24 4.26 4.33 3.94 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 1 3 13 4.56 635/1575 4.56 4.38 4.27 4.30 4.56 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 11 2 2 0 2 1 2.71 1298/1380 2.71 3.77 3.94 3.85 2.71 Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 2 5 7 3 3.50 1169/1520 3.50 3.80 4.01 4.19 3.50 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 1 6 3 8 4.00 1024/1515 4.00 4.05 4.24 4.47 4.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 4 3 10 4.35 798/1511 4.35 4.12 4.27 4.49 4.35	9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	10	4	4.20	794/1656	4.20	4.02	4.07	4.15	4.20
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 2 6 10 4.44 945/1586 4.44 4.53 4.43 4.50 4.44 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 16 4.83 737/1585 4.83 4.68 4.69 4.79 4.83 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 1 5 6 6 3.94 1181/1582 3.94 4.24 4.26 4.33 3.94 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 1 3 13 4.56 635/1575 4.56 4.38 4.27 4.30 4.56 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 11 2 2 0 2 1 2.71 1298/1380 2.71 3.77 3.94 3.85 2.71 Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 2 5 7 3 3.50 1169/1520 3.50 3.80 4.01 4.19 3.50 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 1 6 3 8 4.00 1024/1515 4.00 4.05 4.24 4.47 4.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 4 3 10 4.35 798/1511 4.35 4.12 4.27 4.49 4.35	Lecture														
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 16 4.83 737/1585 4.83 4.68 4.69 4.79 4.83 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 1 5 6 6 3.94 1181/1582 3.94 4.24 4.26 4.33 3.94 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 1 3 13 4.56 635/1575 4.56 4.38 4.27 4.30 4.56 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 11 2 2 0 2 1 2.71 1298/1380 2.71 3.77 3.94 3.85 2.71  Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 2 5 7 3 3.50 1169/1520 3.50 3.80 4.01 4.19 3.50 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 1 6 3 8 4.00 1024/1515 4.00 4.05 4.24 4.47 4.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 4 3 10 4.35 798/1511 4.35 4.12 4.27 4.49 4.35		0	0	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	945/1586	4.44	4.53	4.43	4.50	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 1 5 6 6 3.94 1181/1582 3.94 4.24 4.26 4.33 3.94 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 1 3 13 4.56 635/1575 4.56 4.38 4.27 4.30 4.56 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 11 2 2 0 2 1 2.71 1298/1380 2.71 3.77 3.94 3.85 2.71  Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 2 5 7 3 3.50 1169/1520 3.50 3.80 4.01 4.19 3.50 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 1 6 3 8 4.00 1024/1515 4.00 4.05 4.24 4.47 4.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 4 3 10 4.35 798/1511 4.35 4.12 4.27 4.49 4.35	± ±	0	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83			4.68	4.69	4.79	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 1 3 13 4.56 635/1575 4.56 4.38 4.27 4.30 4.56 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 11 2 2 0 2 1 2.71 1298/1380 2.71 3.77 3.94 3.85 2.71  Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 2 5 7 3 3.50 1169/1520 3.50 3.80 4.01 4.19 3.50 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 1 6 3 8 4.00 1024/1515 4.00 4.05 4.24 4.47 4.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 4 3 10 4.35 798/1511 4.35 4.12 4.27 4.49 4.35		0	0	0	1	5	6	6	3.94	1181/1582	3.94	4.24	4.26	4.33	3.94
Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  1. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  1. Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  2. Ti 2.71 1298/1380 2.71 3.77 3.94 3.85 2.71		0	0	0	1	1	3	13	4.56	635/1575	4.56	4.38	4.27	4.30	4.56
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 2 5 7 3 3.50 1169/1520 3.50 3.80 4.01 4.19 3.50 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 1 6 3 8 4.00 1024/1515 4.00 4.05 4.24 4.47 4.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 4 3 10 4.35 798/1511 4.35 4.12 4.27 4.49 4.35	<del>-</del>	0	11	2	2	0	2	1	2.71	1298/1380	2.71	3.77	3.94	3.85	2.71
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 2 5 7 3 3.50 1169/1520 3.50 3.80 4.01 4.19 3.50 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 1 6 3 8 4.00 1024/1515 4.00 4.05 4.24 4.47 4.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 4 3 10 4.35 798/1511 4.35 4.12 4.27 4.49 4.35	Discussion														
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 1 6 3 8 4.00 1024/1515 4.00 4.05 4.24 4.47 4.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 4 3 10 4.35 798/1511 4.35 4.12 4.27 4.49 4.35		0	0	1	2	5	7	3	3 50	1169/1520	3 50	3 80	4 01	4 19	3 50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 4 3 10 4.35 798/1511 4.35 4.12 4.27 4.49 4.35	-	-	-	0	1	6	3	8							
		1	-	-	0	4	_								
		0	-	-	1	2	1			,					
Frequency Distribution															

