

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	3	9	16	2	3.48	1517/1674	3.99	4.22	4.27	4.07	3.48
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	11	10	6	3.63	1436/1674	4.12	4.25	4.23	4.16	3.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	16	7	3.90	1107/1423	4.32	4.37	4.27	4.16	3.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	24	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	****/1609	4.07	4.13	4.22	4.05	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	5	9	9	5	3.26	1364/1585	3.82	3.96	3.96	3.88	3.26
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	27	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/1535	3.79	4.01	4.08	3.89	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	5	4	7	14	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	15	16	4.52	1196/1673	4.48	4.66	4.69	4.67	4.52
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	4	12	12	0	3.29	1462/1656	3.82	4.02	4.07	3.96	3.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	9	19	4.48	887/1586	4.43	4.53	4.43	4.37	4.48
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	2	16	12	4.23	1410/1585	4.62	4.68	4.69	4.60	4.23
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3	9	13	6	3.71	1333/1582	4.06	4.24	4.26	4.17	3.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	6	13	12	4.19	1010/1575	4.27	4.38	4.27	4.17	4.19
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	23	0	2	2	3	1	3.38	1108/1380	3.65	3.77	3.94	3.78	3.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	5	10	5	4	3.07	1339/1520	3.65	3.80	4.01	3.76	3.07
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	3	10	5	4	4	2.85	1451/1515	3.84	4.05	4.24	3.97	2.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	7	4	8	2	6	2.85	1454/1511	3.94	4.12	4.27	4.00	2.85
4. Were special techniques successful	5	24	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 994	3.44	3.64	3.94	3.73	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	3.97	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	3.32	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	28	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.87	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	2	A	3	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	12	General	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	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 101 0201
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS
 Instructor: SORKIN, ALAN L
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 524
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	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	538/1586	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	4.53	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 Distribution

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

Course-Section: ECON 101 0301
 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

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	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	16	4.50	632/1582	4.06	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	3.65	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	3.19	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	3.50	1303/1515	3.84	4.05	4.24	3.97	3.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	3	4	8	4.13	1004/1511	3.94	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	4.00	****/ 95	****	4.71	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 99	****	4.75	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 97	****	4.88	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	****	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	****	

Course-Section: ECON 101 0301
 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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	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	B	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 responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 101 0401
 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

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	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	4.12	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	4.11	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	14	4.19	1010/1575	4.27	4.38	4.27	4.17	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	3.05	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	3.39	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	3.67	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	5.00	****/ 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	3.50	****/ 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	3.67	****/ 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	3.67	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 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	3.00	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 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	****	

Course-Section: ECON 101 0401
 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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A	13	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 101 0501
 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

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	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	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	4.12	1060/1674	4.12	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	4.32	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	4.43	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	3.92	1199/1582	4.06	4.24	4.26	4.17	3.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	6	8	11	4.20	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	3.68	1080/1520	3.65	3.80	4.01	3.76	3.68	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	2	4	5	6	3.58	1282/1515	3.84	4.05	4.24	3.97	3.58	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	2	2	9	5	3.79	1205/1511	3.94	4.12	4.27	4.00	3.79	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	7	2	4	0	1	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	3.00	****/ 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	21	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 99	****	4.75	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 97	****	4.88	4.14	3.69	****	
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	3.67	****/ 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	****	

Course-Section: ECON 101 0501
 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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	2	A	9	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 101 0601
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS
 Instructor: DASGUPTA, NANDI
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 528
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	2	7	5	4.07	1147/1674	3.99	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	4.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	203/1423	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	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	2	2	1	3	4	3.42	1289/1585	3.82	3.96	3.96	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	4.33	
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	4.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	13	0	3.93	1612/1673	4.48	4.66	4.69	4.67	3.93	
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	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	581/1586	4.43	4.53	4.43	4.37	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	453/1585	4.62	4.68	4.69	4.60	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	5	7	4.29	903/1582	4.06	4.24	4.26	4.17	4.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	5	6	4.07	1111/1575	4.27	4.38	4.27	4.17	4.07	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	9	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	540/1380	3.65	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	3.00	
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	3.83	
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	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 994	3.44	3.64	3.94	3.73	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	4
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	4
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 1		Under-grad 16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	4
			? 0		

Course-Section: ECON 101 0701
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS
 Instructor: CARROLL, KATHLE
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 529
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	3	6	13	4.25	954/1674	3.99	4.22	4.27	4.07	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	2	8	11	4.22	980/1674	4.12	4.25	4.23	4.16	4.22	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	1	5	15	4.39	707/1423	4.32	4.37	4.27	4.16	4.39	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	1	1	2	1	8	4.08	1048/1609	4.07	4.13	4.22	4.05	4.08	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	3	3	7	9	3.87	946/1585	3.82	3.96	3.96	3.88	3.87	
6. Did written assignments contribute to 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 grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	7	13	4.38	713/1651	4.15	4.33	4.18	4.10	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	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	3	0	0	1	5	7	8	4.05	930/1656	3.82	4.02	4.07	3.96	4.05	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures 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 instructor seem interested in 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 material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	4	8	11	4.17	1025/1582	4.06	4.24	4.26	4.17	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	1	5	15	4.43	780/1575	4.27	4.38	4.27	4.17	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	14	0	1	2	1	6	4.20	540/1380	3.65	3.77	3.94	3.78	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	1	3	1	10	4.13	760/1520	3.65	3.80	4.01	3.76	4.13	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	2	1	0	2	11	4.19	949/1515	3.84	4.05	4.24	3.97	4.19	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	2	1	4	0	9	3.81	1188/1511	3.94	4.12	4.27	4.00	3.81	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	13	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 994	3.44	3.64	3.94	3.73	****	
Field Work															
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.42	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.87	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B	7						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C	5	General	1	Under-grad	24	Non-major	22
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	4						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	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	4.12	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	5.00	****/ 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	4.33	****/ 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	5.00	****/ 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	****	

