Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

Instructor: CARROLL, KATHLE

Enrollment: 34
Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 482 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	8	8	4.33	816/1669	3.75	4.20	4.23	4.02	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	6	8	4.22	922/1666	3.80	4.22	4.19	4.11	4.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	3	12	4.39	701/1421	3.94	4.27	4.24	4.11	4.39
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	0	3	3	5	3.92	1154/1617	3.54	4.04	4.15	3.99	3.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	7	7	4.06	741/1555	3.81	3.98	4.00	3.92	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	1195/1543	3.37	3.93	4.06	3.86	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	583/1647	3.82	4.31	4.12	4.06	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	10	4.56	1157/1668	4.58	4.67	4.67	4.62	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	1	5	1	8	4.07	877/1605	3.64	4.01	4.07	3.96	4.07
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	Λ	2	4	11	4.53	775/1514	4.21	4.53	4.39	4.32	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	973/1551	4.52	4.72	4.66	4.55	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	5	5	- 6		1127/1503	3.73	4.22	4.24	4.17	3.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	3	5	7		1132/1506	3.86	4.27	4.26	4.17	3.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	10	0	0	0	5	2		426/1311		3.81		3.68	
_, ,														
Discussion		_	_	_	_	_	_							
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	0	2	3	3		1154/1490		3.86	4.05	3.85	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	3	4	2		1279/1502	3.71	4.02	4.26	4.06	3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8 8	0	1	U T	3	2	3		1279/1489	3.79	4.10	4.29	4.07	3.50 ***
4. Were special techniques successful	8	/	U	U	T	1	Τ	4.00	****/1006	3.83	4.05	4.00	3.81	* * * *
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
Frequ	encv	Dist	rib	ution	ı									

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

Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

Instructor: CARROLL, KATHLE

Enrollment: 36
Questionnaires: 12

KATHLE Fall 2

I 0

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2006

Page 483 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

						Fr	eque	ncies	5		Ins	tructo	r	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rar	nk	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 Did 1701	u gain ng	General w insights,skills f	rom this source	0	0	2	2	3	3	2	2 00	1590/1	1660	3.75	4.20	4.23	4.02	3.08
_	_	ctor make clear the		0	0	1	4	0	4			1527/1		3.80	4.22	4.19	4.11	
		lestions reflect the		0	0	2	2	1	3			1273/1		3.94	4.27		4.11	3.42
	_	lations reflect the		0	1	1	4	1	3			1501/1					3.99	3.09
		eadings contribute t		1	0	1	4	3	2			1480/1		3.81	3.98	4.00	3.92	2.82
	_	3	to what you learned	1	4	2	1	1	3			1492/1		3.37		4.06	3.86	2.71
		system clearly exp		1	0	1	0	2	5			1241/1				4.12		3.82
		was class cancelled		1	0	0	0	0	1			713/1		4.58			4.62	4.91
			aching effectiveness	3	0	0	3	1	5			1464/1						
		Lecture																
1 Were th	he instri	actor's lectures wel	1 prepared	0	0	1	0	1	4	6	4 17	1136/1	1514	4 21	4 53	4.39	4.32	4.17
		ctor seem interested		0	0	0	0	1	3	8		1127/1		4.52	4.72			4.58
		erial presented and	_	0	0	3	1	2	4	-		1418/1		3.73			4.17	
		es contribute to wha		0	0	3	2	2	2			1403/1			4.27		4.17	
		l techniques enhance	-	0	10	0	1	1	0			****/						****
3. 21a aa	a10115aa1	-	your undersounding	Ü		Ü	_	_	ŭ	Ü	2.50	, -		3.70	3.01	3.03	3.00	
1 Did ala	aga diga	Discussion ussions contribute t	o what you learned	1	0	2	2	3	3	1	2 01	1383/1	1 4 9 0	3.46	3.86	4.05	3.85	2.91
			_	1	0	0	3	3	5	0		1379/1		3.40	4.02	4.05	4.06	3.18
				1	0	0	3	1	2	-		1163/1		3.71	4.10	4.29	4.07	3.82
		tudents actively encouraged to participa structor encourage fair and open discusa al techniques successful			9	1	0	0	1			****/		3.79	4.05	4.00	3.81	****
		T - 1 +																
1 544 + 6.	- 1-b	Laboratory crease understanding	£ . b	10	1	1	0	0	0	0	1 00	****/	226	****	4.83	4.20	3.98	****
		_		10	0	0	1	1	0	0		****/		****	4.83	4.19	4.09	****
		materials available	ckground information	10	1	0	1	0	0	0		****/		****	4.33	4.19	4.42	****
	_	structor provide ass		10	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/		****	4.80	4.35	4.19	****
		its for lab reports		10	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/		****	5.00	4.15	4.19	****
o. were re	equiremen	its for lab reports	clearly specified	10	1	U	U	1	U	U	3.00	,	200		5.00	4.13	4.01	
1 513 61		Field Work		11	0	0	0	1	0	_	2 00	*****/	F 0	***	2 50	4 00	4 00	****
	_	rience contribute to	_	11 11	0	0	0 1	1 0	0	0	3.00	****/ ****/	58	****	3.50	4.22	4.00	****
2. Dia you	u cleari	y understand your ev	aluation criteria	11	U	U	Τ	U	U	U	2.00	****/	52	* * * * *	****	4.06	3.81	* * * *
		Self Paced																
1. Did se	lf-paced	system contribute t	o what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****
		tions make clear the		11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	42	****	****		4.08	****
		Frequ	ıency	Dist	trib	utio	n											
Cmodite T	awn od	Ermoghed Greater				Π.						m				Mo		
Credits Ea		Expected Grades					asons	. – – –				Тур	.е 			Majors 	; 	
00-27	1	A 0		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	s	3	Grad	duate	9	0	Majo	or	1	
28-55 56-83	2 1	B 1 C 6		Cos	nera	1				3	IInd	~~~	cad 1	L2	Non	ma iox	11	
84-150	0	2.00-2.99 0 3.00-3.49 1	D 1		Ger	пета	т				٥	OHA	er-gi	Lau J	L <b>Z</b>	MOI1-	-major	ТТ
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 1		יום.	ecti	7707				1	###1	H _ 7	Means t	here -	re not	enous	rh
Grad.	U	3.50-4.00 I	P 0		г. т. (	CULI	v C S				_			means ( es to b			_	111
			P 0		0-1	h					1	rest	-O1186	נט ג	re sign	ıııcdı	16	

Other

1

Course Section: ECON 101 0301 University of Maryland Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS Baltimore County

Baltimore County
Fall 2006

Page 484

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 43
Questionnaires: 19

COOMBER, WILLIA

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	1	2	6	5	2	3.31	1547/1669	3.75	4.20	4.23	4.02	3.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	4	3	6	4	3.59	1438/1666	3.80	4.22	4.19	4.11	3.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	3	0	4	3	6	3.56	1202/1421	3.94	4.27	4.24	4.11	3.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	6	1	4	1	1	3	3.10	1500/1617	3.54	4.04	4.15	3.99	3.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	3	1	2	1	4	4	3.67	1133/1555	3.81	3.98	4.00	3.92	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	6	0	3	3	1	2	3.22	1352/1543	3.37	3.93	4.06	3.86	3.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	4	4	3	4	3.47	1411/1647	3.82	4.31	4.12	4.06	3.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	1	0	1	0	10	3	4.07	1492/1668	4.58	4.67	4.67	4.62	4.07
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	918/1605	3.64	4.01	4.07	3.96	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	2	1	7	4	3.73	1330/1514	4.21	4.53	4.39	4.32	3.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	2	6	6		1326/1551	4.52	4.72	4.66	4.55	4.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	3	2	7	2	3.57	1309/1503	3.73	4.22	4.24	4.17	3.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	1	6	5	3.93	1153/1506	3.86	4.27	4.26	4.17	3.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	2	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	587/1311	3.76	3.81	3.85	3.68	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	1	2	2	0		1391/1490	3.46	3.86	4.05	3.85	2.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	1	2	1	1		1395/1502	3.71	4.02	4.26	4.06	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	1	3	0	1		1433/1489	3.79	4.10	4.29	4.07	2.83
4. Were special techniques successful	14	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1006	3.83	4.05	4.00	3.81	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

Instructor: MITCH, DAVID F

Enrollment: 38
Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2006

Page 485 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eguei	ncies	<b>;</b>		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		Mean
~														
General  1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	590/1669	3.75	4.20	4.23	4.02	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	814/1666	3.80	4.22	4.19	4.11	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	557/1421	3.94	4.27	4.24	4.11	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	583/1617	3.54	4.04	4.15	3.99	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	492/1555	3.81	3.98	4.00	3.92	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	723/1543	3.37	3.93	4.06	3.86	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	2	5		1043/1647	3.82	4.31	4.12	4.06	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	0	9		1125/1668	4.58	4.67	4.67	4.62	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	139/1605	3.64	4.01	4.07	3.96	4.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	408/1514	4.21	4.53	4.39	4.32	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	567/1551	4.52	4.72	4.66	4.55	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	800/1503	3.73	4.22	4.24	4.17	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	326/1506	3.86	4.27	4.26	4.17	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	189/1311	3.76	3.81	3.85	3.68	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	764/1490	3.46	3.86	4.05	3.85	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	938/1502	3.71	4.02	4.26	4.06	4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	684/1489	3.79	4.10	4.29	4.07	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	307/1006	3.83	4.05	4.00	3.81	4.40
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 226	****	4.83	4.20	3.98	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.83	4.19	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 225	****	4.33	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 223	****	4.80	4.35	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 206	****	5.00	4.15	4.01	****
Seminar	_	_	_		_	_								
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 112	****	4.70	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	1	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 97	***	5.00	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	1	0	0	1	0	0	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8 8	1 1	0	1	1	0	0		****/ 105 ****/ 98	****	4.60	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	Т	U	U	1	U	U	3.00	****/ 98		4.30	3.95	3.90	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 58	****	3.50	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	1	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	1	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****

Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

Instructor: MITCH, DAVID F

Enrollment: 38
Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 485 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Course Section: ECON 101 0501 University of Maryland
Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS Baltimore County

Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS Baltimore County Instructor: MITCH, DAVID F Fall 2006

Enrollment: 33
Questionnaires: 23

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 486

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

							Fre	equei	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	1	5	9	8	4.04	1145/1669	3.75	4.20	4.23	4.02	4.04
2. Did th	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	4	9	10	4.26	868/1666	3.80	4.22	4.19	4.11	4.26
3. Did th	e exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	3	9	11	4.35	737/1421	3.94	4.27	4.24	4.11	4.35
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	2	1	1	6	4	9	3.90	1168/1617	3.54	4.04	4.15	3.99	3.90
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	1	0	0	5	4	12	4.33	492/1555	3.81	3.98	4.00	3.92	4.33
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	1	0	1	1	6	8	6	3.77	1123/1543	3.37	3.93	4.06	3.86	3.77
7. Was th	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	1	0	0	1	7	5	9	4.00	1043/1647	3.82	4.31	4.12	4.06	4.00
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		2	1	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1668	4.58	4.67	4.67	4.62	5.00
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	5	2	2	1	4	7	2	3.38	1412/1605	3.64	4.01	4.07	3.96	3.38
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	2	8	13	4.48	845/1514	4.21	4.53	4.39	4.32	4.48
2. Did th	e instru	n the subject	0	0	0	0	2	8	13	4.48	1216/1551	4.52	4.72	4.66	4.55	4.48		
3. Was le	the instructor seem interested in the subject lecture material presented and explained clea					0	1	0	7	10	5	3.78	1220/1503	3.73	4.22	4.24	4.17	3.78
4. Did th	e lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	1	0	5	5	12	4.17	973/1506	3.86	4.27	4.26	4.17	4.17
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	2	9	2	0	2	5	3	3.58	899/1311	3.76	3.81	3.85	3.68	3.58
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	5	0	1	0	3	7	7	4.06	828/1490	3.46	3.86	4.05	3.85	4.06
2. Were a	ll stude	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	5	0	0	3	3	3	9	4.00	1013/1502	3.71	4.02	4.26	4.06	4.00
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	5	0	1	1	4	2	10	4.06	1025/1489	3.79	4.10	4.29	4.07	4.06
4. Were s	pecial t	echniques succe	ssful		5	4	0	4	2	2	6	3.71	669/1006	3.83	4.05	4.00	3.81	3.71
				Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ty	pe.			Majors	
														- 				
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 6		Re	quir	ed fo	or M	ajor	s	6	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	4
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В 6														
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 5		Ger	nera	l				2	Under-g	rad 2	23	Non-	major	19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0		_						_						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		El	ecti	ves				2	#### - 1				_	ŗh
				P 0			_						respons	es to k	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Ot]	her					8						

1

University of Maryland PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

Title Instructor: CARPENTER, ROBE

Enrollment: 95 Questionnaires: 51 Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 487 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean			
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	6	9	18	17	3.92	1265/1669	3.75	4.20	4.23	4.02	3.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	8	13	28	4.29	827/1666	3.80	4.22	4.19	4.11	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	8	10	31	4.35	728/1421	3.94	4.27	4.24	4.11	4.35
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	35	1	0	4	4	6	3.93	1126/1617	3.54	4.04	4.15	3.99	3.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	5	15	27	4.40	445/1555	3.81	3.98	4.00	3.92	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	41	2	0	1	2	3	3.50	****/1543	3.37	3.93	4.06	3.86	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	1	2	4	15	26	4.31	790/1647	3.82	4.31	4.12	4.06	4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	1	0	1	46	1	3.94	1574/1668	4.58	4.67	4.67	4.62	3.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	0	0	8	18	13	4.13	830/1605	3.64	4.01	4.07	3.96	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	15	33	4.65	600/1514	4.21	4 53	4.39	4.32	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	1	10	39		1000/1511		4.72	4.66	4.55	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	6	18	26	4.40	719/1503		4.22	4.24	4.17	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	1	6	8	32	4.44	731/1506		4.27	4.26	4.17	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	1	0	6	11	28	4.41	326/1311		3.81		3.68	4.41
5. Did didiovibidi eccimiques cimanee jour anderstanding	-	•	-	Ü	Ü		20	1.11	320/1311	3.70	3.01	3.03	3.00	1.11
Discussion		_		_	_									
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	1	6	9	14	4.10	812/1490	3.46	3.86	4.05	3.85	4.10
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	2	2	7	6	14		1117/1502		4.02	4.26	4.06	3.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	2	2	11	16	4.32	874/1489	3.79	4.10	4.29	4.07	4.32
4. Were special techniques successful	20	22	2	2	2	0	3	3.00	****/1006	3.83	4.05	4.00	3.81	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	45	4	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 226	****	4.83	4.20	3.98	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	47	0	1	0	0	3	0	3.25	****/ 233	****	4.83	4.19	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	48	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 225	****	4.33	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	48	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 223	****	4.80	4.35	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	48	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 206	****	5.00	4.15	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	47	2	0	0	0	1	1	4 50	****/ 112	****	4.70	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	48	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	48	1	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 92	****	4.50	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	0	0	2	1		****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	48	0	0	0	0	2	1		****/ 98	****	4.30	3.95	3.90	****
									,					
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	49	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 58	****	3.50	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	49	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	48	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	48	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	48	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	49	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	49	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	49	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	49	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	49	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****

Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

Instructor: CARPENTER, ROBE

Enrollment: 95
Questionnaires: 51

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 487 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits I	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	8	А	 7	Required for Majors	16	 Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	1	В	17						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	3	C	13	General	5	Under-grad	51	Non-major	46
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	3						

Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

KAIKAI, ALPHA

Instructor:

Enrollment:

37 Questionnaires: 23 Fall 2006

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Page 488 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

				Fre	equer	cie	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Ouestions	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	2	4	11	6	3.91	1276/1669	3.75	4.20	4.23	4.02	3.91
2.	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	10	7	3.96	1164/1666	3.80	4.22	4.19	4.11	3.96
3.	Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	7	9	4.00	969/1421	3.94	4.27	4.24	4.11	4.00
4.	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	1	3	6	1	3.64	1317/1617	3.54	4.04	4.15	3.99	3.64
5.	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	4	9	7	4.05	747/1555	3.81	3.98	4.00	3.92	4.05
6.	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	13	2	0	3	1	4	3.50	1260/1543	3.37	3.93	4.06	3.86	3.50
7.	Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	7	11	4.22	907/1647	3.82	4.31	4.12	4.06	4.22
8.	How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	21	2	4.09	1487/1668	4.58	4.67	4.67	4.62	4.09
9.	How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	7	10	3	3.80	1172/1605	3.64	4.01	4.07	3.96	3.80
	Lecture														
1	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	5	8	9	4 12	1124/1514	4.21	4.53	4.39	4.32	4.18
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	9	10		1314/1551	4.52	4.72	4.66	4.55	4.32
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	2	2	5	9		1189/1503	3.73	4.22	4.24	4.17	3.85
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	4	5	-		1002/1506		4.22		4.17	4.14
	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	14	0	1	3	2			875/1311		3.81			3.63
5.	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	Т	14	U	1	3	۷	۷	3.03	0/5/1311	3.70	3.01	3.05	3.00	3.03
	Discussion														
1.	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	3	5	5	4.00	849/1490	3.46	3.86	4.05	3.85	4.00
2.	Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	5	2	6	3.93	1096/1502	3.71	4.02	4.26	4.06	3.93
3.	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	0	8	5	4.21	941/1489	3.79	4.10	4.29	4.07	4.21
4.	Were special techniques successful	9	10	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/1006	3.83	4.05	4.00	3.81	***
	Tabanahann														
2	Laboratory	0.1	0	1	0	0	1	0	2 50	++++/ 222	****	4 02	4 10	4 00	****
	Were you provided with adequate background information	21	-	1		0	1	-		****/ 233	****	4.83	4.19	4.09	****
	Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	1 1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 225	****	4.33	4.50	4.42	****
4.	Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	Т	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223		4.80	4.35	4.19	
	Seminar														
1.	Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.70	4.38	4.04	****
2.	Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.19	****
3.	Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.22	3.79	****
	Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	3.94	****
	Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.30	3.95	3.90	***
-	Field Work	0.1	0	0	0	0	-	-	4 50	***** / 50	de de de de	2 50	4 00	4 00	***
	Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	Ţ		****/ 58	****	3.50	4.22	4.00	****
	Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52		****	4.06	3.81	
	Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	***
	To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	***
5.	Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****
	Self Paced														
1.	Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	***
	Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	***
	Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	***
	Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	***
	Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	***
٠.	I		-	-	-	-	Ū	_		, 2,					

Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

Instructor: KAIKAI, ALPHA

Enrollment: 37
Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 488 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	2	 А	6	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1	В	11						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	3	Under-grad	23	Non-major	23
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	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	1						

Course Section: ECON 101 1001 University of Maryland Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS Baltimore County

Instructor: KAIKAI, ALPHA

Enrollment: 42 Questionnaires: 25

Fall 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 489

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	7	8	9	3.96	1219/1669	3.75	4.20	4.23	4.02	3.96
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	7	8	7		1348/1666	3.80	4.22	4.19	4.11	3.72
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	4	5	4	11	3.80	1118/1421	3.94	4.27	4.24	4.11	3.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	17	0	2	1	1	4	3.88	1184/1617	3.54	4.04	4.15	3.99	3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	0	4	5	11	3.91	922/1555	3.81	3.98	4.00	3.92	3.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	15	0	0	4	4	2	3.80	1101/1543	3.37	3.93	4.06	3.86	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	4	8	9	3.84	1214/1647	3.82	4.31	4.12	4.06	3.84
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	21	4	4.16	1438/1668	4.58	4.67	4.67	4.62	4.16
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	9	7	5	3.73	1233/1605	3.64	4.01	4.07	3.96	3.73
▼ a selection														
Lecture	0	0	0	1	1	10	11	4 20	1020/1514	4 01	4 52	4.39	4 20	4 22
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	Τ	12 9	11		1032/1514 1231/1551	4.21 4.52	4.53 4.72	4.39	4.32 4.55	4.32 4.46
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	6	5	13 11		1066/1503	4.52 3.73	4.72	4.00	4.55	4.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	4	8			1033/1506		4.22	4.24	4.17	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	21	2	0	0	0	1		****/1311		3.81		3.68	****
5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding		21	2	U	U	U		4.33	/1311	3.70	3.01	3.03	3.00	
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	2	0	5	4	4	3.53	1142/1490	3.46	3.86	4.05	3.85	3.53
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	1	2	3	8	4.07	990/1502	3.71	4.02	4.26	4.06	4.07
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	2	1	6	6	4.07	1023/1489	3.79	4.10	4.29	4.07	4.07
From	onar	Dict	-rib	1+10	2									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	В	10						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	3	Under-grad	25	Non-major	25
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	1						

Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

Instructor: COBB, VINCENT

Enrollment: 33
Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2006

Page 490 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	rcies			Tnei	ructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	MΔ	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	3	1	5	5	6	3.50	1480/1669	3.75	4.20	4.23	4.02	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	4	3	8	3	3.30	1534/1666	3.80	4.22	4.19	4.11	3.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	4	3	6	4	3.20	1319/1421	3.94	4.27	4.24	4.11	3.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	4	1	5	0	4	2.93	1544/1617	3.54	4.04	4.15	3.99	2.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	5	5	6	1	3	2.60	1514/1555	3.81	3.98	4.00	3.92	2.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	4	2	5	5	2	2.94	1441/1543	3.37	3.93	4.06	3.86	2.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	4	2	7	3	3	2.95	1539/1647	3.82	4.31	4.12	4.06	2.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	731/1668	4.58	4.67	4.67	4.62	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	2	4	3	3	3	3.07	1498/1605	3.64	4.01	4.07	3.96	3.07
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	2	1	6			1292/1514	4.21	4.53	4.39	4.32	3.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	4			1000/1551	4.52	4.72	4.66	4.55	4.68
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	3	3	4	4			1392/1503	3.73	4.22	4.24	4.17	3.26
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	2	2	6	6		1315/1506	3.86	4.27	4.26	4.17	3.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	4	1	2	3	2	2.83	1178/1311	3.76	3.81	3.85	3.68	2.83
Discussion	_	0	2	0	4	_	4	2 (2	1107/1400	2 46	2 06	4 05	2 05	2 62
<ol> <li>Did class discussions contribute to what you learned</li> <li>Were all students actively encouraged to participate</li> </ol>	5 5	0	0	1	4 3	6 6	4 6	4.06	1107/1490	3.46 3.71	3.86 4.02	4.05 4.26	3.85 4.06	3.63 4.06
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5 5		2	1	3 6	4	3		990/1502				4.06	3.31
4. Were special techniques successful	5 6	0 11	0	0	1	0	3		1348/1489 ****/1006	3.79 3.83	4.10 4.05	4.29	3.81	3.3⊥ ****
4. Were special techniques successful	O	ТТ	U	U	Τ	U	3	4.50	/1006	3.03	4.05	4.00	3.01	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.83	4.20	3.98	****
	20	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 233	****	4.83	4.19	4.09	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.70	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.30	3.95	3.90	****
Field Work						_	_							
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 58	****	3.50	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 42	****	****	4.34	4.17	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.06	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****
J. Here there chagn process for all the students	20	J	U	U	U	U	_	3.00	, 29			1.51	1.22	

Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

Instructor: COBB, VINCENT

Enrollment: 33

Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 490 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	6	General	5	Under-grad	21	Non-major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	1						

Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

Instructor: DASGUPTA, NANDI

Enrollment: 42 Questionnaires: 14

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 491 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

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

Questions				Fre	equer	cies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
1. Didd you gain new insights,skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. O 0 0 1 1 1 3 8 9 4.43 657/1421 3.94 4.27 4.24 4.11 4.43 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. In 1 0 1 0 1 1 3.07 ****/1543 3.37 3.93 4.06 3.86 ****  1. Was the grading system clearly explained 9. In 1 0 1 0 1 1 3.07 ****/1543 3.37 3.93 4.06 3.86 ****  1. Was the grading system clearly explained 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. O 0 2 0 9 3 3.93 1057/1605 3.64 4.01 4.07 3.96 3.09  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. O 0 0 0 1 1 1 3 8 4.38 742/1503 3.73 4.22 4.24 4.17 4.38 1. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3. C 1 0 1 0 1 2 3 3.86 979/1490 3.46 3.86 4.07 4.07 4.08  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3. Did read and explained background information 4. Were special techniques successful 4. Were special techniques successful 5. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 7. O 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 ****/1006 3.83 4.05 4.09 3.81 ****  2. Were you provided with adequate background information 12. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 4.	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1. Didd you gain new insights,skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. O 0 0 1 1 1 3 8 9 4.43 657/1421 3.94 4.27 4.24 4.11 4.43 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. In 1 0 1 0 1 1 3.07 ****/1543 3.37 3.93 4.06 3.86 ****  1. Was the grading system clearly explained 9. In 1 0 1 0 1 1 3.07 ****/1543 3.37 3.93 4.06 3.86 ****  1. Was the grading system clearly explained 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. O 0 2 0 9 3 3.93 1057/1605 3.64 4.01 4.07 3.96 3.09  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. O 0 0 0 1 1 1 3 8 4.38 742/1503 3.73 4.22 4.24 4.17 4.38 1. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3. C 1 0 1 0 1 2 3 3.86 979/1490 3.46 3.86 4.07 4.07 4.08  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3. Did read and explained background information 4. Were special techniques successful 4. Were special techniques successful 5. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 7. O 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 ****/1006 3.83 4.05 4.09 3.81 ****  2. Were you provided with adequate background information 12. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 4.															
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 1 1 1 6 6 4.21 935/1666 3.80 4.22 4.19 4.11 4.21 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 1 1 3 3 9 4.34 657/1421 3.94 4.27 4.24 4.11 4.24 4.11 4.24 4.10 4.24 4.10 4.24 4.10 4.24 4.10 4.25 3.99 3.40 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 2 1 1 2 3.40 1425/1617 3.54 4.04 4.15 3.99 3.40 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 11 0 1 1 3.67 ****/1543 3.37 3.93 4.06 3.86 **** 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 1 1 5 6 4.23 885/1647 3.82 4.31 4.12 4.06 4.23 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 1 1 5 6 4.23 885/1647 3.82 4.31 4.12 4.06 4.23 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 5 6 4.23 885/1647 3.82 4.31 4.12 4.06 4.23 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 1 4.77 424/1514 4.21 4.53 4.39 4.32 4.77 4.25 5.00 5. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 2 0 9 3 3.93 1057/1605 3.64 4.01 4.07 3.96 3.93    Lecture 1. Were the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 4.77 424/1514 4.21 4.53 4.39 4.32 4.77 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 1 1 4.85 677/1551 4.52 4.72 4.66 4.55 4.85 8. Was becture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 1 1 3 8 4.38 742/1503 3.73 4.22 4.24 4.17 4.23 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 6 1 0 2 0 2 3.40 995/1311 3.76 3.81 3.85 3.68 3.40    Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 1 0 1 2 3 3.86 979/1490 3.46 3.86 4.07 4.22 4.07 4.23 8.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00				_		_	_	_							
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 1 1 3 9 4.43 657/1421 3.94 4.27 4.24 4.11 4.34 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 9 1 1 0 1 2 3.40 1425/1617 3.54 4.04 4.15 3.99 3.43 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 9 1 1 0 1 0 1 2 3.40 1425/1617 3.54 4.04 4.15 3.99 3.43 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 11 0 1 0 1 1 3.67 ****/1543 3.37 3.93 4.06 3.86 ****  1. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 1 1 5 6 4.23 885/1647 3.82 4.31 4.12 4.06 4.23 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 5 6 4.23 885/1647 3.82 4.31 4.12 4.06 4.23 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 5 5.00 1/1668 4.58 4.67 4.67 4.62 5.00			-	_	•		-	-							
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. 10 0 0 1 1 5 6 4.23 885/1647 3.82 4.31 4.12 4.06 4.25 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. 0 0 0 0 1 1 5 6 4.23 885/1647 3.82 4.31 4.12 4.05 4.25 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. 0 0 0 0 1 1 5 6 4.23 885/1647 3.82 4.31 4.12 4.05 4.25 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 1 4.77 424/1514 4.21 4.53 4.39 4.32 4.77 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 1 4.77 424/1514 4.21 4.53 4.39 4.32 4.77 1. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 3 8 4.38 742/1503 3.73 4.22 4.24 4.17 4.38 1. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 1 1 1 1 9 4.23 926/1506 3.66 4.27 4.26 4.17 4.32 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Were special techniques successful  Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4. 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0			-	-			-	_							
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 1 0 1 2 3 5 3.83 996/1555 3.81 3.98 4.00 3.92 3.83 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 11 0 1 0 1 1 3.67 ****/1543 3.37 3.93 4.06 3.86 ****  7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 0 1 1 1 5 6 4.23 885/1647 3.82 4.31 4.12 4.06 4.23 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 5 5.00 1/1668 4.58 4.67 4.67 4.62 5.00 9 1 3 3.93 1057/1605 3.64 4.01 4.07 3.96 3.93					_		-	-							
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 0 1 1 3.67 ****/1543 3.37 3.93 4.06 3.86 ****  7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 1 1 5 6 4.23 885/1647 3.82 4.31 4.12 4.06 4.23 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 1 3 5.00 1/1668 4.58 4.67 4.67 4.62 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 2 0 9 3 3.93 1057/1605 3.64 4.01 4.07 3.96 3.93  Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 4.77 424/1514 4.21 4.53 4.39 4.32 4.77 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 11 4.85 677/1551 4.52 4.72 4.66 4.55 4.85 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 1 1 1 3 8 4.38 742/1503 3.73 4.22 4.24 4.24 4.74 4.38 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 1 1 1 9 4.23 926/1506 3.86 4.27 4.26 4.17 4.28 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 6 1 0 2 0 2 3.40 995/1311 3.76 3.81 3.85 3.68 3.40  Discussion  Discussion  Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 1 0 1 2 3 3.86 979/1490 3.46 3.86 4.05 3.85 3.86 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5 4.71 438/1502 3.71 4.02 4.26 4.06 4.71 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 0 0 0 0 3 4 4.57 622/1489 3.79 4.10 4.29 4.07 4.57 4.57 4.57 4.57 4.57 4.57 4.57 4.5															
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 1 1 1 5 6 4.23 885/1647 3.82 4.31 4.12 4.06 4.23 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 1 3 5.00 1/1668 4.58 4.67 4.67 4.62 5.00    Lecture   1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 4.77 424/1514 4.21 4.53 4.39 4.32 4.77   2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 2 1 1 4.85 677/1551 4.21 4.53 4.39 4.32 4.77   2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 2 1 1 4.85 677/1551 4.22 4.72 4.66 4.55 4.85   3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 1 1 3 8 4.38 742/1503 3.73 4.22 4.24 4.17 4.23   5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 6 1 0 2 0 2 3.40 995/1311 3.76 3.81 3.85 3.68 3.40    Discussion   1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 1 0 1 2 3 3.86 979/1490 3.46 3.86 4.05 3.85 3.86   2. Were all students actively encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 0 0 0 2 5 4.71 438/1502 3.71 4.02 4.26 4.06 4.75   4. Were special techniques successful 8 4 0 0 1 0 1 2 4.00 ****/1006 3.83 4.05 4.00 3.81 ****  Laboratory   2. Were you provided with adequate background information 12 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 ****/12 **** 4.70 4.38 4.04 ****    Seminar   1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 12 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 97 **** 5.00 4.36 4.99 ****    3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 12 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 97 **** 5.00 4.36 4.99 ****    5. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 12 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 92 **** 5.00 4.36 4.99 ****    Field Work   2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 13 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	3 3			_	_	_	-	_		,					
8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 13 5.00 1/1668 4.58 4.67 4.67 4.62 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 2 0 9 3 3.93 1057/1605 3.64 4.01 4.07 3.96 3.93  Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 11 4.77 424/1514 4.21 4.53 4.39 4.32 4.77 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 2 11 4.85 677/1551 4.52 4.72 4.66 4.55 4.85 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 1 1 3 8 4.38 742/1503 3.73 4.22 4.24 4.17 4.38 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 1 1 1 1 9 4.23 926/1506 3.86 4.27 4.26 4.17 4.23 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 6 1 0 2 0 2 3.40 995/1311 3.76 3.81 3.85 3.68 3.40  Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 1 0 1 2 3 3.86 979/1490 3.46 3.86 4.05 3.85 3.86 3.40  Discussion  2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 0 0 0 2 5 4.71 438/1502 3.71 4.02 4.26 4.06 4.71 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 0 0 0 3 4 4.57 622/1489 3.79 4.10 4.29 4.07 4.57 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.0				-	_	-	_	_		,					
New would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness   0   0   0   2   0   9   3   3.93   1057/1605   3.64   4.01   4.07   3.96   3.93			-	-	_	_	-	_		,					
Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared  1. 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 11 4.77 424/1514 4.21 4.53 4.39 4.32 4.77  2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned  5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  7. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  7. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  8. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  7. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  7. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  8. A 0 0 1 0 1 2 3 3.86 979/1490 3.46 3.86 4.05 3.85 3.86  4. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  7. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  8. A 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/1006 3.83 4.05 4.00 3.81 ****  Laboratory  2. Were you provided with adequate background information  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  3. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  3. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  4. O 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.06 3.81 *****			-	-	-	-	-			,					
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 11 4.77 424/1514 4.21 4.53 4.39 4.32 4.77 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 11 4.85 677/1551 4.52 4.72 4.66 4.55 4.85 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 1 1 3 8 4.38 742/1503 3.73 4.22 4.24 4.17 4.38 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 1 1 1 1 9 4.23 926/1506 3.86 4.27 4.26 4.17 4.23 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 6 1 0 2 0 2 3.40 995/1311 3.76 3.81 3.85 3.68 3.40  Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 1 0 1 2 3 3.86 979/1490 3.46 3.86 4.05 3.85 3.86 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 0 0 0 2 5 4.71 438/1502 3.71 4.02 4.26 4.06 4.71 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 0 0 0 2 5 4.71 438/1502 3.71 4.02 4.26 4.06 4.71 4. Were special techniques successful 8 4 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/1006 3.83 4.05 4.00 3.81 ****  Laboratory  2. Were you provided with adequate background information 12 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 ****/1006 3.83 4.19 4.09 ****  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 12 1 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/112 **** 4.70 4.38 4.04 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 12 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 97 **** 5.00 4.36 4.19 ****  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 13 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 58 **** 3.50 4.22 4.00 ****  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 13 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.06 3.81 ****	9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	2	0	9	3	3.93	1057/1605	3.64	4.01	4.07	3.96	3.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 2 11 4.85 677/1551 4.52 4.72 4.66 4.55 4.85 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 1 1 3 8 4.38 742/1503 3.73 4.22 4.24 4.17 4.38 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 1 1 1 9 4.23 926/1506 3.86 4.27 4.26 4.17 4.38 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 6 1 0 2 0 2 3.40 995/1311 3.76 3.81 3.85 3.68 3.40  Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 1 0 1 2 3 3.86 979/1490 3.46 3.86 4.05 3.85 3.86 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5 4.71 438/1502 3.71 4.02 4.26 4.06 4.71 4.38 4.09 4.07 4.57 4.09 4.09 4.07 4.57 4.09 4.09 4.07 4.57 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09	Lecture														
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 1 1 3 8 4.38 742/1503 3.73 4.22 4.24 4.17 4.38 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 1 1 1 1 9 4.23 926/1506 3.86 4.27 4.26 4.17 4.23 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 6 1 0 2 0 2 3.40 995/1311 3.76 3.81 3.85 3.68 3.40  Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 1 0 1 2 3 3.86 979/1490 3.46 3.86 4.05 3.85 3.86 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5 4.71 438/1502 3.71 4.02 4.26 4.06 4.71 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 0 0 0 0 3 4 4.57 622/1489 3.79 4.10 4.29 4.07 4.57 4. Were special techniques successful 8 4 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/1006 3.83 4.05 4.00 3.81 ****  Laboratory  2. Were you provided with adequate background information 12 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 ****/ 233 **** 4.83 4.19 4.09 ****  Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 12 1 0 1 0 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 12 **** 4.70 4.38 4.04 ****  2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 12 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 97 **** 5.00 4.36 4.19 ****  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 13 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 58 **** 3.50 4.22 4.00 ****  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 13 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.66 3.81 ****	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	424/1514	4.21	4.53	4.39	4.32	4.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 1 1 1 1 9 4.23 926/1506 3.86 4.27 4.26 4.17 4.23 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 6 1 0 2 0 2 3.40 995/1311 3.76 3.81 3.85 3.68 3.40  Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 1 0 1 2 3 3.86 979/1490 3.46 3.86 4.05 3.85 3.86 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5 4.71 438/1502 3.71 4.02 4.26 4.06 4.71 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 0 0 0 3 4 4.57 622/1489 3.79 4.10 4.29 4.07 4.57 4. Were special techniques successful 8 4 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/1006 3.83 4.05 4.00 3.81 ****  Laboratory  2. Were you provided with adequate background information 12 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 ****/ 233 **** 4.83 4.19 4.09 ****  Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 12 1 0 1 0 0 0 0.200 ****/ 112 **** 4.70 4.38 4.04 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 12 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 97 **** 5.00 4.36 4.19 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 12 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.50 4.22 3.79 ****  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 13 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 58 **** 3.50 4.22 4.00 ****  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 13 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.66 3.81 ****	2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	677/1551	4.52	4.72	4.66	4.55	4.85
Discussion  Discus	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	742/1503	3.73	4.22	4.24	4.17	4.38
Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 1 0 1 2 3 3.86 979/1490 3.46 3.86 4.05 3.85 3.86  2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5 4.71 438/1502 3.71 4.02 4.26 4.06 4.71  3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 0 0 0 3 4 4.57 622/1489 3.79 4.10 4.29 4.07 4.57  4. Were special techniques successful 8 4 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/1006 3.83 4.05 4.00 3.81 ****  Laboratory  2. Were you provided with adequate background information 12 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 ****/ 233 **** 4.83 4.19 4.09 ****  Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 12 1 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 112 **** 4.70 4.38 4.04 ****  2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 12 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 97 **** 5.00 4.36 4.19 ****  3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 12 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.50 4.22 3.79 ****  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 13 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 58 **** 3.50 4.22 4.00 ****  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 13 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.06 3.81 ****	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	1	9	4.23	926/1506	3.86	4.27	4.26	4.17	4.23
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 1 0 1 2 3 3.86 979/1490 3.46 3.86 4.05 3.85 3.86 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5 4.71 438/1502 3.71 4.02 4.26 4.06 4.71 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 0 0 0 3 4 4.57 622/1489 3.79 4.10 4.29 4.07 4.57 4. Were special techniques successful 8 4 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/1006 3.83 4.05 4.00 3.81 ****  Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 12 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 ****/ 233 **** 4.83 4.19 4.09 ****  Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 12 1 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 112 **** 4.70 4.38 4.04 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 12 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 97 **** 5.00 4.36 4.19 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 12 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.50 4.22 3.79 ****  Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 13 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 58 **** 3.50 4.22 4.00 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 13 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.06 3.81 ****	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	995/1311	3.76	3.81	3.85	3.68	3.40
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 1 0 1 2 3 3.86 979/1490 3.46 3.86 4.05 3.85 3.86 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5 4.71 438/1502 3.71 4.02 4.26 4.06 4.71 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 0 0 0 3 4 4.57 622/1489 3.79 4.10 4.29 4.07 4.57 4. Were special techniques successful 8 4 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/1006 3.83 4.05 4.00 3.81 ****  Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 12 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 ****/ 233 **** 4.83 4.19 4.09 ****  Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 12 1 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 112 **** 4.70 4.38 4.04 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 12 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 97 **** 5.00 4.36 4.19 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 12 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.50 4.22 3.79 ****  Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 13 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 58 **** 3.50 4.22 4.00 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 13 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.06 3.81 ****	<b>-</b> 1														
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 0 0 0 2 5 4.71 438/1502 3.71 4.02 4.26 4.06 4.71 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 0 0 0 3 4 4.57 622/1489 3.79 4.10 4.29 4.07 4.57 4. Were special techniques successful 8 4 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/1006 3.83 4.05 4.00 3.81 ****  Laboratory  2. Were you provided with adequate background information 12 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 ****/ 233 **** 4.83 4.19 4.09 ****  Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 12 1 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 112 **** 4.70 4.38 4.04 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 12 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 97 **** 5.00 4.36 4.19 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 12 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.50 4.22 3.79 ****  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 13 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 58 **** 3.50 4.22 4.00 ****  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 13 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.06 3.81 ****		_	0	-	_	-	_	_	2 06	000/1400	2 16	2 06	4 05	2 05	2 06
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 0 0 0 3 4 4.57 622/1489 3.79 4.10 4.29 4.07 4.57 4. Were special techniques successful 8 4 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/1006 3.83 4.05 4.00 3.81 ****  Laboratory  2. Were you provided with adequate background information 12 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 ****/ 233 **** 4.83 4.19 4.09 ****  Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 12 1 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 112 **** 4.70 4.38 4.04 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 12 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 97 **** 5.00 4.36 4.19 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 12 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.50 4.22 3.79 ****  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 13 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 58 **** 3.50 4.22 4.00 ****  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 13 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.06 3.81 ****		7	-	_	•		2	-							
Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 12 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 ****/1006 3.83 4.05 4.00 3.81 ****  Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 12 1 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 112 **** 4.70 4.38 4.04 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 12 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 97 **** 5.00 4.36 4.19 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 12 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.50 4.22 3.79 ****  Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 13 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 58 **** 3.50 4.22 4.00 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 13 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.06 3.81 ****			-				2	-							
Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 12 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 ****/ 233 **** 4.83 4.19 4.09 ****  Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 12 1 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 112 **** 4.70 4.38 4.04 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 12 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 97 **** 5.00 4.36 4.19 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 12 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.50 4.22 3.79 ****  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 13 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 58 **** 3.50 4.22 4.00 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 13 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.06 3.81 ****															
Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 12 1 0 1 0 0 1 0 2.00 ****/ 233 **** 4.83 4.19 4.09 ****  2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 12 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 97 **** 5.00 4.36 4.19 ****  3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 12 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.50 4.22 3.79 ****  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 13 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 58 **** 3.50 4.22 4.00 ****  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 13 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.06 3.81 ****	4. Were special techniques successful	8	4	U	U	1	U	Τ	4.00	****/1006	3.83	4.05	4.00	3.81	****
Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	Laboratory														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.83	4.19	4.09	***
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 12 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 97 **** 5.00 4.36 4.19 ****  3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 12 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.50 4.22 3.79 ****  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 13 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 58 **** 3.50 4.22 4.00 ****  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 13 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.06 3.81 ****	Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 12 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 97 **** 5.00 4.36 4.19 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 12 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.50 4.22 3.79 ****  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 13 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 58 **** 3.50 4.22 4.00 ****  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 13 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.06 3.81 ****	1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 112	****	4.70	4.38	4.04	***
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 12 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.50 4.22 3.79 ****  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 13 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 58 **** 3.50 4.22 4.00 ****  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 13 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.06 3.81 ****	-			0	0		0	0	3.00	****/ 97	****				***
Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  13 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.06 3.81 ****							0	0	3.00	,	****				****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 13 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 58 **** 3.50 4.22 4.00 ****  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 13 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.06 3.81 ****															
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 13 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.06 3.81 ****															
			-				-	-		, 50					
3. Was the instructor available for consultation 13 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.39 4.30 ****								-		,					
	3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	***	****	4.39	4.30	***
Self Paced	Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 55 **** **** 4.34 4.17 ****	1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 13 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 42 **** **** 4.31 4.08 ****		13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 46 **** **** 4.45 4.26 ****		13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 13 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 33 **** **** 4.25 4.25 ****				0			0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25		****
Frequency Distribution	From	ana:	Dia+	rib	tion	,									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	С	3	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	12
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	h
				P	0			responses to	be sid	nificant	
				I	0	Other	6	-	-	-	