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	2	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	15	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	3	Non-major	18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	15	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 601 0101 University of Maryland
Title MICROECONOMIC ANALYSIS Baltimore County

Instructor: BRADLEY, MICHAE

Enrollment: 14
Ouestionnaires: 13

Fall 2005

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 590

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 5 4.15 1066/1674 4.15 4.22 4.27 4.44 4.15 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 5 7 4.46 641/1674 4.46 4.25 4.23 4.34 4.46 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 1 3 9 4.62 445/1423 4.62 4.37 4.27 4.28 4.62 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 4 0 0 1 3 5 4.44 583/1609 4.44 4.13 4.22 4.34 4.44 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 0 1 2 9 4.38 432/1585 4.38 3.96 3.96 4.23 4.38 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 1 1 1 4 5 3.92 1006/1535 3.92 4.01 4.08 4.27 3.92 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 2 11 4.85 151/1651 4.85 4.33 4.18 4.32 4.85 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 9 4 4.31 1383/1673 4.31 4.66 4.69 4.78 4.31 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 1 8 2 4.09 900/1656 4.09 4.02 4.07 4.15 4.09 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 Ω Ω 2 2 9 4.54 826/1586 4.54 4.53 4.43 4.50 4.54 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 1 12 4.92 453/1585 4.92 4.68 4.69 4.79 4.92 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 1 6 6 4.38 798/1582 4.38 4.24 4.26 4.33 4.38 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 1 5 6 4.23 975/1575 4.23 4.38 4.27 4.30 4.23 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 1 0 4 8 4.46 333/1380 4.46 3.77 3.94 3.85 4.46 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 1 5 1 1 3.00 1353/1520 3.00 3.80 4.01 4.19 3.00 5 2 2 3.67 1253/1515 3.67 4.05 4.24 4.47 3.67 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 0 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 0 4 2 2 3.75 1221/1511 3.75 4.12 4.27 4.49 3.75 4. Were special techniques successful 4 7 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 994 \*\*\*\* 3.64 3.94 4.07 \*\*\*\*

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades			Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	12	Non-major	13
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	า
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	10	-			
				?	1						

University of Maryland Page 591
Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006
Fall 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: ECON 611 0101