Course-Section: ECON 101 0801
 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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	B	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 101 0901
 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	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	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	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	4.12	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	4.00	****/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	4.39	1024/1586	4.43	4.53	4.43	4.37	4.39	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	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	4.06	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	3.65	3.80	4.01	3.76	4.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	2	5	6	4.07	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	2	2	9	4.36	798/1511	3.94	4.12	4.27	4.00	4.36	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	13	0	1	0	1	0	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	3.00	****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 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	3.00	****/ 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	3.00	****/ 95	****	4.71	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 99	****	4.75	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	2	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	18	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 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	4.00	****/ 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	****	

Course-Section: ECON 101 0901
 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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 101 1001
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS
 Instructor: KAIKAI, ALPHA
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 532
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	5	10	8	3.85	1359/1674	3.99	4.22	4.27	4.07	3.85	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	7	15	4.31	870/1674	4.12	4.25	4.23	4.16	4.31	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	16	4.54	540/1423	4.32	4.37	4.27	4.16	4.54	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	18	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	852/1609	4.07	4.13	4.22	4.05	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	4	6	12	4.13	682/1585	3.82	3.96	3.96	3.88	4.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	19	2	1	0	1	3	3.29	1374/1535	3.79	4.01	4.08	3.89	3.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	7	18	4.62	382/1651	4.15	4.33	4.18	4.10	4.62	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	19	7	4.27	1412/1673	4.48	4.66	4.69	4.67	4.27	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	2	0	3	1	13	4	3.86	1162/1656	3.82	4.02	4.07	3.96	3.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	0	8	15	4.50	858/1586	4.43	4.53	4.43	4.37	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	1	5	17	4.58	1158/1585	4.62	4.68	4.69	4.60	4.58	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	3	9	11	4.25	935/1582	4.06	4.24	4.26	4.17	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what 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 audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	17	0	2	0	0	5	4.14	585/1380	3.65	3.77	3.94	3.78	4.14	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute 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 all students actively encouraged 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 the instructor encourage fair and 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 special techniques successful	11	9	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	****/ 994	3.44	3.64	3.94	3.73	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	3.97	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	1	A	12	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C	4	General	8	Under-grad	26	Non-major	25
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 101 1401
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS
 Instructor: DASGUPTA, NANDI
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 533
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	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	0	0	0	2	10	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	4.06	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	4.25	
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	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 11	Required for Majors	8
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 0		0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		14
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	3

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ECON 101 1501
 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

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	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	3.18	1599/1674	3.99	4.22	4.27	4.07	3.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	2	9	4	3	3.00	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	3.09	1354/1423	4.32	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	3.40	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	2.24	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	4	2.55	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	4.14	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	2.70	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	3.89	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	2.50	1564/1582	4.06	4.24	4.26	4.17	2.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	1	5	3	7	3.40	1402/1575	4.27	4.38	4.27	4.17	3.40	
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	3.42	1337/1515	3.84	4.05	4.24	3.97	3.42	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	2	3	2	0	5	3.25	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	3.94	3.73	3.50	
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	****/ 260	****	****	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	5.00	****/ 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	5.00	****/ 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	****	
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	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	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	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	****	****	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: ECON 101 1501
 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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	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	B	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	8	13	3	3.62	1474/1674	3.99	4.22	4.27	4.07	3.62	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	8	8	9	3.96	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	3.96	1052/1423	4.32	4.37	4.27	4.16	3.96	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	2	8	11	2	3.57	1427/1609	4.07	4.13	4.22	4.05	3.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	7	9	7	3.84	966/1585	3.82	3.96	3.96	3.88	3.84	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	7	8	8	3.73	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	3.68	1368/1651	4.15	4.33	4.18	4.10	3.68	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	1	15	8	4.29	1390/1673	4.48	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															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	8	8	8	4.00	1300/1586	4.43	4.53	4.43	4.37	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	5	7	12	4.29	1378/1585	4.62	4.68	4.69	4.60	4.29	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	12	5	6	3.74	1314/1582	4.06	4.24	4.26	4.17	3.74	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	2	3	11	6	3.83	1254/1575	4.27	4.38	4.27	4.17	3.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	4	3	7	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	3.97	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	3.44	3.64	3.94	3.73	3.43	
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	4.00	****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 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	3.50	****/ 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	****	

Course-Section: ECON 101 1701
 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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected 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	B	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 101 1801
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS
 Instructor: Coomber, Willia
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 536
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	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	4.48	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	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 1	A 11	Required for Majors	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 1	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General	4
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		Under-grad 22
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	8
			? 0		

Course-Section: ECON 101H 0101
 Title PRIN OF MICROECON-HONO
 Instructor: MCCONNELL, VIRG
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 537
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	1	7	13	4.35	841/1674	4.35	4.22	4.27	4.07	4.35	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	13	4	3.91	1258/1674	3.91	4.25	4.23	4.16	3.91	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	12	6	4.04	992/1423	4.04	4.37	4.27	4.16	4.04	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	3	3	7	7	3.76	1313/1609	3.76	4.13	4.22	4.05	3.76	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	3	7	11	4.09	715/1585	4.09	3.96	3.96	3.88	4.09	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	5	8	5	3.43	1320/1535	3.43	4.01	4.08	3.89	3.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	4	10	6	3.78	1303/1651	3.78	4.33	4.18	4.10	3.78	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.66	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	10	7	3	3.57	1344/1656	3.57	4.02	4.07	3.96	3.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	7	13	4.39	1014/1586	4.39	4.53	4.43	4.37	4.39	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	853/1585	4.78	4.68	4.69	4.60	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	4	12	5	3.87	1239/1582	3.87	4.24	4.26	4.17	3.87	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	4	9	8	3.96	1177/1575	3.96	4.38	4.27	4.17	3.96	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	16	2	1	2	2	0	2.57	1314/1380	2.57	3.77	3.94	3.78	2.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	3	4	0	0	2.57	1466/1520	2.57	3.80	4.01	3.76	2.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	873/1515	4.29	4.05	4.24	3.97	4.29	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	865/1511	4.29	4.12	4.27	4.00	4.29	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	0	1	2	0	3	1	3.14	863/ 994	3.14	3.64	3.94	3.73	3.14	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	3.32	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	3.88	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 12	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0	Major 2
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B 8			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C 1	General 3	Under-grad 23	Non-major 21
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 1			
				I 0	Other 10		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ECON 102 0101
 Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS
 Instructor: THOMAS, MARK S
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 538
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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	0	0	0	2	4	9	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	4.40	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	4.13	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	4.20	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	859/1380	3.62	3.77	3.94	3.78	3.82	
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	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ECON 102 0201
 Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS
 Instructor: THOMAS, MARK S
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 539
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	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	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 3	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99 1	B 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 responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 14	
			? 1		