? 0

University of Maryland PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

Instructor: COBB, VINCENT

Enrollment: 35 Questionnaires: 20

Title

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 492 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eaner	ncies			Tnst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	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	3	2	4	6	5	3.40	1525/1669	3.75	4.20	4.23	4.02	3.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	7	7	3	3.58	1442/1666	3.80	4.22	4.19	4.11	3.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	5	2	8	4	3.45	1250/1421	3.94	4.27	4.24	4.11	3.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	3	1	2	3	6	3.53	1360/1617	3.54	4.04	4.15	3.99	3.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	1	5	9	3.75	1062/1555	3.81	3.98	4.00	3.92	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	2	2	7	3	3.60	1226/1543	3.37	3.93	4.06	3.86	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	5	7	6	3.80	1250/1647	3.82	4.31	4.12	4.06	3.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	3	16	4.70	1039/1668	4.58	4.67	4.67	4.62	4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	2	1	0	5	2	1	3.22	1464/1605	3.64	4.01	4.07	3.96	3.22
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	4	5	8	3.95	1241/1514	4.21	4.53	4.39	4.32	3.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	2	2	14	4.53	1176/1551	4.52	4.72	4.66	4.55	4.53
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	4	7	2	6	3.53	1324/1503	3.73	4.22	4.24	4.17	3.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	4	3	8	3.74	1250/1506	3.86	4.27	4.26	4.17	3.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	2	2	0	5	3	3.42	989/1311	3.76	3.81	3.85	3.68	3.42
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	3	2	2	5	3	3.20	1288/1490	3.46	3.86	4.05	3.85	3.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	4	1	3	6	3.60	1279/1502	3.71	4.02	4.26	4.06	3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	3	2	3	5	3.57	1249/1489	3.79	4.10	4.29	4.07	3.57
4. Were special techniques successful	6	8	0	2	0	1	3	3.83	632/1006	3.83	4.05	4.00	3.81	3.83
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 226	****	4.83	4.20	3.98	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	1	2	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 233	****	4.83	4.19	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	2	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 225	****	4.33	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	2	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 223	****	4.80	4.35	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	1	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	****/ 206	***	5.00	4.15	4.01	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.70	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	1	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/ 98	****	4.30	3.95	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	2	0	0		****/ 58	****	3.50	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	2	1	0	0	2.33	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	1	2	0	0	0		****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	***
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	***
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	1	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****

Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

Instructor: COBB, VINCENT

Enrollment: 35

Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 492 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	9	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

Title

Instructor: APPIAH, ELIZABE

Enrollment: 41 Questionnaires: 27

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Fall 2006

Page 493 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	2	8	6	6	2	2.92	1614/1669	3.75	4.20	4.23	4.02	2.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	3	7	7	6	1		1611/1666	3.80	4.22	4.19	4.11	2.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	5	5	10	3	3.38	1284/1421	3.94	4.27	4.24	4.11	3.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	1	5	6	4	5	3	2.78	1571/1617	3.54	4.04	4.15	3.99	2.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	2	9	4	7	3.61	1178/1555	3.81	3.98	4.00	3.92	3.61
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	3	3	7	10	0	1	2.48	1517/1543	3.37	3.93	4.06	3.86	2.48
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	2	7	8	4	2	2.87	1551/1647	3.82	4.31	4.12	4.06	2.87
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	357/1668	4.58	4.67	4.67	4.62	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	5	4	10	2	0	2.43	1566/1605	3.64	4.01	4.07	3.96	2.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	7	8	2	4		1453/1514		4.53	4.39	4.32	3.05
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	2	4	10	6		1443/1551	4.52	4.72	4.66	4.55	3.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	4	5	8	3	2		1454/1503	3.73	4.22	4.24	4.17	2.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	1	5	5	5	5	1		1446/1506	3.86	4.27	4.26	4.17	2.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	2	4	5	6	4	3.29	1048/1311	3.76	3.81	3.85	3.68	3.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	3	4	5	0	0		1466/1490	3.46	3.86	4.05	3.85	2.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	2	6	4	0	0		1491/1502	3.71	4.02	4.26	4.06	2.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	4	2	5	1	0		1477/1489		4.10	4.29	4.07	2.25
4. Were special techniques successful	15	6	3	0	3	0	0	2.00	****/1006	3.83	4.05	4.00	3.81	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 226	****	4.83	4.20	3.98	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.83	4.19	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 225	****	4.33	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 223	****	4.80	4.35	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 206	****	5.00	4.15	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 112	****	4.70	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	,	****	4.50	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	,	****	4.60	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 98	****	4.30	3.95	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	3.50	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****

Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

Instructor: APPIAH, ELIZABE

Enrollment: 41
Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 493 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	3	 А	 6	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	2	Under-grad	27	Non-major	25
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	1						

Course Section: ECON 101 1801 University of Maryland
Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS Baltimore County

Instructor: APPIAH, ELIZABE

Enrollment: 33

Questionnaires: 19 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	4	0	_	2 04	1242/1669	3.75	4.20	4.23	4 00	2 04
1 9 ,	Τ	0	1	J	2	8	2						4.02	3.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	-	Τ	2	_	8	10		1280/1666	3.80	4.22	4.19	4.11	3.84
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	5	10		746/1421	3.94	4.27	4.24	4.11	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	Τ	Τ	4	Τ	Τ_	6	5		1419/1617	3.54	4.04	4.15	3.99	3.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	Ţ	5	2	10	4.17	644/1555	3.81	3.98	4.00	3.92	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	4	0	4	5	3		1365/1543	3.37	3.93	4.06	3.86	3.19
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	1	2	6	6		1270/1647	3.82	4.31	4.12	4.06	3.76
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	0	1	16		1004/1668	4.58	4.67	4.67	4.62	4.72
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	2	5	5	2	3.50	1357/1605	3.64	4.01	4.07	3.96	3.50
Lecture														
	1	0	0	0	2	0	7	4 00	1100/1514	4.21	4.53	4.39	4.32	4.22
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	3	8	10		, -					
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	Τ	6	10		1279/1551	4.52	4.72	4.66	4.55	4.39
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	Τ	4	2	4	/		1277/1503	3.73	4.22	4.24	4.17	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	T	0	2	4	0	6	6		1309/1506	3.86	4.27	4.26	4.17	3.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	2	3	4	7	3.82	751/1311	3.76	3.81	3.85	3.68	3.82
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	2	2.	2	2	3.00	1328/1490	3.46	3.86	4.05	3.85	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	2	5	2		1179/1502	3.71	4.02	4.26	4.06	3.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	953/1489	3.79	4.10	4.29	4.07	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	2	0	2	1	3	3.38	823/1006	3.83	4.05	4.00	3.81	3.38
	-	_	_	Ū	_	_		3.30	123, 1300	3.03	1.00	1.00	3.01	3.55
Frequ	ency	Dist	rib	utior	ı									

Fall 2006

Page 494

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	Α	7	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	19	Non-major	16
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	9	_			
				?	2						

#### Course Section: ECON 101H 0101 University of Maryland Title PRIN OF MICROECON-HONO Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Fall 2006 Instructor: MCCONNELL, VIRG

Enrollment: 8 Questionnaires: 7

Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire	

Page 495

								Fre	equer	ncies	;		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
			Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
			Genera	 1															
1 т	nov bic	gain new	insights,ski	_	m this course	٥	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	876/1669	4.29	4.20	4.23	4.02	4.29
	_	_	or make clear			0	0	0	0	2	3	2		1094/1666	4.00	4.22	4.19	4.11	4.00
			estions reflec			0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	331/1421	4.71	4.27	4.24	4.11	4.71
		_	tions reflect		_	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14		4.14	4.04	4.15	3.99	4.14
					what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	0	5	4.14		4.14	3.98	4.00	3.92	4.14
		_	_		o what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	1		1060/1543	3.86	3.93	4.06	3.86	3.86
			system clearly			1	0	0	0	1	1	4		481/1647	4.50	4.31	4.12	4.06	4.50
			as class canc			0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.67		4.62	5.00
	_				hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	4	1		1132/1605	3.86		4.07		3.86
		u 70u 91	0110 01010	0000	ning criccolveness	ŭ	Ü	ŭ	Ü	_	-	_	3.00	1101,1000	3.00	1.01	1.07	3.70	3.00
			Lectur	e															
1. 1	Were the	instruc	tor's lecture	prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	799/1514	4.50	4.53	4.39	4.32	4.50	
			or seem inter		1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	1028/1551	4.67	4.72	4.66	4.55	4.67	
				xplained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	2	2		1066/1503	4.00	4.22	4.24	4.17	4.00	
			you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	980/1506	4.17	4.27	4.26	4.17	4.17		
5. I	Did audi	ovisual	techniques enl	hance y	our understanding	1	4	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	939/1311	3.50	3.81	3.85	3.68	3.50
			-	-	5														
			Discus	sion															
1. I	oid clas	s discus	sions contrib	ute to	what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	849/1490	4.00	3.86	4.05	3.85	4.00
2. 1	Were all	student	s actively en	courage	d to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	632/1502	4.50	4.02	4.26	4.06	4.50
3. I	Did the	instruct	or encourage	fair an	d open discussion	5	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1279/1489	3.50	4.10	4.29	4.07	3.50
4. 7	Were spe	cial tec	hniques succe	ssful		5	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	923/1006	3.00	4.05	4.00	3.81	3.00
					Frequ	iency	Dist	tribu	ution	n									
Cred	dits Ear	ned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors		
	27	0	 Д 3			 guire					1	Graduat		0	Majc		0		
	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 3 28-55 2 1.00-1.99 0 B 2						кес	quire	=u 1(	או דר	LJOES		4	Graduati	=	U	Ma JC	ıΤ	0
	-33 -83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	ı				1	Under-g	rad	7	Non-	major	7
	34-150 2 3.00-3.49 1 D 0						Gei	iici a.	L				_	onder-g.	Lau	,	11011-	ilia JUI	,
	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0						r12	ectiv	700				0	#### - 1	Meane +	here a	re not	enous	h
GI		J	3.30 4.00	5	P 0		ътс	CCCI	, CB				0	respons				_	11
					I O		O+1	her					2	r capons.	-B CO L	c bigi	ıııcaı		
					Ι 0		ULI	TICI					4						

? 1 Course Section: ECON 102 0101 University of Maryland Title

PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS Baltimore County Instructor: THOMAS, MARK S Fall 2006

Enrollment: 35

Questionnaires: 15

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 496

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eque	ncie	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	Ο	3	2	4	3	3	3 07	1591/1669	3.97	4.20	4.23	4.02	3.07
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	4	3	5		1432/1666		4.22	4.19	4.11	3.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	1	3	8		- ,		4.27	4.24	4.11	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	5	4	3		1328/1617	4.10	4.04	4.15	3.99	3.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	3	2	3	2	1		1509/1555		3.98	4.00	3.92	2.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	1	3	3	1		1352/1543		3.93	4.06	3.86	3.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	3	3	6		1285/1647	4.22	4.31	4.12	4.06	3.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	14		499/1668		4.67	4.67	4.62	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	4	1	5	3	3.36	1420/1605	3.88	4.01	4.07	3.96	3.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	1	3	8	4.31	1052/1514	4.54	4.53	4.39	4.32	4.31
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	2	1	2	8	4.23	1346/1551	4.68	4.72	4.66	4.55	4.23
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	4	0	2	7	3.92	1147/1503	4.24	4.22	4.24	4.17	3.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	757/1506	4.32	4.27	4.26	4.17	4.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	1	2	1	1	5	3.70	818/1311	3.83	3.81	3.85	3.68	3.70
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	1	1	2	2 60	1117/1490	3.86	3.86	4.05	3.85	3.60
	10	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	754/1502	3.93	4.02	4.05	4.06	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate		0	0	0	1	3	2		800/1489	4.02		4.26		
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	4	0	0	U T	Τ	3	4.40			4.10		4.07	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	10	4	U	U	U	U	Τ	5.00	****/1006	4.13	4.05	4.00	3.81	
Frem	iency	Diet	rih	ıt i oı	n									

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

PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS

Instructor: THOMAS, MARK S

Enrollment: 30
Questionnaires: 12

Title

# Baltimore County Fall 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Page 497 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque:	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	478/1669	3.97	4.20	4.23	4.02	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	549/1666	4.10	4.22	4.19	4.11	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	356/1421	4.28	4.27	4.24	4.11	4.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	496/1617	4.10	4.04	4.15	3.99	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	0	5	3	4.11	698/1555	3.78	3.98	4.00	3.92	4.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	659/1543	3.94	3.93	4.06	3.86	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	270/1647	4.22	4.31	4.12	4.06	4.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1668	4.55	4.67	4.67	4.62	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	373/1605	3.88	4.01	4.07	3.96	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	223/1514	4.54	4.53	4.39	4.32	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	567/1551	4.68	4.72	4.66	4.55	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	254/1503	4.24	4.22	4.24	4.17	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	326/1506		4.27	4.26	4.17	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	305/1311	3.83	3.81	3.85	3.68	4.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	298/1490	3.86	3.86	4.05	3.85	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	859/1502	3.93	4.02	4.26	4.06	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	1	2	3		1038/1489	4.02	4.10	4.29	4.07	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	143/1006	4.13	4.05	4.00	3.81	4.75
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.83	4.20	3.98	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.83	4.19	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.33	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 223	****	4.80	4.35	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 206	***	5.00	4.15	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 112	****	4.70	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 98	****	4.30	3.95	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 58	****	3.50	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****

Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS

Instructor: THOMAS, MARK S

Enrollment: 30
Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 497 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	 А	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad 1	L2	Non-major	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means t	there are	e not enough	n
				P	0			responses to b	oe signi:	ficant	
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS

Instructor: COOMBER, WILLIA

Enrollment:

40 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 498 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

	Questions						Fr	equei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Cour	se Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	n Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did you	u gain new	insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	2	0	0	1	1	6	7	4.27	901/166	9 3.9	7 4.20	4.23	4.02	4.27
2. Did the	e instruct	or make clear	the ex	pected goals	2	0	0	1	3	6	5	4.00	1094/166	6 4.10	4.22	4.19	4.11	4.00
3. Did the	e exam que	stions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	2	0	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	806/142	1 4.28	3 4.27	4.24	4.11	4.27
4. Did otl	her evalua	tions reflect	the ex	pected goals	2	4	1	0	3	1	6	4.00	1029/161	7 4.1	4.04	4.15	3.99	4.00
5. Did ass	signed rea	dings contrib	ute to	what you learned	2	2	1	1	2	2	7	4.00	773/155	5 3.78	3.98	4.00	3.92	4.00
	_	_		o what you learned	3	6	1	1	0	2	4	3.88	1043/154	3 3.9	1 3.93	4.06	3.86	3.88
		system clearl		_	2	0	0	0	5	2	8	4.20	926/164				4.06	4.20
		as class canc			2	0	1	0		11	3		1530/166				4.62	
	-			hing effectiveness	5	1	0	0	1	6	4		666/160					4.27
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instruc	tor's lecture		prepared	2	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	679/151	4 4.5	4.53	4.39	4.32	4.60
		or seem inter			2	0	0	0	1	3	11		1028/155				4.55	4.67
				xplained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	719/150				4.17	4.40
		contribute t			2	0	1	0	1	5	8	4.27					4.17	
				our understanding	3	1	2	0	1	3	7	4.00	587/131				3.68	4.00
J. DIG au	aiovisuai	ceciniiques en	nance y	our understanding	5		2	U	_	J	,	1.00	307/131	1 3.0.	3.01	3.03	3.00	1.00
		Discus		7		_		_	_									
	id class discussions contribute to what you learners all students actively encouraged to participa					0	1	0	1	5	3	3.90					3.85	3.90
	ere all students actively encouraged to participate the instructor encourage fair and open discussed the instructor encourage fair and open discussed.					0	1	0	2	4	3		1179/150				4.06	3.80
	id the instructor encourage fair and open discuss					0	0	0	2	4		4.20	953/148				4.07	4.20
4. Were sp	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discus Were special techniques successful					4	1	1	0	2	2	3.50	759/100	6 4.1	3 4.05	4.00	3.81	3.50
		Labora	_				_											
2. Were yo	ou provide	ed with adequa	te back	ground information	15	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 23	3 ***	4.83	4.19	4.09	****
		Field																
1. Did fie	eld experi	ence contribu	te to w	hat you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	1			8 ***	3.50	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you	u clearly	understand yo	ur eval	uation criteria	15	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 5	2 ***	* ****	4.06	3.81	****
4. To what	t degree c	ould you disc	uss you	r evaluations	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	0 ***	* ****	3.97	4.00	****
5. Did con	nferences	help you carr	y out f	ield activities	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 3	0 ***	* ****	4.33	4.30	****
		Self	Paced															
1. Did se	lf-paced s	system contrib	ute to	what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/	5 ***	* ****	4.34	4.17	****
		Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	ution	n											
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			7	ype			Majors	;	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 A 7				 ed f	or Ma	ior		5	 Gradua		0	 Majo		1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 4		1/6/	1u11	cu I	JI 110	، ٢٠٠١	٥	J	Gradue		U	Ma J	<i>)</i> <u> </u>	Τ.
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 2		Gor	nera	1				1	Under-	arad	17	Non	-major	16
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0		GEI	лста	_				_	onder -	grau	± /	INOII	a JUI	10
Grad.						ភ្ជ	ecti <sup>.</sup>	17AC				0	#### -	Meang	there	are not	enouc	rh
Grau.	rad. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0					11.1	LI	vca				U			be sign		_	111
				I O		O+1	ner					7	T Cabor	a . U	DE BIG.	iiiiiiii	10	
				? 0		001						,						
				: U														

PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS

Title COOMBER, WILLIA

Instructor:

Enrollment: 39 Questionnaires: 20 Fall 2006

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Page 499 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	3	7	5	3	3.32	1547/1669	3.97	4.20	4.23	4.02	3.32
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	7	7	4	3.68	1372/1666	4.10	4.22	4.19	4.11	3.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	3	5	8	3	3.58	1198/1421	4.28	4.27	4.24	4.11	3.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	9	1	1	4	3	1	3.20	1487/1617	4.10	4.04	4.15	3.99	3.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	2	2	6	5		1062/1555		3.98	4.00	3.92	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	15	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	****/1543	3.94	3.93	4.06	3.86	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	3	8	6		1169/1647		4.31	4.12	4.06	3.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	19	0	4.00	1530/1668	4.55	4.67	4.67	4.62	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	2	1	2	7	4	1	3.13	1488/1605	3.88	4.01	4.07	3.96	3.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	4	4	11	4.37	993/1514	4.54	4.53	4.39	4.32	4.37
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	2	2			1216/1551		4.72	4.66	4.55	4.47
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	3	3	9	4		1245/1503	4.24	4.22	4.24	4.17	3.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	2	0	6	7		1277/1506	4.32	4.27	4.26	4.17	3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	1	1	4	2	6		774/1311			3.85		3.79
5. Dia dadiovibadi ecominqueb emanee your anacibednamig	_	3	_	_	-	_	Ü	3.75	,,1,1311	3.03	3.01	3.03	3.00	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	5	0	2	4	1		1417/1490		3.86	4.05	3.85	2.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	3	2	1	2	4	3.17	1382/1502	3.93	4.02	4.26	4.06	3.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	4	2	2	1	3	2.75	1441/1489	4.02	4.10	4.29	4.07	2.75
4. Were special techniques successful	8	11	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1006	4.13	4.05	4.00	3.81	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	1	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 226	****	4.83	4.20	3.98	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 233	****	4.83	4.19	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	2	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 225	****	4.33	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 223	****	4.80	4.35	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 206	****	5.00	4.15	4.01	****
5. Were requirements for tab reports creatly specified	10	_	O	Ü	O	_	O	1.00	, 200		3.00	1.15	1.01	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	4.70	4.38	4.04	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 98	****	4.30	3.95	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	3.50	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****
1. 10 what degree court you discuss your evaluations	10	O	O	_	O	O	O	2.00	, 10			3.77	1.00	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	***

Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS

Instructor:

Baltimore County COOMBER, WILLIA Fall 2006

Page 499 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 39 Questionnaires: 20

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

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

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

Instructor: FALCON, JAIME Enrollment: 40

Questionnaires: 17

Fall 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 500

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	590/1669	3.97	4.20	4.23	4.02	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	173/1666	4.10	4.22	4.19	4.11	4.81
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	280/1421	4.28	4.27	4.24	4.11	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	382/1617	4.10	4.04	4.15	3.99	4.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	379/1555	3.78	3.98	4.00	3.92	4.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	3	9	4.31	598/1543	3.94	3.93	4.06	3.86	4.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	2	11	4.50	481/1647	4.22	4.31	4.12	4.06	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	15	1	4.06	1498/1668	4.55	4.67	4.67	4.62	4.06
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	486/1605	3.88	4.01	4.07	3.96	4.42
Legture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	342/1514	4.54	4.53	4.39	4.32	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	358/1551	4.68	4.72	4.66	4.55	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	2	11	4.50	556/1503	4.24	4.22	4.24	4.17	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	273/1506	4.32	4.27	4.26	4.17	4.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	11	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1311	3.83	3.81	3.85	3.68	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	622/1490	3.86	3.86	4.05	3.85	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	818/1502	3.93	4.02	4.26	4.06	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	684/1489	4.02	4.10	4.29	4.07	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	11	4	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1006	4.13	4.05	4.00	3.81	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	8	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS

Instructor: GINDLING, THOMA

Enrollment: 38
Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 501 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

								Fre	equei	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
			Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
			General	 															
1. Di	d vou	gain ne	ew insights,skil	_	om this course	0	0	0	0	6	8	13	4.26	914/1669	3.97	4.20	4.23	4.02	4.26
			ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	4	7	16	4.44	634/1666	4.10	4.22	4.19	4.11	
			uestions reflect			1	0	1	0	3	8	14	4.31	773/1421	4.28	4.27	4.24	4.11	4.31
4. Di	d othe	er evalı	uations reflect	the e	xpected goals	1	6	0	0	3	5	12	4.45	583/1617	4.10	4.04	4.15	3.99	4.45
5. Di	d assi	gned re	eadings contribu	ite to	what you learned	2	0	3	0	5	11	6	3.68	1118/1555	3.78	3.98	4.00	3.92	3.68
6. Di	d writ	ten ass	signments contri	bute	to what you learned	1	5	1	1	4	6	9	4.00	895/1543	3.94	3.93	4.06	3.86	4.00
7. Wa	s the	grading	g system clearly	expl	ained	0	0	0	0	4	5	18	4.52	469/1647	4.22	4.31	4.12	4.06	4.52
8. Ho	w many	times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/1668	4.55	4.67	4.67	4.62	5.00
9. Ho	w woul	.d you g	grade the overal	ll tea	ching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	3	12	4	4.05	884/1605	3.88	4.01	4.07	3.96	4.05
			Lecture	2															
1. We	re the	instru	actor's lectures		prepared	0	0	0	0	2	4	21	4.70	522/1514	4.54	4.53	4.39	4.32	4.70
	. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	1	2	24	4.85	650/1551		4.72	4.66	4.55	4.85
	. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly						0	0	0	2	7	18	4.59	473/1503	4.24	4.22	4.24	4.17	4.59
			es contribute to			0	0	0	0	2	5	20	4.67	471/1506	4.32	4.27	4.26	4.17	4.67
5. Di	d audi	ovisual	l techniques enh	nance	your understanding	0	18	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	464/1311	3.83	3.81	3.85	3.68	4.22
			Discuss	sion															
1. Di	d clas	s discu	ussions contribu	ite to	what you learned	14	0	1	1	1	2	8	4.15	771/1490	3.86	3.86	4.05	3.85	4.15
					ed to participate	14	0	1	1	1	4	6	4.00	1013/1502	3.93	4.02	4.26	4.06	4.00
					nd open discussion	14	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	930/1489	4.02	4.10	4.29	4.07	4.23
			echniques succes		-	14	10	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1006	4.13	4.05	4.00	3.81	****
			Laborat	orv															
2. We	re vou	provid		-	kground information	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.83	4.19	4.09	****
					for lab activities	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.33	4.50	4.42	****
		Frequ	ıency	7 Dist	trib	utio	n												
a 1'		,	a ana						_					_					
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade									Rea	ason	.s 			Ту]	pe 			Majors	; 
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 8							Red	quir	ed fo	or M	ajor	s 1	.1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	0
28-55 4 1.00-1.99 1 B 12 56-83 2 2.00-2.99 6 C 4							Cor	nera	1				2	IInder-a	mad 0	7	Non	maior	27

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1	В	12						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	6	С	4	General	3	Under-grad	27	Non-major	27
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13				
				2	0						

Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS

Instructor: TAKACS, WENDY E

Enrollment: 78

Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 502 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque 2	ncie:	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	9	9	9	3.77	1367/1669	3.97	4.20	4.23	4.02	3.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	14	9	6		1387/1666	4.10	4.22	4.19	4.11	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	3	14	10		1005/1421	4.28	4.27	4.24	4.11	3.97
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	3	5	8	4.31	739/1617	4.10	4.04	4.15	3.99	4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	11	9	9	3.83	996/1555	3.78	3.98	4.00	3.92	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	19	1	1	1	2	6	4.00	895/1543	3.94	3.93	4.06	3.86	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	7	6	14	4.00	1043/1647	4.22	4.31	4.12	4.06	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	25	4.86	788/1668	4.55	4.67	4.67	4.62	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	2	11	12	1	3.46	1374/1605	3.88	4.01	4.07	3.96	3.46
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	5	15	9		1182/1514			4.39	4.32	4.07
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	7	22	4.70	986/1551	4.68	4.72	4.66	4.55	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	5	6	11	8		1245/1503	4.24		4.24	4.17	3.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	5	7	7	10		1277/1506		4.27	4.26	4.17	3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	17	3	2	4	2	2	2.85	1175/1311	3.83	3.81	3.85	3.68	2.85
Discussion					_	_								
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	7	3	4		1088/1490		3.86	4.05	3.85	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	2	1	3	5	4		1294/1502	3.93	4.02	4.26	4.06	3.53
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	2	3 0	2	8		1023/1489		4.10	4.29	4.07	4.07
4. Were special techniques successful	15	10	U	2	U	0	3	3.80	****/1006	4.13	4.05	4.00	3.81	^ ^ ^ ^
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	29	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 226	****	4.83	4.20	3.98	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	0	0	0	0	1			****	4.83	4.19	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	29	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 225	****	4.33	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	29	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 223	****	4.80	4.35	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	5.00	4.15	4.01	****
Seminar	0.0	0	0	0		•	-	F 00	/ 110	4.4.4.4.	4 50	4 20	4 04	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 112	****	4.70	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	29 29	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 92 ****/ 105	****	4.50	4.22	3.79 3.94	****
<ol> <li>Did presentations contribute to what you learned</li> <li>Were criteria for grading made clear</li> </ol>	29	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 98	****	4.60 4.30	3.95	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made crear	29	U	U	U	U	U	_	3.00	/ 96		4.30	3.93	3.90	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 58	****	3.50	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	29	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	29	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	***	4.33	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****

Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS

Instructor: TAKACS, WENDY E

Enrollment: 78
Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 502 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	10	General	6	Under-grad	30	Non-major	30
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	1			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I

Title ST MARTIN, JEAN

Instructor: Enrollment:

39 Questionnaires: 24 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 503 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Question	ıs		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 Did	Genera n new insights,ski			2	0	0	0	2	1	1.0	4.77	244/1660		4 20	4 22	4 00	4 77
	n new insights,ski tructor make clear			2	0	0	0	1	4	19 17	4.77	244/1669 281/1666		4.20	4.23	4.02 4.11	4.77 4.73
	m questions reflec			2	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.73	151/1421		4.22	4.19	4.11	4.73
	waluations reflect		_	3	5	1	0	1	4	10	4.38	673/1617		4.27	4.15	3.99	4.38
	d readings contrib			2	5	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	324/1555		3.98	4.15	3.99	4.50
			what you learned	3	5 7	0	0	1	4	9	4.53	324/1555		3.93	4.06	3.86	4.53
	ding system clearl			2	0	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	161/1647		4.31	4.12	4.06	4.82
	mes was class cand		rnea	3	0	0	0	0	19	2		1482/1668		4.67	4.12	4.62	4.02
			ning effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	2	14		111/1605		4.01	4.07		4.10
9. HOW WOULD Y	ou grade the overa	iii teaci	iing effectiveness	0	U	U	U	U	۷	14	4.00	111/1605	4.32	4.01	4.07	3.90	4.00
	Lectur	re															
1. Were the in	structor's lecture	es well j	prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	189/1514	4.64	4.53	4.39	4.32	4.90
2. Did the inst	tructor seem inter	rested in	n the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1551	4.77	4.72	4.66	4.55	5.00
3. Was lecture	material presente	ed and ex	xplained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	173/1503	4.49	4.22	4.24	4.17	4.85
4. Did the lec	tures contribute t	o what	you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1506	4.45	4.27	4.26	4.17	5.00
5. Did audiovi	sual techniques en	our understanding	4	15	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/1311	3.64	3.81	3.85	3.68	****	
	Discus																
	iscussions contrib		-	8	0	1	0	2	1	12	4.44	524/1490		3.86	4.05	3.85	4.44
	udents actively en			7	0	0	0	5	1	11	4.35	800/1502		4.02	4.26	4.06	4.35
	tructor encourage		d open discussion	7	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	718/1489		4.10	4.29	4.07	4.47
4. Were special	l techniques succe	essful		7	10	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	110/1006	4.73	4.05	4.00	3.81	4.86
	Semina	ır															
1. Were assign	ed topics relevant		announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.70	4.38	4.04	****
1. 11010 0001911	od copios iciovano				Ü	Ü	ŭ	Ü	Ü	_	3.00	,		11,70	1.50	1.01	
	Self																
	ced system contrib			22	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****
	uestions make clea			22	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****
	ontacts with the i			22	1 1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 46		****	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the fee	4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful							0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
	Fre																
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	7	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
00-27 1	0.00-0.99	1	A 7		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	`s	0	Graduat	.e	0	Majo	r	1
28-55 2	1.00-1.99	0	в 8			-			-								
56-83 5							L				1	Under-	rad 2	24	Non-	major	23
84-150 3	3.00-3.49	2	D 1													-	
Grad. 0	F 0		Ele	ectiv	res				1	#### -		here a		enoug	ıh		

Other

16

Ρ

I

0

0

Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I

Instructor: ST MARTIN, JEAN

Enrollment: 35
Questionnaires: 18

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 504 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncie	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	2	15	4.67	389/1669	4.44	4.20	4.23	4.02	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	218/1666		4.22	4.19	4.11	4.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	392/1421	4.51	4.27	4.24	4.11	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	0	5	9	4.47	554/1617	4.22	4.04	4.15	3.99	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	508/1555		3.98	4.00	3.92	4.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	1	4	9	4.33	580/1543	4.18	3.93	4.06	3.86	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	241/1647	4.56	4.31	4.12	4.06	4.72
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	18	0	4.00	1530/1668	4.48	4.67	4.67	4.62	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	182/1605	4.32	4.01	4.07	3.96	4.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	Ο	0	17	5.00	1/1514	4.64	4.53	4.39	4.32	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1551	4.77	4.72	4.66	4.55	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	144/1503	4.49	4.22	4.24	4.17	4.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	261/1506		4.27	4.26	4.17	4.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	12	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	764/1311	3.64	3.81	3.85	3.68	3.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	1	3	7	4.25	692/1490	3.88	3.86	4.05	3.85	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	2	,	4.50	632/1502	3.91	4.02	4.26	4.06	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	1	۸	2	7	4.17	973/1489	3.95	4.10	4.29	4.07	4.17
4. Were special techniques successful	6	7	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	199/1006		4.05	4.00	3.81	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	,	U	U		U	4	4.00	199/1000	4.73	4.03	4.00	3.01	4.00
Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	6	C	5	General	1	Under-grad	18	Non-major	12
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	13	_			
				?	1						

Course Section: ECON 121 0301 University of Maryland Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I Baltimore County Instructor: CROTEAU, MARCIA Fall 2006

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Fall 2006

Page 505

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	41		
Questionnaires:	25	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	2

							Fre	_	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1 Did :	vou gain n	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	1	2	4	18	4.56	522/1669	4.44	4.20	4.23	4.02	4.56
	1 0	ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	4	21	4.84	149/1666	4.54	4.22	4.19	4.11	4.84
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	0	2	7	16	4.56	502/1421	4.51	4.27	4.24	4.11	4.56
	_	uations reflect		_	0	5	0	0	2	8	10	4.40	641/1617	4.22	4.04	4.15	3.99	4.40
				what you learned	1	1	0	0	5	6	12	4.30	516/1555	4.40	3.98	4.00	3.92	4.30
				o what you learned	1	8	0	0	0		11	4.69		4.18	3.93	4.06	3.86	4.69
		g system clearl			1	0	0	0	1	4	19	4.75	213/1647		4.31	4.12	4.06	4.75
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1668	4.48	4.67	4.67	4.62	5.00
	-			hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	9	13	4.52	358/1605	4.32	4.01	4.07	3.96	4.52
		Lectur																
			0	0			_	_										
	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared  Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	1		18	4.68	569/1514		4.53	4.39	4.32	4.68
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0		23	4.92	409/1551		4.72	4.66	4.55	4.92
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	0	0		17	4.68	373/1503	4.49	4.22	4.24	4.17	4.68
				-	0	0	0	1	1		19	4.64	496/1506		4.27		4.17	4.64
5. Did	audiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	9	2	1	2	6	5	3.69	832/1311	3.64	3.81	3.85	3.68	3.69
		Discus	sion															
1. Did	class disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	8	0	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	604/1490	3.88	3.86	4.05	3.85	4.35
				d to participate	8	0	0	1	3	6	7	4.12	968/1502	3.91	4.02	4.26	4.06	4.12
				d open discussion	8	0	0	0	5	4	8	4.18	966/1489	3.95	4.10	4.29	4.07	4.18
		echniques succe				11	2	1	2	1			****/1006			4.00	3.81	****
				Frequ	ency	7 Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 8							 ed fo	or Ma	ior		0	Graduat	 -	0	Majo	 r	0
28-55							-10-1				-	-	or adda	-	-		_	•
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C 1		Gei	nera	l				1	Under-q	rad 2	25	Non-	major	25
84-150		3.00-3.49	7	D 0		00.		_				_	2302 3		-	-1011		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				2	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enous	rh
	-		-	P 0									respons				_	•
	I 0						her				2	:0			3			
	? 1										_	-						

Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I

TICLE FRIN OF ACCOUNT

Instructor: MCBRIDE, CHUCK

Enrollment: 35
Questionnaires: 22

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 506 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	5	2	14	4.32	840/1669	4.44	4.20	4.23	4.02	4.32
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	12	4.36	740/1666	4.54	4.22	4.19	4.11	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	1	6	12	4.23	839/1421	4.51	4.27	4.24	4.11	4.23
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	5	4	11	4.19	863/1617	4.22	4.04	4.15	3.99	4.19
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	213/1555	4.40	3.98	4.00	3.92	4.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	3	1	3	11	4.05	863/1543	4.18	3.93	4.06	3.86	4.05
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	1	2	3	12	4.26	851/1647	4.56	4.31	4.12	4.06	4.26
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	13	6	4.32	1345/1668	4.48	4.67	4.67	4.62	4.32
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	5	6	6	3.94	1022/1605	4.32	4.01	4.07	3.96	3.94
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	3	5	9	4.22	1100/1514	4.64	4.53	4.39	4.32	4.22
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	539/1551	4.77	4.72	4.66	4.55	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	2	1	0	8	7	3.94	1127/1503	4.49	4.22	4.24	4.17	3.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	0	1	6	9	4.11	1017/1506	4.45	4.27	4.26	4.17	4.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	11	2	1	1	0	3	3.14	1091/1311	3.64	3.81	3.85	3.68	3.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	2	2	4	3	3.50	1154/1490	3.88	3.86	4.05	3.85	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	2	1	5	4	3.92	1106/1502	3.91	4.02	4.26	4.06	3.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	2	2	2	5	3.67	1223/1489	3.95	4.10	4.29	4.07	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	10	10	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1006	4.73	4.05	4.00	3.81	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 226	****	4.83	4.20	3.98	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.83	4.19	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 225	****	4.33	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 223	****	4.80	4.35	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 206	****	5.00	4.15	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 112	****	4.70	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 98	***	4.30	3.95	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	3.50	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****

Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I

Instructor: MCBRIDE, CHUCK

Enrollment: 35
Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 506 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	2	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	11						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C	6	General	2	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	2	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

Course Section: ECON 121 0501 University of Maryland Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I Baltimore County Instructor: COLE, RICHARD Fall 2006

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 21

38

University of Maryland Page 507
Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007
Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

	Ouestionnaire

								Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
			Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
			 Genera	 1															
1 т	714 77011	anin no	w insights,ski	_	m this source	1	0	0	0	6	4	10	4.20	988/1669	4.44	4.20	4.23	4.02	4.20
	_	_	w insignes,ski tor make clear			1	0	0	0	4	8	8	4.20	957/1666	4.54		4.19	4.11	4.20
			estions reflec		_	1	0	1	0	4	4	11	4.20	863/1421	4.51	4.27	4.24	4.11	4.20
		_	ations reflect		_	2	5	1	1	2	5	5		1196/1617	4.22	4.04	4.15	3.99	3.86
					what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	5	11	4.20	611/1555	4.40	3.98	4.15	3.99	4.20
		_	_		to what you learned	1	5	2	2	2	3	6		1226/1543	4.18	3.90	4.06	3.86	3.60
			system clearly			1	0	0	1	1	3	15	4.60	367/1647		4.31	4.12	4.06	4.60
			was class canc		armed	1	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1668	4.48	4.67		4.62	5.00
	_				hing effectiveness	4	0	0	0	4	9	4	4.00	918/1605		4.01		3.96	
Э. г	now woul	.a you g	rade the overa	II Lead	ming effectiveness	4	U	U	U	4	9	4	4.00	910/1005	4.32	4.01	4.07	3.90	4.00
			Lecture	_															
1. V	Were the	instru	ctor's lecture	_	prepared	2	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	631/1514	4.64	4.53	4.39	4.32	4.63
			tor seem inter			2	0	1	0	2	3	13		1254/1551	4.77	4.72	4.66	4.55	4.42
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearl						0	0	1	0	7	10	4.44	653/1503	4.49	4.22	4.24	4.17	4.44
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	4	5	10	4.32	858/1506	4.45	4.27	4.26	4.17	4.32
					our understanding	2 1		0	1	4	0	5	3.90	699/1311		3.81	3.85		3.90
٥. ١	,	.0110441	ocomina daca cir	.101100 ]	our anderbounding	_		Ū	_	-	Ū		3.70	0,5,7,1,511	3.01	3.01	3.05	5.00	5.50
			Discus	sion															
1. I	Did clas	s discu	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	9	0	2	1	5	2	2	3.08	1319/1490	3.88	3.86	4.05	3.85	3.08
2. V	Were all	studen	ts actively en	courage	ed to participate	9	0	1	3	5	0	3	3.08	1392/1502	3.91	4.02	4.26	4.06	3.08
3. I	Did the	instruc	tor encourage :	fair ar	nd open discussion	9	0	1	0	7	1	3	3.42	1314/1489	3.95	4.10	4.29	4.07	3.42
4. V	Were spe	cial te	chniques succe	ssful		9	11	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1006	4.73	4.05	4.00	3.81	****
					Frequ	ency	Dist	tribu	utior	n									
Cred	dits Ear	ned	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors			
	00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 5						Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ijor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	1
	28-55 4 1.00-1.99 2 B 10																		
	56-83 3 2.00-2.99 7 C 4						Gei	nera:	L				4	Under-g	rad 2	21	Non-	major	20
	84-150 4 3.00-3.49 3 D 0															_			
Gra	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0						Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				1	#### - 1				_	h
					P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
	I O							her				1	2						

Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I

Instructor: COLE, RICHARD

Enrollment: 39 Questionnaires: 21

### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 508 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Eva	luation Qu	uesti	.onnai	ire
--------------------	------------	-------	--------	-----

			Fre	quer	ncies			Inst	cructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	1	3	6	9	4.21	963/1669	4.44	4.20	4.23	4.02	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	472/1666	4.54	4.22	4.19	4.11	4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	6		4.58	493/1421		4.27	4.24	4.11	4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	4	0	0	4	4	7	4.20	863/1617				3.99	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	2	1	0	3	2	10	4.25	558/1555	4.40	3.98	4.00	3.92	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	3	1	1	2	3	8	4.07	857/1543	4.18	3.93	4.06	3.86	4.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	0	2			123/1647		4.31		4.06	4.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	0	4	13		952/1668	4.48	4.67	4.67	4.62	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	3	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	565/1605	4.32	4.01	4.07	3.96	4.36
Lecture	2	0	0	0	0	_	1 /	1 71	472/1514	1 (1	4 52	4 20	4 20	1 71
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	5 4			473/1514		4.53	4.39	4.32	4.74
<ol> <li>Did the instructor seem interested in the subject</li> <li>Was lecture material presented and explained clearly</li> </ol>	3	0	0	1	1 2	3	12 13	4.50	1193/1551	4.77	4.72 4.22	4.66	4.55	4.50 4.61
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	3 7	9	4.32	451/1503 858/1506	4.49 4.45	4.22	4.24	$4.17 \\ 4.17$	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	1	1	4	2	5	3.69	825/1311	3.64	3.81	3.85		3.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	Τ	Τ	4	2	5	3.09	023/1311	3.04	3.01	3.05	3.00	3.09
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	2	3	3	6	3 73	1049/1490	3.88	3.86	4.05	3.85	3.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	1	3	2	7		1219/1502	3.91	4.02	4.26	4.06	3.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	2	4	3	6		1142/1489	3.95	4.10	4.29	4.07	3.87
4. Were special techniques successful	6	10	1	0	0	1	3		****/1006	4.73	4.05	4.00	3.81	****
			_	-	•	_	_		,					
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.83	4.20	3.98	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.83	4.19	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.33	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	4.80	4.35	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	5.00	4.15	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.70	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.30	3.95	3.90	****
Field Work					•		_		= 0					
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 58	****	3.50	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	1	0	U	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20 19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.34	4.17	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.08	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.45	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 29	****	****		4.22	****
5. Here there chaugh proceeds for all the seadenes	17	_	J	J	J	J	_	5.00	, 20			1.51	1.22	

Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I

Instructor: COLE, RICHARD

Enrollment: 39
Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 508 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	В	9						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	С	2	General	1	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	1						

Course Section: ECON 121 0701 University of Maryland Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Instructor: MCBRIDE, CHUCK

Enrollment: 38 Questionnaires: 25

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 509 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Questions					MD	NA	Fre	_	ncies	5	E	Ins Mean	tructor Rank		_		Level Mean	
		Quescion	5 									Mean	Raiik		Mean	Mean	Mean	меа 
		Genera	_															
		ew insights,ski			0	0	1	0	3	7			828/1669			4.23	4.02	4.3
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	3	9	12	4.28	841/1666		4.22	4.19	4.11	4.2
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	1	2	8	14	4.40		4.51	4.27	4.24	4.11	4.4
		uations reflect			0	1	0	1	5	9	9	4.08			4.04	4.15	3.99	4.0
	_	-		what you learned	0	2	0	0	4	3	16		324/1555		3.98	4.00	3.92	4.5
		_		o what you learned	0	0	1	1	6	8	9		994/1543		3.93	4.06	3.86	3.9
		g system clearl		ined	0	0	1	2	6	6	10		1178/1647		4.31	4.12	4.06	3.8
		was class canc			0	1	0	0	0	19	5		1412/1668		4.67	4.67	4.62	4.2
9. How wou	ıld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	8	1	0	1	5	6	4	3.81	1164/1605	4.32	4.01	4.07	3.96	3.8
		Lectur																
		uctor's lecture			1	0	1	0	2	8	13	4.33	1022/1514	4.64	4.53	4.39	4.32	4.3
		ctor seem inter			1	0	0	0	1	6	17	4.67	1028/1551	4.77	4.72	4.66	4.55	4.6
				xplained clearly	1	0	1	0	4	11	8	4.04	1045/1503	4.49	4.22	4.24	4.17	4.0
1. Did the	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	2	0	1	2	5	5	10	3.91	1163/1506	4.45	4.27	4.26	4.17	3.9
. Did aud	diovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	2	13	0	1	4	3	2	3.60	890/1311	3.64	3.81	3.85	3.68	3.0
		Discus																
L. Did cla	ass discu	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	15	0	0	1	4	1	4	3.80	1003/1490	3.88	3.86	4.05	3.85	3.8
2. Were al	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	15	0	0	2	2	3	3	3.70	1237/1502	3.91	4.02	4.26	4.06	3.5
3. Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	15	0	0	0	5	1	4	3.90	1125/1489	3.95	4.10	4.29	4.07	3.9
l. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful	_	15	6	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1006	4.73	4.05	4.00	3.81	* * *
		Semina	r															
l. Were as	ssigned t	topics relevant	to the	announced theme	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.70	4.38	4.04	* * *
2. Was the	e instruc	ctor available	for ind	ividual attention	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.19	***
3. Did res	search pi	rojects contrib	ute to	what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.22	3.79	***
1. Did pre	esentatio	ons contribute	to what	you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	***	4.60	4.20	3.94	***
_		for grading mad		-	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.30	3.95	3.90	***
				Freq	uency	7 Dist	trib	utio	n									
redits Ea	redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra							Rea	asons	3			Ту	ne			Majors	3
00-27 28-55						Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	S	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	3
56-83						Ger	nera	1				2	Under-q	rad ?	25	Non-	-major	22
84-150						Gel	LLCI a.	-				-	onder -g	_ uu		14011-	, О	44
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		ਸ <b>ੀ</b>	ecti	Ves				1	#### -	Meane +	here :	are not	enous	τh
oraa.	U	3.30 1.00	2	P 0		11.11	CCCI	v CD				_	respons				_	2++
				I 0		0.1	her				0		T Cabour	CD LO L	,c argi	ıııcaı	10	
												:0						

Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING II

Instructor: MALIN, BARRY

Enrollment: 15
Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2006

Page 510 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	aner	cies			Tnst	ructor	Course	Dent	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	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	2	2	4	3	3.50	1480/1669	4.02	4.20	4.23	4.02	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	3	3	3.82	1303/1666	4.12	4.22	4.19	4.11	3.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	939/1421	4.10	4.27	4.24	4.11	4.08
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	1448/1617	3.77	4.04	4.15	3.99	3.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	3	4	2	3.45	1265/1555	3.91	3.98	4.00	3.92	3.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1543	3.69	3.93	4.06	3.86	***
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	2	3	3	3.45	1416/1647	4.07	4.31	4.12	4.06	3.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	1164/1668	4.65	4.67	4.67	4.62	4.55
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	1	4	2	1	3.38	1412/1605	3.81	4.01	4.07	3.96	3.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	2	4	4		1295/1514	4.35	4.53	4.39	4.32	3.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4	6		1231/1551	4.75	4.72	4.66	4.55	4.45
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	3	3	3		1289/1503	4.08	4.22	4.24	4.17	3.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	3	0			1174/1506	4.01	4.27	4.26	4.17	3.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	995/1311	3.38	3.81	3.85	3.68	3.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	970/1490	3.83	3.86	4.05	3.85	3.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	3	1	3		1208/1502	3.99	4.02	4.26	4.06	3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	3	0	3		1249/1489	3.78	4.10	4.29	4.07	3.57
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	0	0	1	0	-		****/1006		4.05		3.81	****
1. Were special techniques successful	5	5	O	O	_	O	_	1.00	71000	3.03	1.05	1.00	3.01	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 226	****	4.83	4.20	3.98	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.83	4.19	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 225	****	4.33	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 223	****	4.80	4.35	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 206	****	5.00	4.15	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 112	****	4.70	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 98	****	4.30	3.95	3.90	****
Field Work														
	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	2 00	++++/ [0	++++	2 50	4 22	4 00	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11				1	0	0		****/ 58	****	3.50	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 39			4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 40	***	****	3.97	4.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****

Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING II

Instructor: MALIN, BARRY

Enrollment: 15
Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 510 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	1	Graduate 0	0 Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3					
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad 12	2 Non-major	11
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means th	here are not enougl	h
				P	0			responses to be	e significant	
				I	0	Other	9			
				?	0					

Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING II

Instructor: DAVIS, MARY B

Enrollment: 31
Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 511 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

						Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	8	12	4.30	852/1669	4.02	4.20	4.23	4.02	4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	5	15	4.39	703/1666	4.12	4.22	4.19	4.11	4.39
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	6	14	4.39	692/1421	4.10	4.27	4.24	4.11	4.39
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	1	1	2	3	7	4.00	1029/1617	3.77	4.04	4.15	3.99	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	2	8	3	6	3.43	1287/1555	3.91	3.98	4.00	3.92	3.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	2	2	4	8	3.94	969/1543	3.69	3.93	4.06	3.86	3.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	7	13	4.35	744/1647	4.07	4.31	4.12	4.06	4.35
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	788/1668	4.65	4.67	4.67	4.62	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	10	6	4.16	800/1605	3.81	4.01	4.07	3.96	4.16
T. a. selection														
Lecture	-	•	0	-	-	_	1.0	4 45	000/1514	4 25	4 50	4 20	4 20	4 45
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	Τ	Ţ	./	13	4.45	877/1514		4.53	4.39	4.32	4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1551	4.75	4.72	4.66	4.55	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	8	11	4.43	686/1503	4.08	4.22	4.24	4.17	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	3	16	4.50	642/1506	4.01	4.27	4.26	4.17	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	9	1	1	4	3	3	3.50	939/1311	3.38	3.81	3.85	3.68	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	546/1490	3.83	3.86	4.05	3.85	4.42
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	427/1502	3.99	4.02	4.26	4.06	4.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	4	2	5	4.09	1015/1489	3.78	4.10	4.29	4.07	4.09
4. Were special techniques successful	12	8	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1006	3.63	4.05	4.00	3.81	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	19
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	16	_			
				2	Ω						

Course Section: ECON 122 0301 University of Maryland
Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING II Baltimore County

Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING II Baltimore County Instructor: DAVIS, MARY B Fall 2006

Enrollment: 33
Questionnaires: 20

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 512

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	6	11	4.35	793/1669	4.02	4.20	4.23	4.02	4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	0	5	12	4.42	662/1666	4.12	4.22	4.19	4.11	4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	1	4	12	4.37	719/1421	4.10	4.27	4.24	4.11	4.37
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	7	1	2	2	1	6	3.75	1251/1617	3.77	4.04	4.15	3.99	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	4	4	9	4.29	524/1555	3.91	3.98	4.00	3.92	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	0	4	2	9	4.33	580/1543	3.69	3.93	4.06	3.86	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	4	3	11	4.39	682/1647	4.07	4.31	4.12	4.06	4.39
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	428/1668	4.65	4.67	4.67	4.62	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	2	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	591/1605	3.81	4.01	4.07	3.96	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	441/1514	4.35	4.53	4.39	4.32	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	594/1551	4.75	4.72	4.66	4.55	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	621/1503	4.08	4.22	4.24	4.17	4.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	4	11	4.56	585/1506	4.01	4.27	4.26	4.17	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	7	1	0	4	0	4	3.67	846/1311	3.38	3.81	3.85	3.68	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	2	1	2	4	3.60	1117/1490	3.83	3.86	4.05	3.85	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	1	2	4	2	3.50	1301/1502	3.99	4.02	4.26	4.06	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	2	2	3	2		1352/1489	3.78	4.10	4.29	4.07	3.30
4. Were special techniques successful	11	4	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	729/1006	3.63	4.05	4.00	3.81	3.60
•														

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	8	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	18
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	19	-			
				?	0						

Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING II

Instructor: HARDY, TIMOTHY

Enrollment: 36 Questionnaires: 12 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 513 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncie	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	6	1	3.67	1409/1669	4.02	4.20	4.23	4.02	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	5	2	3.67	1387/1666	4.12	4.22	4.19	4.11	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	5	1	3.42	1273/1421	4.10	4.27	4.24	4.11	3.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	2	4	1	3.63	1323/1617	3.77	4.04	4.15	3.99	3.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	5	3	3.75	1062/1555	3.91	3.98	4.00	3.92	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	3	1	3	1	0	2.25	1530/1543	3.69	3.93	4.06	3.86	2.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	3	2			1361/1647	4.07		4.12	4.06	3.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12			1530/1668		4.67		4.62	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	3	3	4			1449/1605		4.01			3.27
J. now would you grade the overall teaching critetiveness	_	Ü	Ü	3	3	-	_	3.27	1110/1000	3.01	1.01	1.07	3.70	3.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	5	3	3 01	1270/1514	4.35	4.53	4.39	4.32	3.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	5	6		1262/1551	4.75	4.72	4.66	4.55	4.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	1	6			1330/1503	4.73	4.22	4.24	4.17	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	3	3			1399/1506	4.00			4.17	3.08
		5		1							4.27			
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	1	Τ	3	0	Т	2.83	1178/1311	3.38	3.81	3.85	3.68	2.83
Discussion	_		_			_	_							
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	0	2	1	1		1391/1490	3.83	3.86	4.05	3.85	2.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	1	3	1		1253/1502	3.99	4.02	4.26	4.06	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	2	1	1			1279/1489	3.78	4.10	4.29	4.07	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1006	3.63	4.05	4.00	3.81	***
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	1	1	0	0	0		****/ 233	****	4.83	4.19	4.09	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 206	****	5.00	4.15	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	4.70	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.22	3.79	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 98	****	4.30	3.95	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 58	****	3.50	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	1	0	0	0	0	1		,	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	***
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	-		-	-	-	-			,				· <del>-</del>	

Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING II

Instructor: HARDY, TIMOTHY

Enrollment: 36
Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 513 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits I	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	12	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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	1						

Course Section: ECON 122 0501 University of Maryland Baltimore County PRIN OF ACCOUNTING II

Page 514 Title JAN 18, 2007 Instructor: HARDY, TIMOTHY Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	29				
Questionnaires:	10	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Grad.

0

3.50-4.00 0

P

I

						Frequencies					Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Questions				NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																	
1. Did yo	u gain n	ew insights,skil		this cours	se	0	0	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	852/1669	4.02	4.20	4.23	4.02	4.30
		ctor make clear				0	0	1	0	1	1	7	4.30	814/1666	4.12	4.22	4.19	4.11	4.30
		uestions reflect	_	_		1	0	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	839/1421	4.10	4.27	4.24	4.11	4.22
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the exp	ected goals	S	0	3	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	922/1617	3.77	4.04	4.15	3.99	4.14
5. Did as:	signed r	eadings contribu	ite to w	hat you lea	arned	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	262/1555	3.91	3.98	4.00	3.92	4.60
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contri	bute to	what you	learned	0	2	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	659/1543	3.69	3.93	4.06	3.86	4.25
7. Was the	e gradin	g system clearly	explai	.ned		0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	367/1647	4.07	4.31	4.12	4.06	4.60
	-	was class cance				0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	713/1668	4.65	4.67	4.67	4.62	4.90
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overal	l teach	ning effect:	iveness	1	0	1	0	1	4	3	3.89	1108/1605	3.81	4.01	4.07	3.96	3.89
		Lecture																	
1. Were ti	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	360/1514	4.35	4.53	4.39	4.32	4.80
	2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject				ct	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1551	4.75	4.72	4.66	4.55	5.00
		terial presented		-		2	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	753/1503	4.08	4.22	4.24	4.17	4.38
		es contribute to		_	-	0	0	2	0	0	2	6	4.00	1069/1506	4.01	4.27	4.26	4.17	4.00
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques enh	ance yo	our understa	anding	0	0	1	0	5	1	3	3.50	939/1311	3.38	3.81	3.85	3.68	3.50
		D																	
1 Did al		Discuss ussions contribu		.ha+ lar	- was a d	2	0	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	535/1490	3.83	3.86	4.05	3.85	4.43
		nts actively end		-		3	0	1	0	0	1	5		859/1502		4.02	4.05	4.06	4.29
		ctor encourage f	_	-	-	3	0	1	0	0	0	6		776/1489		4.10	4.29	4.07	4.43
		echniques succes		open arset	abbion	3	4	1	0	0	0	2		694/1006		4.05	4.00	3.81	
	Fi							trib	ution	ı									
Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade								Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 A	0		Red	auir	ed fo	or Ma	 aior	 s	0	Graduat	 -	0	Majo	 r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	В	6		1000	-1		- 110		~	•	SI adda C	_	•	.10.50	-	J
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General						0	Under-g	rad 1	.0	Non-	major	10	
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0	General								5				3	

Electives

10

Other

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

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

Title Instructor: CROTEAU, MARCIA Fall 2006

Enrollment: 29 Questionnaires: 26

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 515

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

	-				Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	6	16	4.52	567/1669	4.58	4.20	4.23	4.28	4.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	5	17	4.56	483/1666		4.22	4.19	4.20	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	8	15	4.52	538/1421	4.55	4.27	4.24	4.25	4.52
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	3	12	8	4.22	841/1617	4.11	4.04	4.15	4.22	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	3	4	5	9	3.95	856/1555	4.26	3.98	4.00	4.03	3.95
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	6	3	5	7	3.50	1260/1543	3.75	3.93	4.06	4.14	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	6	18	4.68	292/1647	4.81	4.31	4.12	4.14	4.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	0	24	4.92	570/1668	4.87	4.67	4.67	4.68	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	5	14	4.50	373/1605	4.42	4.01	4.07	4.09	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	392/1514	4.86	4.53	4.39	4.46	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	2	20	4.83	732/1551		4.72	4.66	4.70	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	4	17	4.65	399/1503	4.76	4.22	4.24	4.28	4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	6	15	4.48	680/1506	4.65	4.27	4.26	4.30	4.48
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	9	0	1	4	3	6	4.00	587/1311	4.20	3.81	3.85	3.97	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	3	0	3	2	11	3.95	913/1490	4.34	3.86	4.05	4.11	3.95
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	2	6	6	6		1179/1502	4.08	4.02	4.26	4.28	3.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	3	8	7		1013/1489	4.28	4.10	4.29	4.35	4.11
4. Were special techniques successful	7	14	1	0	1	2	1		****/1006	****	4.05	4.00	4.10	****

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	15						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	5	C	3	General	2	Under-grad	26	Non-major	26
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	า
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	21	_			
				?	0						

INTERMED ACCOUNTING I

Title Instructor: CROTEAU, MARCIA

Enrollment: 33 Questionnaires: 17 Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 516 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

			Fre	anier	ncies			Tnst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	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	6	11	4.65	419/1669	4.58	4.20	4.23	4.28	4.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	11	4.53	527/1666	4.54	4.22	4.19	4.20	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	3	13	4.59	484/1421	4.55	4.27	4.24	4.25	4.59
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	2	5	8	4.00	1029/1617	4.11	4.04	4.15	4.22	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	293/1555	4.26	3.98	4.00	4.03	4.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	4	8	4.00	895/1543	3.75	3.93	4.06	4.14	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	67/1647	4.81	4.31	4.12	4.14	4.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	863/1668	4.87	4.67	4.67	4.68	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	8	4	4.33	591/1605	4.42	4.01	4.07	4.09	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	132/1514	4.86	4.53	4.39	4.46	4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	358/1551	4.88	4.72	4.66	4.70	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	154/1503	4.76	4.22	4.24	4.28	4.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	273/1506	4.65	4.27	4.26	4.30	4.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	9	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	333/1311	4.20	3.81	3.85	3.97	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	289/1490	4.34	3.86	4.05	4.11	4.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	1	1	8	4.36	790/1502	4.08	4.02	4.26	4.28	4.36
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	1	0	9	4.45	742/1489	4.28	4.10	4.29	4.35	4.45
4. Were special techniques successful	6	9	0	0	0	0	2		****/1006	****	4.05	4.00	4.10	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.83	4.20	4.17	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.83	4.19	4.13	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.33	4.50	4.45	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 223	****	4.80	4.35	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	5.00	4.15	4.08	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.70	4.38	4.53	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.22	4.47	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	4.45	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.30	3.95	4.15	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.50	4.22	4.29	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	***

Title INTERMED ACCOUNTING I

Instructor: CROTEAU, MARCIA

Enrollment: 33
Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 516 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA						Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Title INTERM MICROECON ANALY