16

ECONOMETRICS I

GINDLING, THOMA

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 13

is course ed goals ed goals	0 0 0	0 0	0											
ed goals ced goals ed goals	0	•	0											
ed goals ced goals ed goals	0	•	()	0	1	1	11	1 77	207/1674	4 77	4 00	4 07	1 11	4 77
ed goals	-		0	0	1	1 4	11 8	4.77 4.54	287/1674 542/1674	4.77 4.54	4.22	4.27	4.44	4.77 4.54
ed goals	U	0	1	0	1	3	8	4.31	803/1423	4.31	4.25	4.23	4.28	4.31
	Λ		0	1	2		8							4.33
	-		-	_			-							4.31
		-	-	_	_		-							4.64
ac you rearried		_	-	_	•	_	-		,					4.69
		-	-	•	_	_								4.77
effectiveness	-		-	•	•									4.31
errectiveness	U	U	U	U	1	,	J	4.51	033/1030	4.51	1.02	4.07	4.13	4.51
			0	0	0	2	11	4.85	319/1586		4.53	4.43	4.50	4.85
-				-		_							4.79	4.92
_				-									4.33	4.23
Learned	0		0	1	0	5	7	4.38	838/1575	4.38	4.38	4.27	4.30	4.38
understanding	1	2	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	447/1380	4.30	3.77	3.94	3.85	4.30
vou learned	1	0	2	2	1	3	4	3.42	1215/1520	3.42	3.80	4.01	4.19	3.42
-		0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50		4.50	4.05	4.24	4.47	4.50
			0	1		0								4.25
	1	9	0	1	1	0	1			***	3.64	3.94	4.07	****
material	11	1	Λ	Λ	0	1	Λ	4 00	****/ 265	****	****	1 22	/ E1	****
			-	-	-	_	•		/ 203	****	****			****
			-	-	-	-	_		/ 2/0	****	****			****
ab accivicies	12	U	U	U	U	U	1	3.00	/ 200			1.10	4.07	
						_	-		,		****			****
									,		****			****
elptul	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.64	****
Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
spected Grades				Rea	asons	;			Туј	pe			Majors	3
		Re	quir	ed fo	or Ma	Jor	s	Τ	Graduat	9	4	Majo	or	0
		Go.	ners	1				1	IInder-	rad	9	Non	-maior	13
		Ge.	ııcı d.	_				_	onder -g.	Lau	,	11011-	ilia JUI	13
		₽1.	eati.	760				1	#### _ 1	Means +	here a	re not	enous	τh
		Ήď	CCLI	v CD				±.					_	111
		O+	her			1.0			responses to be significant					
		OL.	TICI					U						
e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e	you learned at you learned effectiveness ared e subject ined clearly learned understanding you learned participate en discussion e material nd information ab activities you learned ted goal elpful	you learned 0 at you learned 0 effectiveness 0  ared 0 e subject 0 ined clearly 0 learned 1 you learned 1 participate 1 en discussion 1  e material 11 nd information 12 ab activities 12  you learned 12 ted goal 12 elpful 12  Frequency  xpected Grades	you learned 0 0 0 at you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	you learned         0         0         0           at you learned         0         2         0           0         0         0         0         0           effectiveness         0         0         0         0           effectiveness         0         0         0         0           eeffectiveness         0         0         0         0           eesubject         0         0         0         0         0           ined clearly         0	you learned         0         0         0         1           at you learned         0         2         0         1           0         0         0         0         0           effectiveness         0         0         0         0           effectiveness         0         0         0         0           effectiveness         0         0         0         0           e subject         0         0         0         0           ined clearly         0         0         0         0           learned         0         0         0         0           you learned         1         0         2         2           participate         1         0         0         0           en discussion         1         0         0         0           ab activities         12         0         0         0           od         ab activities         12         0         0         0           you learned         12         0         0         0         0           requercy         Distribution         0         0         0         0	you learned         0         0         0         1         2           at you learned         0         2         0         1         0           0         0         0         0         0         0           effectiveness         0         0         0         0         0           effectiveness         0         0         0         0         0         0           effectiveness         0	you learned         0         0         0         1         2         2           at you learned         0         2         0         1         0         1         1           0         0         0         0         0         0         1         2         2           effectiveness         0         0         0         0         0         3         3         effectiveness         0         0         0         0         0         0         3         ared         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         1         7         0         <	you