Course-Section: ECON 102 0301
 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

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	11	9	4.32	878/1674	4.17	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	4.23	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	3.94	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	3.45	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	3.88	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	4.09	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	13	4.62	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	3.62	3.77	3.94	3.78	4.14	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	2	2	1	1	2.86	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	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	4.88	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	4.88	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 95	****	4.71	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 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	****	
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	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: ECON 102 0301
 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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected 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	B	7						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	3	C	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 102 0401
 Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS
 Instructor: FRANCIS, JOHANN
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 541
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	3	11	7	4.09	1123/1674	4.17	4.22	4.27	4.07	4.09	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	7	7	8	4.05	1118/1674	4.23	4.25	4.23	4.16	4.05	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	3	3	8	8	3.95	1061/1423	4.29	4.37	4.27	4.16	3.95	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	3	3	6	4	3.69	1366/1609	4.01	4.13	4.22	4.05	3.69	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	6	8	5	3.64	1142/1585	3.67	3.96	3.96	3.88	3.64	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	2	3	3	7	3	3.33	1355/1535	3.89	4.01	4.08	3.89	3.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	7	9	5	3.77	1310/1651	4.10	4.33	4.18	4.10	3.77	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	11	10	4.48	1235/1673	4.44	4.66	4.69	4.67	4.48	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	3	12	2	3.94	1056/1656	4.00	4.02	4.07	3.96	3.94	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	10	9	4.33	1074/1586	4.61	4.53	4.43	4.37	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	2	7	11	4.29	1383/1585	4.57	4.68	4.69	4.60	4.29	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	5	9	5	3.76	1296/1582	4.22	4.24	4.26	4.17	3.76	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	3	9	8	4.25	958/1575	4.41	4.38	4.27	4.17	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	12	2	0	2	4	0	3.00	1217/1380	3.62	3.77	3.94	3.78	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	2	3	2	1	3.00	1353/1520	3.68	3.80	4.01	3.76	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	1	3	2	1	3.13	1409/1515	3.97	4.05	4.24	3.97	3.13	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	0	3	2	2	3.50	1308/1511	4.15	4.12	4.27	4.00	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	7	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 994	3.50	3.64	3.94	3.73	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	5
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	B 8		Graduate 1
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 22
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	13
			? 1		

Course-Section: ECON 102 0601
 Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS
 Instructor: FALCON, JAIME
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 542
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	703/1674	4.17	4.22	4.27	4.07	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	830/1674	4.23	4.25	4.23	4.16	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	153/1423	4.29	4.37	4.27	4.16	4.88	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	408/1609	4.01	4.13	4.22	4.05	4.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute 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 written assignments contribute to 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 the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	866/1651	4.10	4.33	4.18	4.10	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	1511/1673	4.44	4.66	4.69	4.67	4.13	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	331/1656	4.00	4.02	4.07	3.96	4.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures 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 the instructor seem interested in 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 lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	632/1582	4.22	4.24	4.26	4.17	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to 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 audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1380	3.62	3.77	3.94	3.78	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute 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 students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1515	3.97	4.05	4.24	3.97	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1511	4.15	4.12	4.27	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	3.97	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	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	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	406/1674	4.17	4.22	4.27	4.07	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	519/1674	4.23	4.25	4.23	4.16	4.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	376/1423	4.29	4.37	4.27	4.16	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	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	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	482/1585	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	169/1535	3.89	4.01	4.08	3.89	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	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	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	6	4.71	214/1656	4.00	4.02	4.07	3.96	4.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	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. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	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	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	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	1/1520	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	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	****/ 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	****/ 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	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	3.88	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

I	0	Other	6
?	0		

Course-Section: ECON 102 0801
 Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS
 Instructor: Gindling, Tim
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 544
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	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	10	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	10	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/ 994	3.50	3.64	3.94	3.73	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected 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	B 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 responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 12	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ECON 121 0101
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I
 Instructor: ST MARTIN, JEAN
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 545
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	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	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	4	1	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	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1	B	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	24				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ECON 121 0201
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I
 Instructor: ST MARTIN, JEAN
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 546
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	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	8	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	4.73	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	4.21	4.02	4.07	3.96	4.60	
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	0	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	3.88	3.64	3.94	3.73	3.91	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	3.97	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	1
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	B 9		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 1		Under-grad 22
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	16
			? 1		

Course-Section: ECON 121 0301
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I
 Instructor: CROTEAU, MARCIA
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 547
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	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	507/1674	4.56	4.25	4.23	4.16	4.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	16	4.48	599/1423	4.58	4.37	4.27	4.16	4.48	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	1	1	5	10	4.22	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	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	0	3	6	6	4.00	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	0	3	22	4.88	742/1673	4.81	4.66	4.69	4.67	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	9	9	4.29	680/1656	4.21	4.02	4.07	3.96	4.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	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	2	0	0	1	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	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	8	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	****/ 994	3.88	3.64	3.94	3.73	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 1	A 14	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 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 responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 19	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ECON 121 0401
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I
 Instructor: CROTEAU, MARCIA
 Enrollment: 46
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 548
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	8	24	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	0	12	2	0	5	10	5	3.73	923/1380	4.03	3.77	3.94	3.78	3.73	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	2	1	3	5	7	3.78	1010/1520	4.14	3.80	4.01	3.76	3.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	3	1	2	7	5	3.56	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	1	9	5	3.94	1103/1511	4.25	4.12	4.27	4.00	3.94	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	12	1	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	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	19	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	27				
				?	0						