Instructor: COATES, DENNIS

Enrollment: 35
Questionnaires: 19

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 517 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	511/1669	4.27	4.20	4.23	4.28	4.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	6	8	4.22	922/1666		4.22	4.19	4.20	4.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	5	9	4.16	894/1421	4.20	4.27	4.24	4.25	4.16
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	863/1617	3.86	4.04	4.15	4.22	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	2	7	5	4.07	734/1555		3.98	4.00	4.03	4.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	13	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1076/1543		3.93	4.06	4.14	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	2	15	4.63	334/1647	4.57	4.31	4.12	4.14	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	11	7	4.26	1376/1668	4.51	4.67	4.67	4.68	4.26
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	11	4	4.06	884/1605	4.22	4.01	4.07	4.09	4.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	553/1514	4.61	4.53	4.39	4.46	4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	1069/1551	4.69	4.72	4.66	4.70	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	7	10	4.42	686/1503	4.30	4.22	4.24	4.28	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	394/1506	4.44	4.27	4.26	4.30	4.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	264/1311	3.92	3.81	3.85	3.97	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	1	1	2	4	3.78	1022/1490	3.76	3.86	4.05	4.11	3.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	2	3	1	3	3.56	1290/1502	3.68	4.02	4.26	4.28	3.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	1006/1489	3.83	4.10	4.29	4.35	4.11
4. Were special techniques successful	9	5	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	199/1006	4.60	4.05	4.00	4.10	4.60
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 226	****	4.83	4.20	4.17	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.83	4.19	4.13	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 225	****	4.33	4.50	4.45	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 223	****	4.80	4.35	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 206	****	5.00	4.15	4.08	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 112	****	4.70	4.38	4.53	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.22	4.47	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	4.45	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 98	****	4.30	3.95	4.15	****
Frequ	ency.	Dist	ribu	ation	n									

Credits E	redits Earned 			Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate 0	) Major	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	6					
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	1	Under-grad 19	Non-major	14
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means th	nere are not enougl	h
				P	0			responses to be	significant	
				I	0	Other	18			
				?	1					

Title INTERM MICROECON ANALY

Instructor: TAKACS, WENDY E

Enrollment: 43 Questionnaires: 33

Page 518 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Fall 2006

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean			
******														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	0	7	15	9	3.88	1307/1669	4.27	4.20	4.23	4.28	3.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	15	12	4.12	1019/1666	4.18	4.22	4.19	4.20	4.12
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	12	16	4.27	797/1421	4.20	4.27	4.24	4.25	4.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	17	1	0	4	6	4	3.80	1224/1617	3.86	4.04	4.15	4.22	3.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	3	5	6	10	6	3.37	1316/1555	3.85	3.98	4.00	4.03	3.37
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	19	0	1	1	8	4	4.07	850/1543	3.92	3.93	4.06	4.14	4.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	12	18	4.45	566/1647	4.57	4.31	4.12	4.14	4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	5.00	1/1668	4.51	4.67	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	4	14	10	4.14	820/1605	4.22	4.01	4.07	4.09	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	16	15	4.41	955/1514	4.61	4.53	4.39	4.46	4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	0	4	27	4.75	880/1551	4.69	4.72	4.66	4.70	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	19	10	4.22	914/1503	4.30	4.22	4.24	4.28	4.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	11	16	4.31	858/1506	4.44	4.27	4.26	4.30	4.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	19	1	1	3	4	3	3.58	899/1311	3.92	3.81	3.85	3.97	3.58
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	2	2	3	5	4		1196/1490		3.86	4.05	4.11	3.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	1	0	8	2	5		1270/1502	3.68	4.02	4.26	4.28	3.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	3	1	4	3	5		1328/1489	3.83	4.10	4.29	4.35	3.38
4. Were special techniques successful	17	13	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1006	4.60	4.05	4.00	4.10	****
_ ,														
Laboratory	2.0	•	0	0	0	-	0	4 00	****	ate ate ate ate	4 00	4 00	4 15	****
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	32	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 226	****	4.83	4.20	4.17	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	32	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 233		4.83	4.19	4.13	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	32	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 225	****	4.33	4.50	4.45	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	32	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 223	****	4.80	4.35	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	32	U	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	5.00	4.15	4.08	^ ^ ^ ^
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 112	****	4.70	4.38	4.53	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.22	4.47	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	4.45	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	32	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 98	****	4.30	3.95	4.15	****
J. Were effected for grading made effect	22	O	O	O	U	U	_	3.00	, 50		1.50	3.75	1.13	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	3.50	3.50	4.22	4.29	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	32	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	32	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****
									,					
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****

Title INTERM MICROECON ANALY

Instructor: TAKACS, WENDY E

Enrollment: 43
Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 518 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	11						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	4	C	8	General	2	Under-grad	33	Non-major	26
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	1			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	28				
				?	1						

INTERM MICROECON ANALY

Title BRADLEY, MICHAE

Instructor: Enrollment:

31 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 519

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

				Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	
	General														
1.	Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	1	3	3	8	4.00	1173/1669	4.27	4.20	4.23	4.28	4.00
2.	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	4	9	4.06	1065/1666	4.18	4.22	4.19	4.20	4.06
3.	Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	2	10	4.18	878/1421	4.20	4.27	4.24	4.25	4.18
	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	1	1	2	0	3	3.43	1414/1617	3.86	4.04	4.15	4.22	3.43
	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	2	4	8	4.06	734/1555	3.85	3.98	4.00	4.03	4.06
	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1543	3.92	3.93	4.06	4.14	****
	Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5		4.59	389/1647	4.57	4.31	4.12	4.14	4.59
	How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3		4.82	863/1668	4.51	4.67		4.68	4.82
	How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	3	5		4.00	918/1605		4.01		4.09	4.00
,	now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	O	Ü	Ü	O	3	3	3	1.00	J10/1005	1.22	1.01	1.07	1.05	1.00
	Lecture														
1.	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	763/1514	4.61	4.53	4.39	4.46	4.54
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	3	9		1097/1551	4.69	4.72	4.66	4.70	4.62
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	1	2	3	6		1147/1503	4.30	4.22	4.24	4.28	3.92
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	5			926/1506		4.27	4.26	4.30	4.23
	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	2	0	4	1			1100/1311				3.97	
٠.	pra addrevibuar commiques cimanoc your anacistanaring	-	-	_	Ü	-	-	_	3.11	1100/1311	3.72	3.01	3.03	3.77	3.11
	Discussion														
1.	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	3	1	5	3.73	1055/1490	3.76	3.86	4.05	4.11	3.73
2.	Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	4	0	0	6	3.55	1292/1502	3.68	4.02	4.26	4.28	3.55
3.	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	3	2	1	4	3.60	1237/1489	3.83	4.10	4.29	4.35	3.60
	Were special techniques successful	6	8	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1006	4.60	4.05	4.00	4.10	***
	•														
	Laboratory														
2.	Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.83	4.19	4.13	****
3.	Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.33	4.50	4.45	****
	Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	4.80	4.35	4.27	****
5.	Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	5.00	4.15	4.08	****
	Seminar														
1.	Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.70	4.38	4.53	****
2.	Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.12	****
3.	Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.22	4.47	****
4.	Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	4.45	****
5.	Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.30	3.95	4.15	****
	Field Work														
1.	Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	3.50	3.50	4.22	4.29	****
2.	Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****
3.	Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****
4.	To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****
	Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****
	<del>-</del>														
	Self Paced														
	Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****
	Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.13	****
3.	Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****
4.	Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****
5.	Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****

Title INTERM MICROECON ANALY

Instructor:

INTERM MICROECON ANALY BRADLEY, MICHAE

Enrollment: 31
Questionnaires: 17

31

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 519 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	В	7						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	13
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enougl	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	.gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	1						

INTERM MICROECON ANALY

Title Instructor: COATES, DENNIS

Enrollment: 21 Questionnaires: 16 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 520 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	448/1669	4.27	4.20		4.28	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	801/1666	4.18	4.22	4.19	4.20	4.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	4	9	4.19	871/1421	4.20	4.27	4.24	4.25	4.19
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	1	1	3	6	4.00	1029/1617	3.86	4.04	4.15	4.22	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	1	0	5	4	3.91	939/1555	3.85	3.98	4.00	4.03	3.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	1060/1543	3.92	3.93	4.06	4.14	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	367/1647	4.57	4.31	4.12	4.14	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	14	1	3.94	1574/1668	4.51	4.67	4.67	4.68	3.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	210/1605	4.22	4.01	4.07	4.09	4.70
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	342/1514	4.61	4.53	4.39	4.46	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	880/1551	4.69	4.72	4.66	4.70	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	2		4.63		4.30		4.24	4.28	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4		4.50	642/1506		4.27	4.26	4.30	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	10	0	0	0	2		4.50	264/1311		3.81		3.97	4.50
Discussion														
Discussion	-	0	0	0	2	_	4	4 11	000/1400	2 76	2 06	4 05	4 11	4 11
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	800/1490	3.76	3.86	4.05	4.11	4.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	1	3	4		1013/1502	3.68	4.02	4.26	4.28	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	936/1489	3.83	4.10	4.29	4.35	4.22
4. Were special techniques successful	8	7	0	0	0	0	Т	5.00	****/1006	4.60	4.05	4.00	4.10	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.83	4.20	4.17	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	1	0	2		****/ 233	****	4.83	4.19	4.13	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	2	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 225	****	4.33	4.50	4.45	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	2	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 223	****	4.80	4.35	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 206	****	5.00	4.15	4.08	****
or more requirements for two reports offential specified		_	Ü	Ü	ŭ	Ü	_	3.00	, 200		3.00	1113	1.00	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	2	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 112	****	4.70	4.38	4.53	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	1	0	0	0	0	1		,	****	4.60	4.20	4.45	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.30	3.95	4.15	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	46/ 58	3.50	3.50	4.22	4.29	3.50
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****
J. Here there though proceeds for all the students	<b>1</b> .7	_	J	J	J	U	Τ.	5.00	/ 29			1.51	1.10	

Title INTERM MICROECON ANALY

Instructor: COATES, DENNIS

Enrollment: 21
Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 520 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	10
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	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

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

Instructor: CINYABUGUMA, MA

Enrollment: 37
Questionnaires: 27

Fall 2006
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 521

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer		s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	4	10	11	4.19	988/1669	4.01	4.20	4.23	4.28	4.19
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	5	12	8	4.04	1076/1666	4.05	4.22	4.19	4.20	4.04
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	5	11	9		943/1421	4.01	4.27	4.24	4.25	4.08
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	7	2	3	2	7	5	3.53	1364/1617	3.96	4.04	4.15	4.22	3.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	3	3	6	10	4.05	747/1555	4.04	3.98	4.00	4.03	4.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	13	3	0	2	3	4	3.42	1298/1543	3.81	3.93	4.06	4.14	3.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	3	4	7	11	4.04	1022/1647	4.13	4.31	4.12	4.14	4.04
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	8	16	4.67	1068/1668	4.84	4.67	4.67	4.68	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	7	10	2	3.74	1225/1605	3.69	4.01	4.07	4.09	3.74
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	4	7	12	4.35	1013/1514	4.58	4.53	4.39	4.46	4.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	2	4	17	4.65	1042/1551	4.74	4.72	4.66	4.70	4.65
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	5	8	9	4.09	1025/1503	4.11	4.22	4.24	4.28	4.09
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	1	0	4	7	10	4.14	1002/1506	4.21	4.27	4.26	4.30	4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	10	3	0	2	1	5	3.45	967/1311	3.51	3.81	3.85	3.97	3.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	622/1490	3.99	3.86	4.05	4.11	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	586/1502	4.15	4.02	4.26	4.28	4.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	640/1489	4.25	4.10	4.29	4.35	4.56
4. Were special techniques successful	18	3	1	0	2	0	3	3.67	****/1006	4.00	4.05	4.00	4.10	****
Freq	ıency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	ason	ıs			Ту	pe			Majors	;

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	15	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	27	Non-major	21
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	19	-			
				?	0						

INTERM MACROECON ANALY

Title Instructor: CINYABUGUMA, MA

Enrollment: 23 Questionnaires: 22 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 522 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

							Fre	equei	ncie	S		Ins	tructor	:	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Ran	ık	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 1																
1. Did vo	u gain ne	w insights,skil		m this course	0	0	1	0	3	13	5	3.95	1230/1	669	4.01	4.20	4.23	4.28	3.95
_	_	tor make clear			0	0	0	0	5	10	7		1042/1		4.05	4.22	4.19	4.20	4.09
		estions reflect			0	0	0	0	2	9	11	4.41	683/1		4.01	4.27	4.24	4.25	4.41
	_	ations reflect		=	0	13	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	445/1		3.96	4.04	4.15	4.22	4.56
				what you learned	0	3	0	1	3	6	9	4.21	592/1		4.04	3.98	4.00	4.03	4.21
	_	-		what you learned	0	11	1	1	0	4	5	4.00	895/1		3.81	3.93	4.06	4.14	4.00
		system clearly			0	1	0	1	3	5	12	4.33	759/1	647	4.13	4.31	4.12	4.14	4.33
8. How man	ny times	was class cance	elled		0	2	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	1039/1	668	4.84	4.67	4.67	4.68	4.70
9. How wo	uld you g	rade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	3	1	1	1	4	9	3	3.67	1274/1	.605	3.69	4.01	4.07	4.09	3.67
		Lecture	9																
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lectures	s well :	prepared	1	0	0	0	2	9	10	4.38	974/1	514	4.58	4.53	4.39	4.46	4.38
		tor seem intere			1	0	0	0	2	7	12	4.48	1216/1	551	4.74	4.72	4.66	4.70	4.48
3. Was le	Was lecture material presented and explained clea: Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	6	5	10	4.19	932/1	.503	4.11	4.22	4.24	4.28	4.19
4. Did the						0	0	0	2	11	8	4.29	884/1	506	4.21	4.27	4.26	4.30	4.29
							2	2	1	3	1	2.89	1165/1	311	3.51	3.81	3.85	3.97	2.89
		Discus	sion																
1. Did cla	ass discu			what you learned	8	0	1	0	2	6	5	4.00	849/1	490	3.99	3.86	4.05	4.11	4.00
				d to participate	8	0	1	0	6	2	5	3.71	1231/1		4.15	4.02	4.26	4.28	3.71
				d open discussion	8	0	1	0	5	2	6		1146/1		4.25	4.10	4.29	4.35	3.86
4. Were s	pecial te	chniques succes	ssful	_	8	8	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	479/1	.006	4.00	4.05	4.00	4.10	4.00
		Laborat	cory																
2. Were ye	ou provid	led with adequat	e back	ground information	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	233	****	4.83	4.19	4.13	****
		Field V	Work																
1. Did fi	eld exper	ience contribut	te to wi	hat you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	58	****	3.50	4.22	4.29	****
2. Did you	u clearly	understand you	ır eval	uation criteria	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****
3. Was the	e instruc	tor available i	for con	sultation	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****
4. To wha	t degree	could you disc	uss you	r evaluations	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****
		Self I	Paced																
1. Did se	lf-paced	system contribu	ite to	what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n										
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	S				Тур	oe .			Majors	5	
00-27						Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	S	0	Grad	luate	3	0	Majo	or	9
28-55																			
56-83							nera	T				1	Unde	er-gr	rad 2	22	Non-	-major	13
84-150		2 0		7						0	p. n. e. e			1			1-		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0		Εle	ecti	ves				0						enoug	lu
				P 0 T 0		01	h				-	_	resp	onse	es to b	e sign	ııııcar	16	
				I 0		Oti	her				1	5							

INTERM MACROECON ANALY

Title INTERM MACROEC Instructor: PARK, KIYOUNG

Enrollment: 30
Questionnaires: 13

K, KIYOUNG Fall 2006

Page 523 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	1124/1669	4.01	4.20	4.23	4.28	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	4	4.00	1094/1666	4.05	4.22	4.19	4.20	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	969/1421	4.01	4.27	4.24	4.25	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	899/1617	3.96	4.04	4.15	4.22	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	715/1555	4.04	3.98	4.00	4.03	4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	3	4	2	3.70	1175/1543	3.81	3.93	4.06	4.14	3.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	0	2	9	4.38	682/1647	4.13	4.31	4.12	4.14	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1668	4.84	4.67	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	4	1	4	4.00	918/1605	3.69	4.01	4.07	4.09	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	441/1514	4.58	4.53	4.39	4.46	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	460/1551	4.74	4.72	4.66	4.70	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	1025/1503	4.11	4.22	4.24	4.28	4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	838/1506	4.21	4.27	4.26	4.30	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	0	3	1	4	3.78	780/1311	3.51	3.81	3.85	3.97	3.78
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	849/1490	3.99	3.86	4.05	4.11	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	900/1502	4.15	4.02	4.26	4.28	4.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	936/1489	4.25	4.10	4.29	4.35	4.22
4. Were special techniques successful	4	6	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1006	4.00	4.05	4.00	4.10	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.83	4.20	4.17	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.83	4.19	4.13	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.33	4.50	4.45	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 223	****	4.80	4.35	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	5.00	4.15	4.08	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 112	****	4.70	4.38	4.53	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 92	****	4.50	4.22	4.47	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	4.45	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.30	3.95	4.15	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 58	****	3.50	4.22	4.29	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****

Title INTERM MACROECON ANALY

Instructor: PARK, KIYOUNG

Enrollment: 30
Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 523 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	12
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	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Title INTERM MACROECON ANALY

Instructor: PARK, KIYOUNG

Enrollment: 36

Questionnaires: 12

Baltimore County Fall 2006

University of Maryland

Page 524
JAN 18, 2007
Job IRBR3029

			Fre	anier	ncies			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	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	1	2	3	5	3.83	1332/1669	4.01	4.20	4.23	4.28	3.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	1	7	4.08	1048/1666	4.05	4.22	4.19	4.20	4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	0	1	2	5	3.55	1208/1421	4.01	4.27	4.24	4.25	3.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	2	1	2	4	3.60	1334/1617	3.96	4.04	4.15	4.22	3.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	2	1	5	3.80	1021/1555	4.04	3.98	4.00	4.03	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	807/1543	3.81	3.93	4.06	4.14	4.13
<ol> <li>Was the grading system clearly explained</li> </ol>	0	0	1	3	1	0	7	3.75	1275/1647	4.13	4.31	4.12	4.14	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1668		4.67	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	3	3	1	3.38	1412/1605	3.69	4.01	4.07	4.09	3.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	308/1514	4.58	4.53	4.39	4.46	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92		4.74	4.72	4.66	4.70	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	2	1	7	4.08	1025/1503	4.11	4.22	4.24	4.28	4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	1	1	7		1029/1506		4.27	4.26	4.30	4.09
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	1	2	0	6	3.90		3.51	3.81	3.85	3.97	3.90
Diamondo														
Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	1	2	3	2 62	1107/1490	3.99	3.86	4.05	4.11	3.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	962/1502	4.15	4.02	4.26	4.11	4.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.13	827/1489	4.25	4.10	4.29	4.35	4.13
4. Were special techniques successful	4	6	0	0	0	1	1		****/1006		4.05	4.00	4.10	****
4. Were special techniques successiur	7	0	U	U	U	1	_	4.50	71000	4.00	4.05	4.00	4.10	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.83	4.20	4.17	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 233	****	4.83	4.19	4.13	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.33	4.50	4.45	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	4.80	4.35	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	5.00	4.15	4.08	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.70	4.38	4.53	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.22	4.47	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	4.45	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.30	3.95	4.15	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/ 58	****	3.50	4.22	4.29	****
	11	0	0		0	0	1		,	****	****	4.06		****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0 0	0	0	_		, -	****	****		3.59	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00		****	****	4.39 3.97	3.82	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations		0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.34	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	U	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	/ 30			4.33	3.49	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,	****	****	4.34	4.03	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.13	***
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****

Title INTERM MACROECON ANALY

Instructor: PARK, KIYOUNG

Enrollment: 36
Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 524 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	12	Non-major	11
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	2						

Title QUANT MTHDS: MANAGEMENT

Instructor: PALMATEER, JASO

Enrollment: 46 Questionnaires: 30

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 525 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	requencies		s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	4	10	15	4.27	901/1669	4.27	4.20	4.23	4.28	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	8	18	4.40	691/1666	4.40	4.22	4.19	4.20	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	5	19	4.33	746/1421	4.33	4.27	4.24	4.25	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	3	3	17	4.61	394/1617	4.61	4.04	4.15	4.22	4.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	1	2	8	4	8		1111/1555	3.70	3.98	4.00	4.03	3.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	9	0	0	4	4	11	4.37		4.37	3.93	4.06	4.14	4.37
<ol> <li>Was the grading system clearly explained</li> </ol>	0	0	0	1	4	3	22	4.53		4.53	4.31	4.12	4.14	4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	16	13		1274/1668	4.40	4.67		4.68	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	7	10	6	3.88	1116/1605	3.88	4.01	4.07	4.09	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	0	1	5	19	4.58	715/1514	4.58	4.53	4.39	4.46	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	1	4	20	4.65	1042/1551	4.65	4.72	4.66	4.70	4.65
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	2	9	14	4.38	742/1503	4.38	4.22	4.24	4.28	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	1	0	7	16	4.31	868/1506	4.31	4.27	4.26	4.30	4.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	6	1	0	3	5	8	4.12	531/1311	4.12	3.81	3.85	3.97	4.12
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	2	1	3	7	3.73	1049/1490	3.73	3.86	4.05	4.11	3.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	2	1	1	4	7		1141/1502	3.87	4.02	4.26	4.28	3.87
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	1	2	3	8		1023/1489	4.07	4.10	4.29	4.35	4.07
4. Were special techniques successful	15	8	0	1	1	0	5		****/1006	****	4.05	4.00	4.10	****
		-	-	_	_	-	-		,					
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 233	****	4.83	4.19	4.13	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 225	****	4.33	4.50	4.45	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 223	****	4.80	4.35	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 206	****	5.00	4.15	4.08	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 112	****	4.70	4.38	4.53	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	0	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00		****	4.50	4.22	4.47	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	1	1	0	0	0	0			****	4.60	4.20	4.45	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	0	0	1	0	0	1		****/ 98	****	4.30	3.95	4.15	****
3 44 5 4 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6														
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	1	0	1	1.00	,	****	3.50	4.22	4.29	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	28	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	28	1	0	0	1	0	0	5.00	,	****	****	3.97	3.34	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	28	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	28	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	28	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****