learned         0         0         0         1         2         2         8           at you learned         0         2         0         1         0         1         9           0         0         0         0         0         1         2         10           effectiveness         0         0         0         0         0         3         10           effectiveness         0         0         0         0         0         3         10           effectiveness         0         0         0         0         0         1         7         5           ared         0         0         0         0         0         1         1         7         5           ared         0         0         0         0         0         1         12         1         <	you learned 0 0 0 1 2 2 8 4.31 at you learned 0 2 0 1 0 1 9 4.64 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 10 4.69 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 10 4.69 effectiveness 0 0 0 0 0 1 7 5 4.31  ared 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 7 5 4.31  ared 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 12 4.92 ined clearly 0 0 0 0 0 1 12 4.92 ined clearly 0 0 0 0 0 2 6 5 4.23 learned 0 0 0 1 0 5 7 4.38 understanding 1 2 0 1 1 2 6 4.30  you learned 1 0 2 2 1 3 4 3.42 participate 1 0 0 0 2 2 8 4.50 en discussion 1 0 0 1 3 0 8 4.25 1 9 0 1 1 0 1 3.33  e material 11 1 0 0 0 1 3 0 8 4.25 1 9 0 1 1 0 1 5.00  you learned 12 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00  you learned 12 0 0 0 0 1 5.00  you learned 12 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ted goal 12 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ted goal 12 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00  Frequency Distribution  xpected Grades Reasons  A 4 Required for Majors 1 B 8 C 0 General 1 D 0 F 0 Electives 1 P 0 I 0 Other 10	you learned         0         0         1         2         2         8         4.31         512/1585         at you learned         0         2         0         1         0         1         9         4.64         260/1535         0         0         0         0         1         2         10         4.69         298/1651         0         0         0         0         1         2         10         4.69         298/1651         0         0         0         0         1         4.77         944/1673         effectiveness         0         0         0         0         1         1         7         5         4.31         655/1656         6         5         4.23         956/1582         6         esubject         0         0         0         0         1         1         2         453/1585         1         23         956/1582         1         2         956/1582         1         2         956/1582         1         2         956/1582         1         2         956/1582         1         2         956/1582         1         2         2         4         4.30         447/1380         4         477/1380         1         4 <td< td=""><td>you learned         0         0         1         2         2         8         4.31         512/1585         4.34           at you learned         0         2         0         1         0         1         9         4.64         260/1535         4.64           0         0         0         0         1         2         1         4.69         298/1651         4.69           0         0         0         0         1         2         1         4.67         298/1651         4.69           0         0         0         0         0         3         10         4.77         944/1673         4.77           effectiveness         0         0         0         1         2         4.31         655/1656         4.31           ared         0         0         0         0         1         12         4.92         453/1585         4.92           ined clearly         0         0         0         1         12         4.92         453/1585         4.92           ined clearly         0         0         0         2         6         4.23         956/1582         4.23</td><td>you learned 0 0 0 1 2 2 8 4 .31 512/1585 4.31 3.96 at you learned 0 2 0 1 0 1 9 4.64 260/1535 4.64 4.01 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 10 4.69 298/1651 4.69 4.33 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 10 4.77 944/1673 4.77 4.66 effectiveness 0 0 0 0 0 1 7 5 4.31 655/1656 4.31 4.02  ared 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 7 5 4.31 655/1656 4.31 4.02  ared 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 12 4.92 453/1585 4.92 4.68 ined clearly 0 0 0 0 0 1 12 4.92 453/1585 4.92 4.68 ined clearly 0 0 0 0 0 2 6 5 4.23 956/1582 4.23 4.24 learned 0 0 0 1 0 5 7 4.38 838/1575 4.38 4.38 understanding 1 2 0 1 1 2 6 4.30 447/1380 4.30 3.77  you learned 1 0 2 2 1 3 4 3.42 1215/1520 3.42 3.80 participate 1 0 0 0 2 2 8 4.50 629/1515 4.50 4.05 en