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

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	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	5	7	12	4.29	903/1674	4.48	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	551/1423	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	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	7	15	4.54	471/1651	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	635/1673	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	14	4.45	704/1582	4.58	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	4.62	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. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	2	0	1	5	4	3.75	1027/1520	4.14	3.80	4.01	3.76	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	2	5	2	3	3.50	1303/1515	3.99	4.05	4.24	3.97	3.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	2	2	5	3	3.75	1221/1511	4.25	4.12	4.27	4.00	3.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	6	0	1	1	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	5.00	****/ 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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	4	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	2	C	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ECON 121 0601
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I
 Instructor: COLE, RICHARD
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 550
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	13	9	4.19	1026/1674	4.48	4.22	4.27	4.07	4.19	
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	4.62	
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	4.64	
4. 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	4.19	
5. 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	4.10	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	1	2	3	2	10	4.00	870/1535	4.23	4.01	4.08	3.89	4.00	
7. 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	4.81	
8. 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	4.73	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	2	13	6	4.05	930/1656	4.21	4.02	4.07	3.96	4.05	
Lecture															
1. 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	4.79	
2. 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	4.48	
3. 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	4.46	
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	4.77	
5. 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	3.47	
Discussion															
1. 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	4.31	
2. 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	4.18	
3. 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	4.06	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	10	1	1	0	1	4	3.86	591/ 994	3.88	3.64	3.94	3.73	3.86	
Seminar															
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.71	4.31	3.99	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	1
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	B 14		Graduate 0
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	C 5	General	1
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 26
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	23
			? 2		

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

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	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	4.10	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	4.37	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	4.11	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	1	3.78	1290/1582	4.07	4.24	4.26	4.17	3.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	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	4.00	****/ 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	4.00	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 122 0201
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING II
 Instructor: GREENE, RICHARD
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 552
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	9	10	4.17	1056/1674	3.97	4.22	4.27	4.07	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	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 questions reflect the expected 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 evaluations reflect the expected 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 readings 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 assignments contribute to 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 explained	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 was 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 grade the overall teaching 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 instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	431/1586	4.28	4.53	4.43	4.37	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	3	18	4.70	1035/1585	4.49	4.68	4.69	4.60	4.70	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	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 your 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 discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	1	2	7	2	3.62	1122/1520	3.66	3.80	4.01	3.76	3.62	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	2	2	8	4.31	857/1515	4.03	4.05	4.24	3.97	4.31	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	845/1511	4.09	4.12	4.27	4.00	4.31	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	6	2	0	2	2	1	3.00	881/ 994	3.00	3.64	3.94	3.73	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 7		Graduate 0
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	C 8	General	1
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 1		Under-grad 24
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	19
			? 0		

Course-Section: ECON 122 0301
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING II
 Instructor: DAVIS, MARY B
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 553
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	9	12	4.43	719/1674	3.97	4.22	4.27	4.07	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	16	4.65	392/1674	4.12	4.25	4.23	4.16	4.65	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	15	4.52	551/1423	4.16	4.37	4.27	4.16	4.52	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	1	1	6	8	4.31	771/1609	3.90	4.13	4.22	4.05	4.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute 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 written assignments contribute to 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 grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	169/1651	4.26	4.33	4.18	4.10	4.82	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1673	4.74	4.66	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	10	8	4.24	744/1656	3.56	4.02	4.07	3.96	4.24	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	354/1586	4.28	4.53	4.43	4.37	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	664/1585	4.49	4.68	4.69	4.60	4.87	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	8	15	4.65	452/1582	4.07	4.24	4.26	4.17	4.65	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	311/1575	4.17	4.38	4.27	4.17	4.78	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	1	0	3	3	8	4.13	594/1380	3.42	3.77	3.94	3.78	4.13	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	1059/1520	3.66	3.80	4.01	3.76	3.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	1233/1515	4.03	4.05	4.24	3.97	3.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	1166/1511	4.09	4.12	4.27	4.00	3.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	5	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 994	3.00	3.64	3.94	3.73	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 11	Required for Majors	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	B 7		Graduate 0
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 23
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	21
			? 0		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	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	3.90	4.13	4.22	4.05	3.59	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	3	1	5	4	7	3.55	1193/1585	4.07	3.96	3.96	3.88	3.55	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	3	1	2	7	8	3.76	1140/1535	3.81	4.01	4.08	3.89	3.76	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	0	4	8	11	3.92	1201/1651	4.26	4.33	4.18	4.10	3.92	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	9	17	4.56	1169/1673	4.74	4.66	4.69	4.67	4.56	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	4	2	9	7	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	3.52	1476/1586	4.28	4.53	4.43	4.37	3.52	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	2	0	2	5	15	4.29	1378/1585	4.49	4.68	4.69	4.60	4.29	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	2	1	10	5	5	3.43	1431/1582	4.07	4.24	4.26	4.17	3.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	2	3	5	5	8	3.61	1350/1575	4.17	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	3.66	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	4.08	1024/1511	4.09	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	****/ 95	****	4.71	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 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	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 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	1.00	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 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	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 8		Graduate 0
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	C 8	General	0
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 27
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	25

Course-Section: ECON 263 0101
 Title: SPORTS ECONOMICS
 Instructor: COATES, DENNIS
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 555
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	233/1674	4.82	4.22	4.27	4.32	4.82	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	530/1674	4.55	4.25	4.23	4.26	4.55	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	298/1423	4.73	4.37	4.27	4.36	4.73	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	941/1609	4.18	4.13	4.22	4.23	4.18	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	769/1585	4.00	3.96	3.96	3.91	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	828/1535	4.10	4.01	4.08	4.03	4.10	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	169/1651	4.82	4.33	4.18	4.20	4.82	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	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	1	6	3	4.20	794/1656	4.20	4.02	4.07	4.10	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	453/1586	4.78	4.53	4.43	4.48	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	874/1585	4.78	4.68	4.69	4.76	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and 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 lectures contribute to 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 audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	1324/1380	2.50	3.77	3.94	4.03	2.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute 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 all students actively encouraged 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 instructor encourage fair and 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 special techniques successful	7	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 994	****	3.64	3.94	3.98	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	7	Under-grad	11	Non-major	8
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 280 0101
Title INTERNATIONAL ECONOMY
Instructor: TAKACS, WENDY E
Enrollment: 13
Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2005