Title QUANT MTHDS: MANAGEMENT

Instructor: PALMATEER, JASO

Enrollment: 46

Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 525 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	13	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	11						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	30	Non-major	27
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	20				
				?	0						

Course Section: ECON 374 0101 Title FUND FINANCIAL MGMT

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 526

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

instructor:	LAMDIN,	DOUGLAS
Enrollment:	35	
A		

Questionnaires: 24

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

	Frequencies							Inst	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	8	14	4.42	719/1669	4.38	4.20	4.23	4.28	4.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	17	4.67	359/1666	4.58	4.22	4.19	4.20	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	9	13	4.42	670/1421	4.48	4.27	4.24	4.25	4.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	2	0	0	8	12	4.27	780/1617	4.22	4.04	4.15	4.22	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	1	7	8	4	3.62	1170/1555	3.72	3.98	4.00	4.03	3.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	0	5	10	4	3.67	1195/1543	3.88	3.93	4.06	4.14	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	161/1647	4.56	4.31	4.12	4.14	4.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	882/1668	4.80	4.67	4.67	4.68	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	4	10	8	4.18	769/1605	4.06	4.01	4.07	4.09	4.18
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	342/1514	4.78	4.53	4.39	4.46	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	1000/1551	4.74	4.72	4.66	4.70	4.68
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	3	8	9	4.09	1020/1503	4.24	4.22	4.24	4.28	4.09
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	4	14	4.32	858/1506	4.40	4.27	4.26	4.30	4.32
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	2	1	4	6	5	3.61	882/1311	3.88	3.81	3.85	3.97	3.61
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	3	1	3	3	2	3.00	1328/1490	3.71	3.86	4.05	4.11	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	1	3	4	3		1283/1502	3.86	4.02	4.26	4.28	3.58
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	1	2	3	5	3.83	1155/1489	4.17	4.10	4.29	4.35	3.83
4. Were special techniques successful	12	7	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	****/1006	****	4.05	4.00	4.10	****
-														

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	22
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	23	_			
				?	1						

Course Section: ECON 374 0102 University of Maryl Title FUND FINANCIAL MGMT Baltimore County Instructor: LAMDIN, DOUGLAS Fall 2006

University of Maryland Page 527
Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007
Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	38	
Questionnaires:	20	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ouestions						NA		equer 2			E	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean			
		Question	.15 		NK.	NA						меан	Ralik	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	al															
1. Did y	ou gain n	ew insights,sk	ills fro	om this course	0	0	0	0	4	5	11	4.35	793/1669	4.38	4.20	4.23	4.28	4.35
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	2	3	14	4.50	549/1666	4.58	4.22	4.19	4.20	4.50
3. Did t	he exam q	uestions reflec	ct the e	expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	14	4.55	511/1421	4.48	4.27	4.24	4.25	4.55
4. Did o	ther eval	uations reflect	t the ex	spected goals	0	1	2	1	1	3	12	4.16	911/1617	4.22	4.04	4.15	4.22	4.16
5. Did a	ssigned r	eadings contrib	oute to	what you learned	0	4	1	1	4	4	6	3.81	1012/1555	3.72	3.98	4.00	4.03	3.81
6. Did w	ritten as	signments conti	ribute t	to what you learned	0	9	1	0	2	2	6	4.09	838/1543	3.88	3.93	4.06	4.14	4.09
7. Was t	he gradin	g system clear	ly expla	ained	0	0	1	2	2	0	15	4.30	806/1647	4.56	4.31	4.12	4.14	4.30
8. How m	any times	was class cand	celled		1	1	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	939/1668	4.80	4.67	4.67	4.68	4.78
9. How w	ould you	grade the over	all tead	ching effectiveness	1	1	0	1	3	10	4	3.94	1022/1605	4.06	4.01	4.07	4.09	3.94
	Lecture																	
1 1/10	-b		1	0	0	0	0	_	1 /	1 71	472/1514	4 70	4 52	4.39	4.46	4.74		
		uctor's lecture			1	0	0	0	0		15	4.74	473/1514 825/1551		4.53	4.39	4.46	4.74
	2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly						0		1			4.79	742/1503			4.24	4.28	4.39
		es contribute t			2	0	1	0	1		13				4.27		4.30	
				your understanding	2	-	1	1	1	2	8	4.15	507/1311				3.97	
J. DIG A	udiovisua	i teciniiques ei	inance j	our understanding	2	J		1	1	2	O	1.13	307/1311	3.00	3.01	3.03	3.91	1.13
		Discus	ssion															
1. Did c	lass disc	ussions contrib	oute to	what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	535/1490	3.71	3.86	4.05	4.11	4.43
2. Were	all stude	nts actively er	ncourage	ed to participate	13	0	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	950/1502	3.86	4.02	4.26	4.28	4.14
3. Did t	he instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd open discussion	14	0	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	684/1489	4.17	4.10	4.29	4.35	4.50
4. Were	special t	echniques succe	essful		13	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1006	****	4.05	4.00	4.10	****
				Frequ	iency	, Dist	tribu	ıtioı	1									
				1														
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Туј	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 10		Red	quire	ed fo	or M	ajor	 s	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r )r	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 9			-			-						3 -		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Ger	nera	L				0	Under-g	rad 2	20	Non-	major	19
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	10	D 0									_				-	
Grad.	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 4 F 0					Ele	ectiv	res				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ιh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
I 0						Oth	her				1	.8						
? 0																		

Course Section: ECON 408 0101 University of Maryland Page 528 Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007 MANAGERIAL ECONOMICS DASGUPTA, NANDI Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	24
Ougstienneimes:	11

Questionnaires: 11

Title

Instructor:

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

					-					Inst	tructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect		
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 L															
1. Did yo	ou gain n	ew insights,skil	lls fro	m this course	1	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	345/1669	4.74	4.20	4.23	4.39	4.70
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	2	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	494/1666	4.64	4.22	4.19	4.22	4.56
3. Did th	ne exam q	uestions reflect	the e	expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	557/1421	4.56	4.27	4.24	4.38	4.50
4. Did ot	ther eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	4	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	717/1617	4.40	4.04	4.15	4.22	4.33
5. Did as	ssigned r	eadings contribu	ite to	what you learned	1	1	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	955/1555	4.14	3.98	4.00	4.08	3.89
6. Did wi	ritten as	signments contri	bute t	o what you learned	1	6	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1138/1543	4.26	3.93	4.06	4.18	3.75
7. Was th	ne gradin	g system clearly	/ expla	ined	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	167/1647	4.71	4.31	4.12	4.14	4.80
8. How ma	any times	was class cance	elled		1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1668	4.72	4.67	4.67	4.70	5.00
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overal	ll teac	hing effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	690/1605	4.47	4.01	4.07	4.16	4.25
1. Were t		1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1514		4.53		4.45	5.00			
		ctor seem intere		_	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1551		4.72	4.66	4.73	5.00
		_		explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	347/1503		4.22	4.24	4.27	4.70
		es contribute to		-	1	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	433/1506		4.27		4.29	4.70
5. Did au	udiovisua	l techniques enh	nance y	our understanding	1	8	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1311	3.00	3.81	3.85	3.88	****
		Discuss																
				what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	1	3		,		3.86	4.05	4.26	4.17
				ed to participate	5	0	0	0	3	0	3		1013/1502		4.02	4.26	4.46	4.00
		_		d open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	2	3		,	4.60	4.10	4.29	4.52	4.33
4. Were s	special t	echniques succes	ssiul		5	4	0	Τ	0	U	1	3.50	****/1006	3.83	4.05	4.00	4.21	***
Freq							trib	utio:	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade								Re	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	. — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — —		Red		ed f	 or Ma			0	Graduat	 -	0	Majo	 r	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 3	Required for Ma				± ۰ ر ۰		J	STAGGGC	radacc 0		1100		_	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-q	rad 1	.1	Non-	-major	10
0/-150	-	2 00 2 10	-	D 0		00.		_				-	5		_	011		_0

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

Course Section: ECON 408 0201 University of Maryland MANAGERIAL ECONOMICS Title Baltimore County Fall 2006

Instructor: DICKSON, LISA

Enrollment: 26 Ouestionnaires: 18

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 529

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 4 14 4.78 244/1669 4.74 4.20 4.23 4.39 4.78 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 5 13 4.72 281/1666 4.64 4.22 4.19 4.22 4.72 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 1 0 4 13 4.61 453/1421 4.56 4.27 4.24 4.38 4.61 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 1 0 0 5 11 4.47 539/1617 4.40 4.04 4.15 4.22 4.47 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 1 6 10 4.39 453/1555 4.14 3.98 4.00 4.08 4.39 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 00 0 4 14 4.78 164/1543 4.26 3.93 4.06 4.18 4.78 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 1 0 4 13 4.61 356/1647 4.71 4.31 4.12 4.14 4.61 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 10 8 4.44 1240/1668 4.72 4.67 4.67 4.70 4.44 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 5 11 4.69 220/1605 4.47 4.01 4.07 4.16 4.69 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 Ω Ω Ω 4 14 4.78 408/1514 4.89 4.53 4.39 4.45 4.78 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 2 16 4.89 567/1551 4.94 4.72 4.66 4.73 4.89 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 4 14 4.78 254/1503 4.74 4.22 4.24 4.27 4.78 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 3 15 4.83 249/1506 4.77 4.27 4.26 4.29 4.83 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 10 3 1 0 1 3 3.00 1115/1311 3.00 3.81 3.85 3.88 3.00 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 1 1 6 4.63 372/1490 4.40 3.86 4.05 4.26 4.63 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10 0 0 0 0 3 5 4.63 522/1502 4.31 4.02 4.26 4.46 4.63 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10 0 0 0 0 1 7 4.88 309/1489 4.60 4.10 4.29 4.52 4.88 4. Were special techniques successful 10 2 0 1 1 3 3.83 632/1006 3.83 4.05 4.00 4.21 3.83

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	4	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6							
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	6	C	3	General	3	Under-grad	17	Non-major	14	
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	6	D	0							
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	<pre>#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant</pre>				
				P	0							
				I	0	Other	14					
				?	0							

Course Section: ECON 410A 0101

Title GLOBAL AGING AND SOC.I

Instructor: GRIBBIN, JOSEPH Enrollment: 17

Questionnaires: 10

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 530 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

St.udent.	COLLEGA	F'772	luation	Ongetic	<b>コカカココン</b>

			Frequencies			Inst	ructor	Course Dept		t UMBC Level		Sect		
Questions		NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
G1														
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1669	5.00	4.20	4.23	4.39	5.00
	0	-	0	0	0	0	10	4.70	319/1666	4.70	4.20	4.23	4.39	4.70
<ol> <li>Did the instructor make clear the expected goals</li> <li>Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals</li> </ol>	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.70	511/1421	4.70	4.22	4.19	4.22	4.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	4		4.56	445/1617	4.56	4.27	4.15	4.22	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.50	262/1555	4.50	3.98	4.15	4.22	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	344/1543	4.56	3.98	4.00	4.08	4.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	481/1647	4.50	4.31	4.12	4.10	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.67	4.12	4.70	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	373/1605					4.50
7. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	U	U	U	U	4	7	4.50	3/3/1003	4.50	4.01	4.07	4.10	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	189/1514	4.90	4.53	4.39	4.45	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.72	4.66	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	347/1503	4.70	4.22	4.24	4.27	4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	164/1506	4.90	4.27	4.26	4.29	4.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1311	5.00	3.81	3.85	3.88	5.00
									-,					
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	512/1490	4.44	3.86	4.05	4.26	4.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	818/1502	4.33	4.02	4.26	4.46	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	1	0	7	4.44	753/1489	4.44	4.10	4.29	4.52	4.44
4. Were special techniques successful	1	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1006	****	4.05	4.00	4.21	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	50/ 112	4.70	4.70	4.38	4.74	4.70
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 97	5.00	5.00	4.36	4.69	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	42/ 92	4.50	4.50	4.22	4.48	4.50
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	45/ 105	4.60	4.60	4.20	4.27	4.60
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	39/ 98	4.30	4.30	3.95	3.86	4.30

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

Course Section: ECON 410B 0101

Title ECONOMICS OF RISK MGMT

icic Economico or i

Instructor: FARROW, SCOTT

Enrollment: 38
Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 531 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	Frequencies			Tnst	tructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect	
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
x														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	3	2	9	6	3.90	1288/1669	3.90	4.20	4.23	4.39	3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	5	5	4	6	3.55	1449/1666	3.55	4.22	4.19	4.22	3.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	11	5	4.00	969/1421	4.00	4.27	4.24	4.38	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	8	7	4.05	999/1617	4.05	4.04	4.15	4.22	4.05
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	6	5	7	3.80	1021/1555	3.80	3.98	4.00	4.08	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	5	8	5	3.89	1027/1543	3.89	3.93	4.06	4.18	3.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	5	11	4.35	728/1647	4.35	4.31	4.12	4.14	4.35
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	13	4.65	1077/1668	4.65	4.67	4.67	4.70	4.65
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	1	4	6	6	4.00	918/1605	4.00	4.01	4.07	4.16	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	7	10	4.42	923/1514	4.42	4.53	4.39	4.45	4.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	917/1551	4.74	4.72	4.66	4.73	4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	4	3	7	4		1297/1503	3.61		4.24	4.27	3.61
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	4	5	8		1069/1506	4.00	4.27	4.26	4.29	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	3	5	9	4.22	464/1311	4.22	3.81	3.85	3.88	4.22
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	4	3	5	3.85	984/1490	3.85	3.86	4.05	4.26	3.85
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	4	2	5 6		1013/1502	4.00	4.02	4.05	4.26	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	4	1	8	4.31	893/1489	4.31	4.10	4.29	4.52	4.31
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	0	1	1	4	-	4.10	459/1006	4.10	4.10		4.21	4.10
4. Wele special techniques successful	,	J	U	_		7	-	1.10	439/1000	4.10	1.05	1.00	7.21	4.10
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.83	4.20	4.61	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.83	4.19	4.40	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 225	****	4.33	4.50	4.39	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 223	****	4.80	4.35	4.56	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 206	****	5.00	4.15	4.20	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.70	4.38	4.74	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.22	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	4.27	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.30	3.95	3.86	****
n' 11 m 1														
Field Work	1.0	0	_	•	_	_	-	F 00	50	also also also also	2 50	4 00	2 04	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 58	****	3.50	4.22	3.94	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.80	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39		****	4.39	3.78	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.50	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.92	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	0	_		****/ 29	****	****	4.34	2.00	****
2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2														

Course Section: ECON 410B 0101

Title ECONOMICS OF RISK MGMT

Instructor:

FARROW, SCOTT

Enrollment: 38 Questionnaires: 20 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 531 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	1	Major	4	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	11							
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	9	Under-grad	19	Non-major	16	
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	6	D	0							
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough				
				P	0			responses to be significant				
				I	0	Other	11					
				?	1							

# Course Section: ECON 410C 010 University of Maryland Page 532 Title HEALTH CARE FINANCING Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Title HEALTH CARE FINANCING Baltimore County Instructor: COOPER, PHILIP Fall 2006

Enrollment: 29

Questionnaires: 14 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies				3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect						
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did y	you gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	1	0	0	1	1	7	4	4.08	1124/1669	4.08	4.20	4.23	4.39	4.08
2. Did t	the instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	1	0	0	0	0	8	5	4.38	715/1666	4.38	4.22	4.19	4.22	4.38
3. Did t	the exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	701/1421	4.38	4.27	4.24	4.38	4.38
4. Did c	ther eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	2	0	0	2	7	2	4.00	1029/1617	4.00	4.04	4.15	4.22	4.00
5. Did a	assigned r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	1	1	1	0	6	4	3.92	922/1555	3.92	3.98	4.00	4.08	3.92
6. Did w	vritten as:	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	2	1	0	1	1	5	4	4.09	838/1543	4.09	3.93	4.06	4.18	4.09
7. Was t	the grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	1	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	885/1647	4.23	4.31	4.12	4.14	4.23
8. How m	many times	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	952/1668	4.77	4.67	4.67	4.70	4.77
9. How w	vould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	2	0	0	1	2	7	2	3.83	1148/1605	3.83	4.01	4.07	4.16	3.83
		Lectur	e															
1. Were	the instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	1	0	0	2	1	3	7	4.15	1142/1514	4.15	4.53	4.39	4.45	4.15
		ctor seem inter			1	0	0	1	2	3	7		1346/1551		4.72	4.66	4.73	4.23
3. Was 1	lecture ma	terial presente	d and e	explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	835/1503	4.31	4.22	4.24	4.27	4.31
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	2	2	2	7	4.08	1038/1506	4.08	4.27	4.26	4.29	4.08
5. Did a	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding						0	1	1	2	0	3.25	1057/1311	3.25	3.81	3.85	3.88	3.25
		Discus	sion															
1. Did c	class disc			what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	3	5	4.22	718/1490	4.22	3.86	4.05	4.26	4.22
				d to participate	5	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	- ,		4.02	4.26	4.46	
				d open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44		4.44	4.10	4.29	4.52	
		echniques succe			5	4	0	0	1	3	1		479/1006			4.00		4.00
				Frequ	0000	. Dia	- wib	.+ : 0.	-									
				rrequ	terrey	DIS	CLID	10101	1									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 9		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	. jor	`	0	Graduat	e	1	Majo	or	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 3			-			-						<b>J</b> -		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 0		Gei	nera:	1				2	Under-g	rad 1	.3	Non-	-major	13
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	2	D 0													-	
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives			ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	уh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	her					7	_					
				? 0														

Course Section: ECON 415 0101 University of Maryland

I

?