discussion 1 0 0 1 3 0 8 4.25 896/1511 4.25 4.12 1 9 0 1 1 0 1 3.33 ****/ 994 **** 3.64  e material 11 1 0 0 0 1 1 0 4.00 ****/ 265 **** **** ab activities 12 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 260 **** ****  you learned 12 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 265 **** ****  you learned 12 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 50 **** ****  participate 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 50 **** ****  ****  ****  ****  ****  ***  ****  **  ***  ***  ***  ***  ***  ***  ***  ***  ***  ***  ***  ***  **  ***  ***  ***  ***  ***  ***  ***  ***  ***  ***  ***  ***  **  ***  ***  ***  ***  ***  ***  ***  ***  ***  ***  ***  ***  **</td><td>you learned 0 0 0 1 2 2 8 4.31 512/1585 4.31 3.96 3.96 at you learned 0 2 0 1 0 1 9 4.64 260/1535 4.64 4.01 4.08 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 10 4.69 298/1651 4.69 4.33 4.18 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 10 4.77 944/1673 4.77 4.66 4.69 effectiveness 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 7 5 4.31 655/1656 4.31 4.02 4.07 ared 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 7 5 4.31 655/1656 4.31 4.02 4.07 ared 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 12 4.92 453/1585 4.92 4.68 4.69 ined clearly 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 12 4.92 453/1585 4.92 4.68 4.69 ined clearly 0 0 0 0 0 2 6 5 4.23 956/1582 4.23 4.24 4.26 learned 0 0 0 0 1 0 5 7 4.38 838/1575 4.38 4.38 4.38 4.27 understanding 1 2 0 1 1 2 6 4.30 447/1380 4.30 3.77 3.94 are discussion 1 0 0 1 3 0 8 4.25 896/1511 4.25 4.12 4.27 4.26 are discussion 1 0 0 1 3 0 8 4.25 896/1515 4.50 4.05 4.24 are discussion 1 0 0 0 1 3 0 8 4.25 896/1511 4.25 4.12 4.27 4.26 are discussion 1 0 0 0 1 3 0 8 4.25 896/1511 4.50 4.08 4.39 are discussion 1 0 0 0 1 3 0 8 4.25 896/1511 4.25 4.12 4.27 4.26 are discussion 1 0 0 0 1 3 0 8 4.25 896/1511 4.25 4.12 4.27 4.26 are discussion 1 0 0 0 1 0 1 3 3.33 ****/ 994 **** 3.64 3.94 are discussion 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 265 **** **** 4.23 are discussion 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td><td>you learned 0 0 0 1 2 2 8 4.31 512/1585 4.31 3.96 3.96 4.23 at you learned 0 2 0 1 0 1 9 4.64 260/1535 4.64 4.01 4.08 4.27 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 10 4.69 298/1651 4.69 4.33 4.18 4.32 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 10 4.77 944/1673 4.77 4.66 4.69 4.78 effectiveness 0 0 0 0 0 1 7 5 4.31 655/1656 4.31 4.02 4.07 4.15 ared 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 7 5 4.31 655/1656 4.31 4.02 4.07 4.15 ared 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 2 4.92 453/1585 4.92 4.68 4.69 4.79 ined clearly 0 0 0 0 0 2 6 5 4.23 956/1582 4.23 4.24 4.26 4.33 learned 0 0 0 0 1 0 5 7 4.38 838/1575 4.38 4.38 4.27 4.30 understanding 1 2 0 1 1 2 6 4.30 447/1380 4.30 3.77 3.94 3.85 are an ined clearly 1 0 0 0 0 2 2 8 4.50 629/1515 4.50 4.05 4.24 4.26 4.37 participate 1 0 0 0 2 2 8 4.50 629/1515 4.50 4.05 4.24 4.27 4.49 are discussion 1 0 0 1 3 0 8 4.25 896/1511 4.25 4.12 4.27 4.49 are discussion 1 0 0 1 3 0 8 4.25 896/1511 4.25 4.12 4.27 4.49 are discussion 1 0 0 0 1 3 3 0 8 4.25 896/1511 4.25 4.12 4.27 4.49 are discussion 1 0 0 0 1 3 3 0 8 4.25 896/1511 4.25 4.12 4.27 4.49 are discussion 1 0 0 0 1 3 3 0 8 4.25 896/1511 4.25 4.12 4.27 4.49 are discussion 1 0 0 0 1 3 3 0 8 4.25 896/1511 4.25 4.12 4.27 4.49 are discussion 1 0 0 0 1 3 0 8 4.25 896/1511 4.25 4.12 4.27 4.49 are discussion 1 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 265 **** **** 4.23 4.51 and information 12 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ****/ 278 **** **** 4.24 4.47 are discussion 1 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 265 **** **** 4.24 4.47 are discussion 1 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 265 **** **** 4.44 4.64 4.67 are discussion 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td></td<>	you learned         0         0         1         2         2         8         4.31         512/1585         4.34           at you learned         0         2         0         1         0         1         9         4.64         260/1535         4.64           0         0         0         0         1         2         1         4.69         298/1651         4.69           0         0         0         0         1         2         1         4.67         298/1651         4.69           0         0         0         0         0         3         10         4.77         944/1673         4.77           effectiveness         0         0         0         1         2         4.31         655/1656         4.31           ared         0         0         0         0         1         12         4.92         453/1585         4.92           ined clearly         0         0         0         1         12         4.92         