Page 556
JAN 21, 2006
Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank						

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	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	372/1651	4.63	4.33	4.18	4.20	4.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	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	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	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	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	B	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 301 0101
 Title INTERMED ACCOUNTING I
 Instructor: GERKIN, ELIZABE
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 557
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	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	3.32	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	3.84	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	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	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	2	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	4	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	3.73	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	3.27	1366/1511	3.50	4.12	4.27	4.34	3.27	
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	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ECON 301 0201
 Title INTERMED ACCOUNTING I
 Instructor: CROTEAU, MARCIA
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 558
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	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	4.68	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	3.23	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	4.09	996/1515	3.91	4.05	4.24	4.32	4.09	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	2	0	2	2	5	3.73	1238/1511	3.50	4.12	4.27	4.34	3.73	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	9	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 994	3.00	3.64	3.94	3.96	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	14
			? 0		

Course-Section: ECON 301H 0101
 Title
 Instructor: CROTEAU, MARCIA (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 559
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	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	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	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	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	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	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 301H 0101
 Title
 Instructor: CROTEAU, MARCIA (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 560
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	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	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	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	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	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	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 309 0101
 Title SUR OF ECON/FIN
 Instructor: THOMAS, MARK S
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 561
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	4	2	4	2	3.33	1563/1674	3.33	4.22	4.27	4.26	3.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	3	3	3	3	3.50	1499/1674	3.50	4.25	4.23	4.21	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	7	4	4.25	845/1423	4.25	4.37	4.27	4.27	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	2	2	4	3	3.73	1341/1609	3.73	4.13	4.22	4.27	3.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	4	5	1	3.33	1329/1585	3.33	3.96	3.96	3.95	3.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	2	1	3	3	3.50	1295/1535	3.50	4.01	4.08	4.15	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	4	4	3	3.75	1324/1651	3.75	4.33	4.18	4.16	3.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	9	2	4.18	1470/1673	4.18	4.66	4.69	4.68	4.18	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	1	0	4	0	3.60	1330/1656	3.60	4.02	4.07	4.07	3.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	1	1	6	0	3.33	1510/1586	3.33	4.53	4.43	4.42	3.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	2	0	4	3	3.89	1509/1585	3.89	4.68	4.69	4.66	3.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	2	1	1	5	0	3.00	1504/1582	3.00	4.24	4.26	4.26	3.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	3	0	2	4	0	2.78	1530/1575	2.78	4.38	4.27	4.25	2.78	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	2	0	1	2	2	3.29	1149/1380	3.29	3.77	3.94	4.01	3.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1520	****	3.80	4.01	4.09	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1515	****	4.05	4.24	4.32	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1511	****	4.12	4.27	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 994	****	3.64	3.94	3.96	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ECON 311 0101
 Title INTERM MICROECON ANALY
 Instructor: COATES, DENNIS
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 562
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	0	8	13	4.35	841/1674	4.21	4.22	4.27	4.26	4.35	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	14	4.43	689/1674	4.31	4.25	4.23	4.21	4.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	17	4.57	505/1423	4.26	4.37	4.27	4.27	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	1	0	3	5	6	4.00	1094/1609	4.24	4.13	4.22	4.27	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	0	4	6	3	3.92	879/1585	3.61	3.96	3.96	3.95	3.92	
6. Did written assignments contribute to 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 the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	4	16	4.43	628/1651	4.39	4.33	4.18	4.16	4.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1673	4.96	4.66	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	5	10	4	3.80	1200/1656	3.92	4.02	4.07	4.07	3.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	3	18	4.70	618/1586	4.56	4.53	4.43	4.42	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	3	17	4.61	1142/1585	4.66	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.61	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	2	6	13	4.30	882/1582	4.33	4.24	4.26	4.26	4.30	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	7	13	4.35	876/1575	4.31	4.38	4.27	4.25	4.35	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	17	2	0	1	2	1	3.00	1217/1380	2.75	3.77	3.94	4.01	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute 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 all students actively encouraged 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 instructor encourage fair and 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 special techniques successful	14	8	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 994	****	3.64	3.94	3.96	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	1
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 1
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 4	General	0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 22
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 1		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	18
			? 0		

Course-Section: ECON 311 0201
 Title INTERM MICROECON ANALY
 Instructor: TAKACS, WENDY E
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 563
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	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	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 8
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 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 responses to be significant
			P 0		
			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	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	1	0	4	10	15	4.27	941/1674	4.21	4.22	4.27	4.26	4.27	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	14	15	4.52	566/1674	4.31	4.25	4.23	4.21	4.52	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	6	21	4.60	459/1423	4.26	4.37	4.27	4.27	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	3.64	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	5.00	****/ 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	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ECON 311 0401
 Title INTERM MICROECON ANALY
 Instructor: COATES, DENNIS
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 565
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	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	4.25	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. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1520	4.00	3.80	4.01	4.09	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1515	4.15	4.05	4.24	4.32	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1511	4.33	4.12	4.27	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 994	****	3.64	3.94	3.96	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ECON 312 0101
 Title INTERM MACROECON ANALY
 Instructor: Cinyabuguma, Ma
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 566
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	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	4.00	1472/1585	4.27	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	4	3	4	1	3	2.73	1550/1582	3.31	4.24	4.26	4.26	2.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	3	3	4	1	3	2.86	1522/1575	3.37	4.38	4.27	4.25	2.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	12	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1380	3.74	3.77	3.94	4.01	****	
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	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	0
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 17
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	12
			? 2		

Course-Section: ECON 312 0201
 Title INTERM MACROECON ANALY
 Instructor: Cinyabuguma, Ma
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 567
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	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	0	0	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	4.22	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	3.43	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	3.39	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	3.36	1113/1380	3.74	3.77	3.94	4.01	3.36	
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	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 2	A 5	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 11		Graduate 1
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 5	C 6	General	0
84-150	9	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		Under-grad 22
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	19
			? 0		

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

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	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	3.81	4.12	4.27	4.34	4.45	
4. Were special techniques successful	19	17	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 994	3.50	3.64	3.94	3.96	****	
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	3.00	****/ 99	****	4.75	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	37	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	****	4.88	4.14	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	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	38	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	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	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	4.29	****	