453/1585         4.92           ined clearly         0         0         0         2         6         4.23         956/1582         4.23	you learned 0 0 0 1 2 2 8 4 .31 512/1585 4.31 3.96 at you learned 0 2 0 1 0 1 9 4.64 260/1535 4.64 4.01 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 10 4.69 298/1651 4.69 4.33 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 10 4.77 944/1673 4.77 4.66 effectiveness 0 0 0 0 0 1 7 5 4.31 655/1656 4.31 4.02  ared 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 7 5 4.31 655/1656 4.31 4.02  ared 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 12 4.92 453/1585 4.92 4.68 ined clearly 0 0 0 0 0 1 12 4.92 453/1585 4.92 4.68 ined clearly 0 0 0 0 0 2 6 5 4.23 956/1582 4.23 4.24 learned 0 0 0 1 0 5 7 4.38 838/1575 4.38 4.38 understanding 1 2 0 1 1 2 6 4.30 447/1380 4.30 3.77  you learned 1 0 2 2 1 3 4 3.42 1215/1520 3.42 3.80 participate 1 0 0 0 2 2 8 4.50 629/1515 4.50 4.05 en discussion 1 0 0 1 3 0 8 4.25 896/1511 4.25 4.12 1 9 0 1 1 0 1 3.33 ****/ 994 **** 3.64  e material 11 1 0 0 0 1 1 0 4.00 ****/ 265 **** **** ab activities 12 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 260 **** ****  you learned 12 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 265 **** ****  you learned 12 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 50 **** ****  participate 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 50 **** ****  ****  ****  ****  ****  ***  ****  **  ***  ***  ***  ***  ***  ***  ***  ***  ***  ***  ***  ***  **  ***  ***  ***  ***  ***  ***  ***  ***  ***  ***  ***  ***  **  ***  ***  ***  ***  ***  ***  ***  ***  ***  ***  ***  ***  **	you learned 0 0 0 1 2 2 8 4.31 512/1585 4.31 3.96 3.96 at you learned 0 2 0 1 0 1 9 4.64 260/1535 4.64 4.01 4.08 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 10 4.69 298/1651 4.69 4.33 4.18 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 10 4.77 944/1673 4.77 4.66 4.69 effectiveness 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 7 5 4.31 655/1656 4.31 4.02 4.07 ared 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 7 5 4.31 655/1656 4.31 4.02 4.07 ared 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 12 4.92 453/1585 4.92 4.68 4.69 ined clearly 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 12 4.92 453/1585 4.92 4.68 4.69 ined clearly 0 0 0 0 0 2 6 5 4.23 956/1582 4.23 4.24 4.26 learned 0 0 0 0 1 0 5 7 4.38 838/1575 4.38 4.38 4.38 4.27 understanding 1 2 0 1 1 2 6 4.30 447/1380 4.30 3.77 3.94 are discussion 1 0 0 1 3 0 8 4.25 896/1511 4.25 4.12 4.27 4.26 are discussion 1 0 0 1 3 0 8 4.25 896/1515 4.50 4.05 4.24 are discussion 1 0 0 0 1 3 0 8 4.25 896/1511 4.25 4.12 4.27 4.26 are discussion 1 0 0 0 1 3 0 8 4.25 896/1511 4.50 4.08 4.39 are discussion 1 0 0 0 1 3 0 8 4.25 896/1511 4.25 4.12 4.27 4.26 are discussion 1 0 0 0 1 3 0 8 4.25 896/1511 4.25 4.12 4.27 4.26 are discussion 1 0 0 0 1 0 1 3 3.33 ****/ 994 **** 3.64 3.94 are discussion 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 265 **** **** 4.23 are discussion 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	you learned 0 0 0 1 2 2 8 4.31 512/1585 4.31 3.96 3.96 4.23 at you learned 0 2 0 1 0 1 9 4.64 260/1535 4.64 4.01 4.08 4.27 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 10 4.69 298/1651 4.69 4.33 4.18 4.32 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 10 4.77 944/1673 4.77 4.66 4.69 4.78 effectiveness 0 0 0 0 0 1 7 5 4.31 655/1656 4.31 4.02 4.07 4.15 ared 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 7 5 4.31 655/1656 4.31 4.02 4.07 4.15 ared 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 2 4.92 453/1585 4.92 4.68 4.69 4.79 ined clearly 0 0 0 0 0 2 6 5 4.23 956/1582 4.23 4.24 4.26 4.33 learned 0 0 0 0 1 0 5 7 4.38 838/1575 4.38 4.38 4.27 4.30 understanding 1 2 0 1 1 2 6 4.30 447/1380 4.30 3.77 3.94 3.85 are an ined clearly 1 0 0 0 0 2 2 8 4.50 629/1515 4.50 4.05 4.24 4.26 4.37 participate 1 0 0 0 2 2 8 4.50 629/1515 4.50 4.05 4.24 4.27 4.49 are discussion 1 0 0 1 3 0 8 4.25 896/1511 4.25 4.12 4.27 4.49 are discussion 1 0 0 1 3 0 8 4.25 896/1511 4.25 4.12 4.27 4.49 are discussion 1 0 0 0 1 3 3 0 8 4.25 896/1511 4.25 4.12 4.27 4.49 are discussion 1 0 0 0 1 3 3 0 8 4.25 896/1511 4.25 4.12 4.27 4.49 are discussion 1 0 0 0 1 3 3 0 8 4.25 896/1511 4.25 4.12 4.27 4.49 are discussion 1 0 0 0 1 3 3 0 8 4.25 896/1511 4.25 4.12 4.27 4.49 are discussion 1 0 0 0 1 3 0 8 4.25 896/1511 4.25 4.12 4.27 4.49 are discussion 1 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 265 **** **** 4.23 4.51 and information 12 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ****/ 278 **** **** 4.24 4.47 are discussion 1 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 265 **** **** 4.24 4.47 are discussion 1 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 265 **** **** 4.44 4.64 4.67 are discussion 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0