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	31				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 320 0101
 Title QUANT MTHDS:MANAGEMENT
 Instructor: PALMATEER, JASO
 Enrollment: 79
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 569
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	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	1	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	1	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	2	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	1203/1673	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	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		Graduate 0
56-83	11	2.00-2.99 3	C 2	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 7	D 0		Under-grad 24
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	19
			? 0		

Course-Section: ECON 320 0201
 Title QUANT MTHDS:MANAGEMENT
 Instructor: PALMATEER, JASO
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 570
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	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	460/1674	4.50	4.25	4.23	4.21	4.61	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	238/1423	4.43	4.37	4.27	4.27	4.77	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	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	0	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	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	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	1	3.00	****/ 994	4.17	3.64	3.94	3.96	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected 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	B 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 responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 20	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ECON 374 0101
 Title FUND FINANCIAL MGMT
 Instructor: ANORUO, EMMANUE
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 571
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	1	6	7	12	3.93	1296/1674	3.93	4.22	4.27	4.26	3.93	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	1	4	9	11	3.86	1305/1674	3.86	4.25	4.23	4.21	3.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	3	22	4.61	459/1423	4.61	4.37	4.27	4.27	4.61	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	11	1	0	4	3	9	4.12	1018/1609	4.12	4.13	4.22	4.27	4.12	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	9	3	0	4	4	8	3.74	1066/1585	3.74	3.96	3.96	3.95	3.74	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	2	1	4	6	8	3.81	1110/1535	3.81	4.01	4.08	4.15	3.81	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	4	4	17	4.18	956/1651	4.18	4.33	4.18	4.16	4.18	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	5	21	4.81	887/1673	4.81	4.66	4.69	4.68	4.81	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	2	10	8	3	3.52	1367/1656	3.52	4.02	4.07	4.07	3.52	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	1	8	17	4.39	1014/1586	4.39	4.53	4.43	4.42	4.39	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	3	6	7	12	4.00	1472/1585	4.00	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	2	3	10	11	4.04	1114/1582	4.04	4.24	4.26	4.26	4.04	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	3	4	6	14	4.15	1060/1575	4.15	4.38	4.27	4.25	4.15	
5. Did audiovisual 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 class discussions contribute to 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 all students actively encouraged 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 the instructor 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 special techniques successful	18	8	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 994	****	3.64	3.94	3.96	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 1	A 17	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		
56-83	7	2.00-2.99 4	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 29 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 enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 25	
			? 1		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	6	7	4.18	1046/1674	4.18	4.22	4.27	4.42	4.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	11	4.53	554/1674	4.53	4.25	4.23	4.31	4.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	404/1423	4.65	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.65		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	490/1609	4.50	4.13	4.22	4.30	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	4	3	6	3.80	1006/1585	3.80	3.96	3.96	4.01	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	3	1	0	4	3.63	1229/1535	3.63	4.01	4.08	4.18	3.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	0	14	4.65	351/1651	4.65	4.33	4.18	4.23	4.65	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	11	5	4.31	1375/1673	4.31	4.66	4.69	4.67	4.31	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	615/1656	4.33	4.02	4.07	4.19	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures 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 instructor seem interested in 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 lecture material presented and explained 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 lectures contribute to 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 audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	817/1380	3.88	3.77	3.94	4.04	3.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	4	4	4.11	768/1520	4.11	3.80	4.01	4.18	4.11	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	827/1515	4.33	4.05	4.24	4.40	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	816/1511	4.33	4.12	4.27	4.45	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	600/ 994	3.83	3.64	3.94	4.19	3.83	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	4.21	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	4.86	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	4.24	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.86	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.13	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.48	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	17	Non-major	12
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ECON 410 0101
 Title TOPICS IN FIN ECON
 Instructor: GRIBBIN, JOSEPH
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 573
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	4.71	
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	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ECON 415 0101
 Title PRPRTY RIGHTS,ORGAN,MG
 Instructor: CARROLL, KATHLE
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 574
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	148/1674	4.91	4.22	4.27	4.42	4.91	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	1009/1674	4.18	4.25	4.23	4.31	4.18	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	4	6	4.27	828/1423	4.27	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.27	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	645/1609	4.40	4.13	4.22	4.30	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	131/1585	4.82	3.96	3.96	4.01	4.82	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	337/1535	4.55	4.01	4.08	4.18	4.55	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	1	8	4.45	598/1651	4.45	4.33	4.18	4.23	4.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	1001/1673	4.73	4.66	4.69	4.67	4.73	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	615/1656	4.33	4.02	4.07	4.19	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	371/1586	4.82	4.53	4.43	4.46	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	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	2	0	4	5	4.09	1084/1582	4.09	4.24	4.26	4.31	4.09	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	171/1575	4.91	4.38	4.27	4.35	4.91	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	1178/1380	3.20	3.77	3.94	4.04	3.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	397/1520	4.50	3.80	4.01	4.18	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	898/1515	4.25	4.05	4.24	4.40	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	779/1511	4.38	4.12	4.27	4.45	4.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	6	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 994	****	3.64	3.94	4.19	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	4.88	4.41	4.42	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	4.86	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	4.24	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.86	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	4	Under-grad	10	Non-major	6
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 421 0101
 Title INTRO TO ECONOMETRICS
 Instructor: FARROW, SCOTT
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 575
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	5	0	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	4	5	4	3.86	1305/1674	3.86	4.25	4.23	4.31	3.86	
3. Did 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	3.79	
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	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	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	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	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	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
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 7		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	2
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 19
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	11
			? 0		

Course-Section: ECON 439 0101
 Title ENVIRONMENTAL ECONOMIC
 Instructor: MCCONNELL, VIRG
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 576
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	2	2	5	17	4.42	735/1674	4.42	4.22	4.27	4.42	4.42	
2. Did the instructor 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 questions 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 evaluations reflect the 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 readings contribute to 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 assignments 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 explained	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 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 grade the overall teaching 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 instructor's lectures well 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 instructor 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 material 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 contribute to what 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 discussions contribute to 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 students actively encouraged 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 instructor encourage fair 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 techniques successful	19	2	0	1	3	0	2	3.50	****/ 994	****	3.64	3.94	4.19	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.88	4.41	4.42	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.88	4.48	4.65	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.71	4.31	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.75	4.39	4.57	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.88	4.14	4.46	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 8		Graduate 1
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 6	General	3
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 26
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	16
			? 1		

Course-Section: ECON 441 0101
 Title AMERICAN ECONOMIC HIST
 Instructor: LORD, WILLIAM
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 577
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	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	4.05	1111/1674	4.05	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															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	5	13	4.50	858/1586	4.50	4.53	4.43	4.46	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	7	11	4.45	1275/1585	4.45	4.68	4.69	4.76	4.45	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	7	11	4.40	777/1582	4.40	4.24	4.26	4.31	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	4	13	4.45	768/1575	4.45	4.38	4.27	4.35	4.45	
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	3	3.50	1303/1515	3.50	4.05	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	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 12		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	1
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 21
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	19
			? 0		

Course-Section: ECON 443 0101
 Title HIST OF ECON THOUGHT I
 Instructor: BRADLEY, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 578
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	817/1674	4.36	4.22	4.27	4.42	4.36	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	906/1674	4.27	4.25	4.23	4.31	4.27	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected 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 evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	701/1609	4.36	4.13	4.22	4.30	4.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute 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 written assignments contribute to 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 system clearly explained	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 class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	1103/1673	4.64	4.66	4.69	4.67	4.64	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	451/1656	4.45	4.02	4.07	4.19	4.45	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	753/1586	4.60	4.53	4.43	4.46	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	5	4	4.20	998/1582	4.20	4.24	4.26	4.31	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	579/1575	4.60	4.38	4.27	4.35	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	4	1	2	3.71	930/1380	3.71	3.77	3.94	4.04	3.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	2	1	1	2	3.14	1321/1520	3.14	3.80	4.01	4.18	3.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	971/1515	4.14	4.05	4.24	4.40	4.14	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	990/1511	4.14	4.12	4.27	4.45	4.14	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	6	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 994	****	3.64	3.94	4.19	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	2
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 11
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	8
			? 0		

Course-Section: ECON 451 0101
 Title LABOR ECONOMICS
 Instructor: GOLDFARB, MARSH
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 579
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	8	24	4.60	485/1674	4.60	4.22	4.27	4.42	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected 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 exam questions reflect the 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 other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	2	3	5	13	4.26	839/1609	4.26	4.13	4.22	4.30	4.26	
5. Did assigned readings contribute 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 written assignments contribute to 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 system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	14	20	4.54	471/1651	4.54	4.33	4.18	4.23	4.54	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	30	5	4.14	1497/1673	4.14	4.66	4.69	4.67	4.14	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	10	17	4.63	292/1656	4.63	4.02	4.07	4.19	4.63	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	29	4.91	214/1586	4.91	4.53	4.43	4.46	4.91	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	4	27	4.81	786/1585	4.81	4.68	4.69	4.76	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	4	26	4.81	246/1582	4.81	4.24	4.26	4.31	4.81	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	6	24	4.74	375/1575	4.74	4.38	4.27	4.35	4.74	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	17	3	1	2	0	6	3.42	1088/1380	3.42	3.77	3.94	4.04	3.42	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	2	0	3	3	8	3.94	889/1520	3.94	3.80	4.01	4.18	3.94	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	1	2	3	10	4.38	788/1515	4.38	4.05	4.24	4.40	4.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	642/1511	4.50	4.12	4.27	4.45	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	19	10	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	****/ 994	****	3.64	3.94	4.19	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	34	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 11	Required for Majors	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 14		Graduate 4
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 6	General	6
84-150	16	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 31
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 1		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	24
			? 0		

Course-Section: ECON 453 0101
 Title HOUSEHOLD ECONOMICS
 Instructor: LORD, WILLIAM
 Enrollment: 47
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 580
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	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	2.25	****/ 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 5	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0 Major 9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 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 responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 18	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ECON 463 0101
 Title THEORY OF PUBLIC FINAN
 Instructor: BRENNAN, TIMOTH
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 581
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	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	3.78	1358/1674	3.78	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	3.53	1211/1585	3.53	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	4.65	1094/1585	4.65	4.68	4.69	4.76	4.65	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	5	5	5	3.71	1333/1582	3.71	4.24	4.26	4.31	3.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	5	6	5	3.88	1225/1575	3.88	4.38	4.27	4.35	3.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	2	1	2	5	1	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	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 9		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	2
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	D 1		Under-grad 18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	15
			? 0		

Course-Section: ECON 467 0101
 Title HEALTH ECONOMICS
 Instructor: COOPER, PHILIP
 Enrollment: 44
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 582
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 474 0101
 Title: CASES IN CORPORATE FIN
 Instructor: LINGELBACH, DAV
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 583
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	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	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	19	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	18	4.95	91/1582	4.95	4.24	4.26	4.31	4.95	
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	4.95	
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	289/1515	4.83	4.05	4.24	4.40	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	266/1511	4.89	4.12	4.27	4.45	4.89	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	2	0	14	4.75	115/ 994	4.75	3.64	3.94	4.19	4.75	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 7		Graduate 1
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	5
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 18
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	13
			? 1		

Course-Section: ECON 477 0101
 Title DERIVATIVE SECURITIES
 Instructor: GETTER, DARYL
 Enrollment: 47
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 584
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	21	4.74	309/1674	4.74	4.22	4.27	4.42	4.74	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	23	4.85	176/1674	4.85	4.25	4.23	4.31	4.85	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	22	4.81	195/1423	4.81	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.81	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected 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 readings contribute 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 assignments contribute 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 system clearly explained	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 cancelled	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 overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	8	11	4.50	381/1656	4.50	4.02	4.07	4.19	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	22	4.81	389/1586	4.81	4.53	4.43	4.46	4.81	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	25	4.96	227/1585	4.96	4.68	4.69	4.76	4.96	
3. Was lecture material presented 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 lectures contribute to 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 audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	14	1	0	0	3	8	4.42	371/1380	4.42	3.77	3.94	4.04	4.42	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute 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	
2. Were all students actively encouraged 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 instructor encourage fair and 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 special techniques successful	18	7	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 994	****	3.64	3.94	4.19	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	4.21	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 9		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	4
84-150	15	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 27
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	18
			? 1		