Course-Section: ECON 652 0101 University of Maryland Title ECONOMICS OF HEALTH Baltimore County Instructor: GOLDFARB, MARSH Fall 2005

University of Maryland Page 592
Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006
Fall 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	18			
Questionnaires:	18	Student Cou	ourse Evaluation	Questionnaire

? 1

							Fre	eque:	ncie	5		Inst	cructor	Course	Dept	Dept UMBC Level		Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	w insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	276/1674	4.78	4.22	4.27	4.44	4.78
2. Did th	e instruc	tor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	12	4.50	578/1674	4.50	4.25	4.23	4.34	4.50
3. Did th	e exam qu	estions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	1	0	0	1	1	4	11	4.47	611/1423	4.47	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.47
4. Did ot	pected goals	0	1	0	1	1	5	10	4.41	629/1609	4.41	4.13	4.22	4.34	4.41			
5. Did as	signed re	adings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	185/1585	4.72	3.96	3.96	4.23	4.72
6. Did wr	itten ass	ignments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	1	1	0	0	4	12	4.53	355/1535	4.53	4.01	4.08	4.27	4.53
		system clearl			0	0	1	0	0	5	12	4.50	524/1651	4.50	4.33	4.18	4.32	4.50
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	10	8	4.44	1267/1673	4.44	4.66	4.69	4.78	4.44
				hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	561/1656	4.38	4.02	4.07	4.15	4.38
		Ŧt	_															
1 17 +1	h	Lectur	_		0	0	0	0	0	2	1.0	4 00	240/1506	4 00	4 52	1 12	4 50	4 00
		ctor's lecture			0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89 4.89	249/1586	4.89 4.89	4.53	4.43	4.50	4.89
		tor seem inter		3	0	-	-	0	0	2	16		615/1585				4.79	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	217/1582		4.24	4.26	4.33	4.83
				-	1	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	343/1575	4.76	4.38	4.27	4.30	4.76
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	10	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	363/1380	4.43	3.77	3.94	3.85	4.43
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	5	0	2	1	4	2	4	3.38	1230/1520	3.38	3.80	4.01	4.19	3.38
2. Were a	ll studen	ts actively en	courage	d to participate	5	0	2	0	4	1	6	3.69	1242/1515	3.69	4.05	4.24	4.47	3.69
3. Did the	e instruc	tor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	5	0	2	1	1	4	5	3.69	1253/1511	3.69	4.12	4.27	4.49	3.69
4. Were s	pecial te	chniques succe	ssful		5	11	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 994	****	3.64	3.94	4.07	****
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credits E	amad	Cum. GPA		Errogtod Crodog				Do	2222	-			TT				Moder	
		Culli, GPA		Expected Grades					ason:	5 			Ту:	 pe			Majors 	; 
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A 8		Red	quire	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s	2	Graduat	е	6	Majo	or	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В 8														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera	l				6	Under-g	rad 1	.2	Non-	-major	18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0														
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	6	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
				P 0									respons	es to k	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	her					9						
				_														