Course-Section: ECON 482 0101
 Title INTERNATIONAL FINANCE
 Instructor: MCINTYRE, KEVIN
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 585
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	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	4.70	1040/1673	4.70	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	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 10		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 1	C 8	General	0
84-150	18	3.00-3.49 13	D 0		Under-grad 33
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 9	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	27
			? 0		

Course-Section: ECON 490 0101
 Title ANALYTIC METHODS IN EC
 Instructor: THOMAS, MARK S
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 586
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	1	3	6	6	3.88	1334/1674	3.97	4.22	4.27	4.42	3.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	4	8	4.12	1068/1674	4.24	4.25	4.23	4.31	4.12	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	4	1	11	4.24	861/1423	4.43	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.24	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	1	1	5	2	5	3.64	1388/1609	3.74	4.13	4.22	4.30	3.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	7	0	2	3	2	2	3.44	1267/1585	3.22	3.96	3.96	4.01	3.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	2	1	5	4	3	3.33	1355/1535	3.55	4.01	4.08	4.18	3.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	6	3	6	3.88	1246/1651	4.20	4.33	4.18	4.23	3.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	11	4	4.27	1412/1673	4.26	4.66	4.69	4.67	4.27	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	0	2	10	2	3.80	1200/1656	3.90	4.02	4.07	4.19	3.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	3	3	10	4.29	1112/1586	4.48	4.53	4.43	4.46	4.29	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	0	4	12	4.53	1208/1585	4.49	4.68	4.69	4.76	4.53	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	3	3	9	4.25	935/1582	4.29	4.24	4.26	4.31	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	8	8	4.29	923/1575	4.42	4.38	4.27	4.35	4.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	1	3	2	7	3.93	770/1380	4.07	3.77	3.94	4.04	3.93	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	1	0	1	4	3.86	955/1520	3.05	3.80	4.01	4.18	3.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	1	0	2	3	3.71	1233/1515	3.36	4.05	4.24	4.40	3.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	1243/1511	3.43	4.12	4.27	4.45	3.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	4	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 994	****	3.64	3.94	4.19	****	
Field Work															
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.86	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	18	Non-major	15
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 490 0201
 Title ANALYTIC METHODS IN EC
 Instructor: THOMAS, MARK S
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 587
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	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	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	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	4	1	1	1	1	2.25	1496/1520	3.05	3.80	4.01	4.18	2.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	2	0	2	2	1	3.00	1420/1515	3.36	4.05	4.24	4.40	3.00	
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	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	4.53	****	
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	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 493 0501
 Title INDIV RESEARCH IN ECON
 Instructor: CARROLL, KATHLE
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 588
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	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	0	1	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.25	4.23	4.31	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute 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 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	0	1	5.00	1/1656	5.00	4.02	4.07	4.19	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	4.46	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	4.76	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	4.31	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	4.35	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	4.18	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged 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 the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.12	4.27	4.45	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 600 0101
 Title POLICY CONSQ:ECON ANAL
 Instructor: BRENNAN, TIMOTH
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 589
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	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	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	4.06	
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	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	
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	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	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	14	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	****/ 994	****	3.64	3.94	4.07	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ECON 601 0101
 Title MICROECONOMIC ANALYSIS
 Instructor: BRADLEY, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 590
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	5	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	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	0	0	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	0	0	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	1	5	1	1	3.00	1353/1520	3.00	3.80	4.01	4.19	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	5	2	2	3.67	1253/1515	3.67	4.05	4.24	4.47	3.67	
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	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	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	B 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 responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 10	
			? 1		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	287/1674	4.77	4.22	4.27	4.44	4.77	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	542/1674	4.54	4.25	4.23	4.34	4.54	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	3	8	4.31	803/1423	4.31	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.31	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	1	8	4.33	743/1609	4.33	4.13	4.22	4.34	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	2	8	4.31	512/1585	4.31	3.96	3.96	4.23	4.31	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	260/1535	4.64	4.01	4.08	4.27	4.64	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	298/1651	4.69	4.33	4.18	4.32	4.69	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	944/1673	4.77	4.66	4.69	4.78	4.77	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	655/1656	4.31	4.02	4.07	4.15	4.31	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	319/1586	4.85	4.53	4.43	4.50	4.85	
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	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	956/1582	4.23	4.24	4.26	4.33	4.23	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	5	7	4.38	838/1575	4.38	4.38	4.27	4.30	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	447/1380	4.30	3.77	3.94	3.85	4.30	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	1	3	4	3.42	1215/1520	3.42	3.80	4.01	4.19	3.42	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	629/1515	4.50	4.05	4.24	4.47	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	3	0	8	4.25	896/1511	4.25	4.12	4.27	4.49	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	9	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 994	****	3.64	3.94	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	4.51	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	4.42	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.67	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	4.46	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	4.59	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.64	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 4	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 8			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 9	Non-major 13
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 10		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ECON 652 0101
 Title ECONOMICS OF HEALTH
 Instructor: GOLDFARB, MARSH
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 592
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	276/1674	4.78	4.22	4.27	4.44	4.78	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	12	4.50	578/1674	4.50	4.25	4.23	4.34	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	4	11	4.47	611/1423	4.47	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.47	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	5	10	4.41	629/1609	4.41	4.13	4.22	4.34	4.41	
5. Did assigned readings contribute 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 written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	0	4	12	4.53	355/1535	4.53	4.01	4.08	4.27	4.53	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	5	12	4.50	524/1651	4.50	4.33	4.18	4.32	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	8	4.44	1267/1673	4.44	4.66	4.69	4.78	4.44	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	561/1656	4.38	4.02	4.07	4.15	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	249/1586	4.89	4.53	4.43	4.50	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	615/1585	4.89	4.68	4.69	4.79	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	217/1582	4.83	4.24	4.26	4.33	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	343/1575	4.76	4.38	4.27	4.30	4.76	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	10	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	363/1380	4.43	3.77	3.94	3.85	4.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute 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 all students actively encouraged 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 instructor encourage fair and 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 special techniques successful	5	11	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 994	****	3.64	3.94	4.07	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 1	A 8	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 6 Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 6	Under-grad 12 Non-major 18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 9	
			? 1		