0

0

Title Baltimore County PRPRTY RIGHTS, ORGAN, MG CARROLL, KATHLE Instructor: Fall 2006

Enrollment: 30

Questionnaires: 13

Student	Course	Fwaluation	Ouestionnaire

Page 533

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

							Fr	eque	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain n	ew insights, ski	lls fro	om this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	556/1669	4.54	4.20	4.23	4.39	4.54
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	10	2	4.08	1054/1666	4.08	4.22	4.19	4.22	4.08
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	1	3	5	4	3.92	1042/1421	3.92	4.27	4.24	4.38	3.92
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	4	4.00	1029/1617	4.00	4.04	4.15	4.22	4.00
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	1	0	5	1	6	3.85	988/1555	3.85	3.98	4.00	4.08	3.85
5. Did wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	0	1	0	0	4	5	3	3.92	1006/1543	3.92	3.93	4.06	4.18	3.92
7. Was th	e gradin	g system clearly	y expla	ined	0	0	0	2	0	1	10	4.46	549/1647	4.46	4.31	4.12	4.14	4.46
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	1115/1668	4.62	4.67	4.67	4.70	4.62
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	918/1605	4.00	4.01	4.07	4.16	4.00
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	424/1514	4.77	4.53	4.39	4.45	4.77
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	1	0	1	11	4.69	986/1551	4.69	4.72	4.66	4.73	4.69
3. Was le	cture ma	terial presented	d and e	explained clearly	0	0	1	0	2	8	2	3.77	1230/1503	3.77	4.22	4.24	4.27	3.77
4. Did th	e lectur	es contribute to	o what	you learned	0	0	1	1	2	2	7	4.00	1069/1506	4.00	4.27	4.26	4.29	4.00
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	nance y	our understanding	0	11	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1311	****	3.81	3.85	3.88	****
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	9	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1036/1490	3.75	3.86	4.05	4.26	3.75
2. Were a	ill stude	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	9	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	393/1502	4.75	4.02	4.26	4.46	4.75
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage :	fair ar	nd open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	434/1489	4.75	4.10	4.29	4.52	4.75
4. Were s	special t	echniques succe	ssful	-	9	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1006	****	4.05	4.00	4.21	****
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	;
														<u>.</u> 				
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Re	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 9														
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C 2		General			6	Under-g	rad 1	L3	Non-	-major	10			
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### -	Means t	there a	re not	enoug	ıh
				P 0									respons	es to k	oe sign	ificar	ıt	
				_		_						_						

Other

7

Course Section: ECON 421 0101 University of Maryland Title INTRO TO ECONOMETRICS Baltimore County Instructor: DASGUPTA, NANDI Fall 2006

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Fall 2006

Page 534

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	24	•			
Questionnaires:	6	Stud	nt Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Ouestions						_	ncies	5			tructor		e Dept					
		Question	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did voi	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	1026/1669	4.17	4.20	4.23	4.39	4.17
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	1	0	1	2	2		1387/1666		4.22	4.19	4.22	3.67
		estions reflec			0	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	886/1421	4.17	4.27	4.24	4.38	4.17
	_	ations reflect		_	0	0	1	0	2	0	3	3.67	1301/1617	3.67	4.04	4.15	4.22	3.67
				what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	0	1	2.67	1505/1555	2.67	3.98	4.00	4.08	2.67
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	1260/1543	3.50	3.93	4.06	4.18	3.50
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearly	y expla	ined	0	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	1043/1647	4.00	4.31	4.12	4.14	4.00
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	6	0	4.00	1530/1668	4.00	4.67	4.67	4.70	4.00
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	139/1605	4.80	4.01	4.07	4.16	4.80
		Ŧt	_															
1 17 +1	h	Lectur			0	0	1	0	1	0	1	4 00	1100/1514	4 00	4 52	4 20	4.45	4 00
		actor's lecture ctor seem inter			0	0	1 0	0	1	0	5	5.00	1199/1514 1/1551		4.53 4.72	4.39	4.45	4.00 5.00
				xplained clearly	0	0	1	0	1	0	4		1066/1503		4.72	4.24	4.73	4.00
		es contribute t			0	0	1	0	1	0	4		1069/1503		4.22	4.24	4.27	4.00
				our understanding	1	3	0	0	1	0	1		587/1311		3.81	3.85		4.00
5. Did au	aiovisuai	r tecimiques en	lance y	our understanding		3	U	U	1	U	_	4.00	367/1311	4.00	3.01	3.03	3.00	4.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1233/1490	3.33	3.86	4.05	4.26	3.33
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	3	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1357/1502	3.33	4.02	4.26	4.46	3.33
		_		d open discussion	3		0	1	1	0	1		1341/1489		4.10	4.29	4.52	3.33
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		3	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1006	****	4.05	4.00	4.21	****
				Frequ	ency	, Dist	trib	atio	n									
				_	_													
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	jors		0	Graduat	 е	0	Majo	r or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 1			-			_						<b>J</b> -		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 1		Ger	nera:	1				1	Under-g	rad	6	Non-	major	6
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D 0													-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	<sub>J</sub> h
				P 0									respons	es to b	oe sign	nifican	ıt	
				I 0		Oth	her					4						
				? 0														

Course Section: ECON 439 0101
Title ENVIRONMENTAL ECONOMIC

ENVIRONMENTAL ECONOMIC Baltimore County MCCONNELL, VIRG Fall 2006

Instructor: MCCONNELL, VIRG

Enrollment: 37
Questionnaires: 23

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Page 535 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

					Fre	equei	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General															
1. Did voi	u gain ne	ew insights, skills	from this course	0	0	0	0	4	10	9	4.22	963/1669	4.22	4.20	4.23	4.39	4.22
		ctor make clear the		0	0	0	0	5	5	13	4.35	764/1666		4.22	4.19	4.22	4.35
		estions reflect th		0	0	0	3	2	7	11	4.13	909/1421	4.13	4.27	4.24	4.38	4.13
	_	ations reflect the		0	1	0	2	5	7	8	3.95	1098/1617	3.95	4.04	4.15	4.22	3.95
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contribute	to what you learned	0	0	0	3	2	9	9	4.04	747/1555	4.04	3.98	4.00	4.08	4.04
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contribut	e to what you learned	0	0	0	2	7	7	7	3.83	1084/1543	3.83	3.93	4.06	4.18	3.83
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearly ex	plained	0	0	0	0	5	9	9	4.17	940/1647	4.17	4.31	4.12	4.14	4.17
8. How man	ny times	was class cancelle	- d	0	0	0	0	1	1	21	4.87	788/1668	4.87	4.67	4.67	4.70	4.87
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overall t	eaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	5	12	2	3.84	1140/1605	3.84	4.01	4.07	4.16	3.84
		Lecture															
1. Were th	he instru	actor's lectures we	ll prepared	0	0	0	0	4	6	13	4.39	964/1514	4.39	4.53	4.39	4.45	4.39
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor seem intereste	d in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	4	17	4.65	1042/1551	4.65	4.72	4.66	4.73	4.65
3. Was led	cture mat	erial presented an	d explained clearly	0	0	0	2	6	5	10	4.00	1066/1503	4.00	4.22	4.24	4.27	4.00
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute to wh	at you learned	0	0	1	0	7	2	13	4.13	1002/1506	4.13	4.27	4.26	4.29	4.13
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques enhanc	e your understanding	1	9	3	0	3	2	5	3.46	961/1311	3.46	3.81	3.85	3.88	3.46
		Discussion															
1. Did cla	ass disci		to what you learned	12	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	675/1490	4.27	3.86	4.05	4.26	4.27
			aged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	3		4.55	595/1502		4.02	4.26	4.46	4.55
			and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	3		4.55			4.10	4.29		4.55
		echniques successfu		12	2	0	1	3	2		3.78	651/1006		4.05		4.21	
		Laboratory															
2. Were yo	ou provid		ackground information	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.83	4.19	4.40	****
_	-																
1 Works of	aaianad t	Seminar	the announced theme	2.2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 112	****	4.70	4.38	4.74	****
		ons contribute to w		22 22	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 105		4.70	4.38	4.74	****
												,					
			Frequ	lency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Туј	pe			Majors	;
00-27	 1	0.00-0.99 1	A 7		Red	quir	ed fo	or M	 ajor	`	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	в 8			_			-								
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 5	С 6		Gei	nera	1				5	Under-g	rad 2	23	Non-	major	10
84-150	9	3.00-3.49 1	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 8	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves	0 #### - Means there are			re not	enoug	ıh				
			P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
			I 0		Otl	her				1	.6						
? 1																	

Course Section: ECON 442 0101 University of Maryland Title EUROPEAN ECONOMIC HIST Baltimore County

Instructor: MITCH, DAVID F Enrollment: 26

Ouestionnaires: 11

Fall 2006 Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire Page 536

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 5 4.36 781/1669 4.36 4.20 4.23 4.39 4.36 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 4 6 4.45 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 3 8 4.73 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 5 6 4.55 620/1666 4.45 4.22 4.19 4.22 4.45 0 0 3 8 4.73 318/1421 4.73 4.27 4.24 4.38 4.73 455/1617 4.55 4.04 4.15 4.22 4.55 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 1 5 4 4.09 715/1555 4.09 3.98 4.00 4.08 4.09 0 2 4 5 4.27 638/1543 4.27 3.93 4.06 4.18 4.27 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 1 0 2 8 4.55 435/1647 4.55 4.31 4.12 4.14 4.55 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 1 10 4.91 713/1668 4.91 4.67 4.67 4.70 4.91 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 3 5 3 4.00 918/1605 4.00 4.01 4.07 4.16 4.00 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 Ω Ω 1 2 8 4.64 631/1514 4.64 4.53 4.39 4.45 4.64 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 2 9 4.82 760/1551 4.82 4.72 4.66 4.73 4.82 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 1 2 8 4.64 425/1503 4.64 4.22 4.24 4.27 4.64 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 1 9 4.73 394/1506 4.73 4.27 4.26 4.29 4.73 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1 0 0 3 4 3 4.00 587/1311 4.00 3.81 3.85 3.88 4.00 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 0 0 340/1490 4.67 3.86 4.05 4.26 4.67 2 4 4.67 5 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 0 1 5 4.83 306/1502 4.83 4.02 4.26 4.46 4.83 5 0 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 1 5 4.83 348/1489 4.83 4.10 4.29 4.52 4.83 4. Were special techniques successful 5 3 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1006 5.00 4.05 4.00 4.21 5.00

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

Course Section: ECON 453 0101

Title HOUSEHOLD ECONOMICS

Instructor: LORD, WILLIAM

Enrollment: 39
Questionnaires: 24

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 537 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	=		Tngt	tructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	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	2	3	14	5	3.92	1276/1669	3.98	4.20	4.23	4.39	3.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	9	10	4.17	984/1666	4.18	4.22	4.19	4.22	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	8	12	4.29	781/1421	4.27	4.27	4.24	4.38	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	1029/1617	4.06	4.04	4.15	4.22	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	3	6	4	8	3.81	1021/1555	3.76	3.98	4.00	4.08	3.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	18	1	0	2	0	3	3.67	1195/1543	3.67	3.93	4.06	4.18	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	6	15	4.50	481/1647	4.57	4.31	4.12	4.14	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	8	15	4.65	1077/1668	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.70	4.65
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	7	7	3	3.67	1274/1605	3.65	4.01	4.07	4.16	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	9	12	4.38	984/1514	4.56	4.53	4.39	4.45	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4	18	4.74	917/1551	4.83	4.72	4.66	4.73	4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	0	2	10	10	4.08	1025/1503	4.15	4.22	4.24	4.27	4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	3	5			1069/1506	4.08	4.27	4.26	4.29	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	1	2	7	3	7	3.65	854/1311	3.83	3.81	3.85	3.88	3.65
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	3	2	1	2	5	3.31	1242/1490	3.59	3.86	4.05	4.26	3.31
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	772/1502	4.43	4.02	4.26	4.46	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	2	2	8	4.31	893/1489	4.35	4.10	4.29	4.52	4.31
4. Were special techniques successful	11	7	1	0	2	1	-	3.50	759/1006		4.05		4.21	3.50
			_	-	_	_	_		,					
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.83	4.20	4.61	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.83	4.19	4.40	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.33	4.50	4.39	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	4.80	4.35	4.56	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	5.00	4.15	4.20	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.70	4.38	4.74	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.22	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	4.27	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 98	****	4.30	3.95	3.86	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.50	4.22	3.94	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.80	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.78	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.50	****
	_	_			•	-	_		, 30					
Self Paced				_	_	_	_							
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.92	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	2.00	***

Course Section: ECON 453 0101

Title HOUSEHOLD ECONOMICS

Instructor: LORD, WILLIAM

Enrollment: 39
Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 537 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	1	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	3	С	5	General	2	Under-grad	23	Non-major	15
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	20				
				?	1						

Course Section: ECON 453 0201 University of Maryland Title HOUSEHOLD ECONOMICS Baltimore County Instructor: LORD, WILLIAM Fall 2006

I

?

0

0

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 25

41

University of Maryland Page 538
Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007
Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

18

	Ouestionnaire

							±		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
		Question	ns		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 al															
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	2	5	8	10	4.04	1145/1669	3.98	4.20	4.23	4.39	4.04
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	8	4	13	4.20	957/1666		4.22	4.19	4.22	4.20
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	0	7	5	13	4.24	831/1421	4.27	4.27	4.24	4.38	4.24
	_	uations reflect			0	16	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	958/1617	4.06	4.04	4.15	4.22	4.11
				what you learned	0	4	1	1	7	6	6	3.71	1095/1555	3.76	3.98	4.00	4.08	3.71
				o what you learned	0	20	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/1543	3.67	3.93	4.06	4.18	***
7. Was th	ne grading	g system clearl	ly expla	ined	0	0	0	0	2	5	18	4.64	324/1647	4.57	4.31	4.12	4.14	4.64
8. How ma	any times	was class cand	celled		0	0	0	0	0	4	21	4.84	825/1668	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.70	4.84
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	all tead	hing effectiveness	1	0	1	0	9	11	3	3.63	1299/1605	3.65	4.01	4.07	4.16	3.63
		Lectur	_		_			•		_								
		uctor's lecture			1	0	0	0	0	6	18	4.75	441/1514		4.53	4.39	4.45	4.75
		ctor seem inter		_	1	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	460/1551		4.72	4.66	4.73	4.92
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	3 2	2	6 8	13 11	4.21	923/1503		4.22	4.24	4.27 4.29	4.21
				-	1	0 4	1	2	<i>3</i> 3	8	10	4.17	980/1506		4.27	4.26		4.17
5. Did at	udiovisua.	i tecnniques en	nance y	our understanding	Т	4	Т	2	3	4	10	4.00	587/1311	3.83	3.81	3.85	3.88	4.00
		Discus	ssion															
1. Did cl	lass discu	ussions contrib	oute to	what you learned	10	0	2	0	3	3	7	3.87	974/1490	3.59	3.86	4.05	4.26	3.87
				d to participate	10	0	0	1	2	1	11	4.47	680/1502		4.02	4.26	4.46	4.47
				d open discussion	10	0	1	0	1	3	10	4.40	800/1489	4.35	4.10	4.29	4.52	4.40
		echniques succe		-	9	8	1	1	4	1	1	3.00	923/1006	3.25	4.05	4.00	4.21	3.00
				Frequ	lency	Dist	trib	utior	1									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	3			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 8		P.	quire					0	Graduat		3	Majc	·	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 13		re(	4urr,	=u 10	J⊥ 1¥1¢	בטעב	۵	U	Graduat	C	J	Ma JC	, <u>.</u>	3
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5	C 4	General				7	Under-q	rad 2	12	Non-	major	22			
84-150	17	3.00-3.49	13	D 0	General					J				3 -				
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h			
	P 0					respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt								

Other

Course Section: ECON 454 0101 Title

University of Maryland ECON: EDUC/HUMAN CAPITA

Instructor: DICKSON, LISA

Enrollment: 17 Questionnaires: 16 Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007 Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Page 539

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

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	_	0	0	•	•	_		4 60	260/1660	4 60	4 00	4 00	4 20	4 60
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	360/1669	4.69	4.20	4.23	4.39	4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	243/1666	4.75	4.22	4.19	4.22	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	280/1421	4.75	4.27	4.24	4.38	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	300/1617	4.69	4.04	4.15	4.22	4.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	213/1555	4.69	3.98	4.00	4.08	4.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	4	9	4.33	580/1543	4.33	3.93	4.06	4.18	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	161/1647	4.81	4.31	4.12	4.14	4.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	7		1248/1668	4.44	4.67	4.67	4.70	4.44
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	373/1605	4.50	4.01	4.07	4.16	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	_	11	4.69	553/1514	1 60	4.53	4.39	4.45	4.69
± ±	0	-	•	-	0	1	11		, -					
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	358/1551	4.94	4.72	4.66	4.73	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	•	1	6	9	4.50	556/1503	4.50		4.24	4.27	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	286/1506	4.80	4.27	4.26	4.29	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	10	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	483/1311	4.20	3.81	3.85	3.88	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	1	3	7	4.25	692/1490	4.25	3.86	4.05	4.26	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	393/1502	4.75	4.02	4.26	4.46	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	0	4	7	4.42	788/1489	4.42	4.10	4.29	4.52	4.42
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	0	0	4	1	3	3.88	617/1006	3.88	4.05	4.00	4.21	3.88
1. Mere apecial ecciniques auccessiai	1	1	O	U	1	_	3	3.00	017/1000	3.00	1.05	1.00	1.21	3.00
Field Work														
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.78	****
Frem	ency	nia:	trib	ıt i oı	า									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	2	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	6	Under-grad	14	Non-major	13
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	7	-			
				2	3						

Course Section: ECON 463 0101

THEORY OF PUBLIC FINAN

Title Instructor:

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 18

COATES, DENNIS 28

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 540 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Frequencies			Tng	tructor	Course	Dent	IIMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	3	5	9		1026/1669	4.17	4.20	4.23	4.39	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	9	4.28	854/1666	4.28	4.22	4.19	4.22	4.28
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	3	10	4.17	886/1421	4.17	4.27	4.24	4.38	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	0	2	4	8	4.20	863/1617	4.20	4.04	4.15	4.22	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	1	5	7	3.94	889/1555	3.94	3.98	4.00	4.08	3.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	4	4	6	3.93	981/1543	3.93	3.93	4.06	4.18	3.93
<ol> <li>Was the grading system clearly explained</li> </ol>	0	0	0	1	2	3		4.44	583/1647		4.31	4.12	4.14	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1		4.94		4.94	4.67		4.70	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	9	4	4.06	877/1605	4.06	4.01	4.07	4.16	4.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	424/1514	4.76	4.53	4.39	4.45	4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	2	13		1055/1551	4.65	4.72	4.66	4.73	4.65
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	2	2	12	4.41	702/1503	4.41	4.22	4.24	4.27	4.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	3	11	4.29	876/1506	4.29	4.27	4.26	4.29	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	718/1311	3.88	3.81	3.85	3.88	3.88
· · · - · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·														
Discussion			_				_							
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	2	3	3		1022/1490	3.78	3.86	4.05	4.26	3.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	1	1	3	3		1253/1502	3.67		4.26	4.46	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	2	1	2	4		1133/1489	3.89	4.10	4.29	4.52	3.89
4. Were special techniques successful	9	7	0	0	1	0	Ι	4.00	****/1006	****	4.05	4.00	4.21	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 226	****	4.83	4.20	4.61	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.83	4.19	4.40	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 225	****	4.33	4.50	4.39	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 223	****	4.80	4.35	4.56	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 206	****	5.00	4.15	4.20	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	1	0	0	1	3 50	****/ 112	****	4.70	4.38	4.74	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 92	****	4.50	4.22	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	4.27	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	,	****	4.30	3.95	3.86	****
		-		_		•	_		,					
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	1		,	****	3.50	4.22	3.94	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.80	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.78	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00		****	****	3.97	3.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.92	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	1	0	0	1		****/ 29	****	****	4.34	2.00	****

Course Section: ECON 463 0101

Title THEORY OF PUBLIC FINAN

Instructor: Enrollment: Questionnaires: 18

COATES, DENNIS

28

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 540 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5 5	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	1	Under-grad	18	Non-major	15
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Fall 2006

Page 541 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	42		
Questionnaires:	34	Student Course Evaluation Questionnair	ionnaire

Course Section: ECON 467 0101

HEALTH ECONOMICS

GOLDFARB, MARSH

Title

Instructor:

	-							Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	1	7	7	17	4.25	914/1669	4.63	4.20	4.23	4.39	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	7	8	16	4.15	993/1666	4.58	4.22	4.19	4.22	4.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	5	10	16	4.18	871/1421	4.49	4.27	4.24	4.38	4.18
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	18	0	0	3	2	9	4.43	612/1617	4.71	4.04	4.15	4.22	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	3	6	5	7	10	3.48	1242/1555	4.24	3.98	4.00	4.08	3.48
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	22	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	690/1543	4.41	3.93	4.06	4.18	4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	2	4	8	17	4.09	997/1647	4.55	4.31	4.12	4.14	4.09
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	0	0	0	2	28	4.93	499/1668	4.97	4.67	4.67	4.70	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	1	7	8	10	4.04	897/1605	4.52	4.01	4.07	4.16	4.04
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	2	6	21	4.57	727/1514	4.78	4.53	4.39	4.45	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	1	1	5	22	4.66	1042/1551	4.83	4.72	4.66	4.73	4.66
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	6	4	18	4.43	686/1503	4.71	4.22	4.24	4.27	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	0	2	5	20	4.67	471/1506	4.83	4.27	4.26	4.29	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	21	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	****/1311	4.00	3.81	3.85	3.88	***
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	26	0	2	0	0	1	5	3.88	****/1490	5.00	3.86	4.05	4.26	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	26	0	2	0	1	0			****/1502		4.02	4.26	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	26	0	1	2	0	0	5	3.75	****/1489		4.10	4.29	4.52	****
4. Were special techniques successful	26	4	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/1006	4.50	4.05	4.00	4.21	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.70	4.38	4.74	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 105		4.60	4.20	4.27	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	33	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 98		4.30	3.95	3.86	***
Frequ	ency	Dist	rib	ution	ı									
Credita Farned Cum CDA Expected Creden				Dos	aan	<b>a</b>			Тъ				Majora	

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	16						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	8	C	5	General	2	Under-grad	34	Non-major	31
84-150	19	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	25				
				2	0						

Baltimore County

University of Maryland Page 542 JAN 18, 2007 Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

St	tudent	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
----	--------	--------	------------	---------------

	Questions							equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1 Did vou	ı gain net	w insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1669	4.63	4.20	4.23	4.39	5.00
-	_	or make clear			0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1666		4.22	4.19	4.22	5.00
		estions reflec			0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	217/1421		4.27	4.24	4.38	4.80
	_	ations reflect		_	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1617		4.04	4.15	4.22	5.00
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1555		3.98	4.00	4.08	5.00
	_	_		o what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	298/1543	4.41	3.93	4.06	4.18	4.60
7. Was the	grading	system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1647	4.55	4.31	4.12	4.14	5.00
8. How man	y times v	was class cand	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1668	4.97	4.67	4.67	4.70	5.00
9. How wou	ild you gi	rade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1605	4.52	4.01	4.07	4.16	5.00
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	e instru	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1514	4.78	4.53	4.39	4.45	5.00		
2. Did the	instruct	n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1551	4.83	4.72	4.66	4.73	5.00		
		xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1503		4.22	4.24	4.27	5.00		
		you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1506	4.83	4.27	4.26	4.29	5.00		
5. Did aud	. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand							0	0	0	3	4.00	587/1311	4.00	3.81	3.85	3.88	4.00
		Discus																
				what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1490		3.86	4.05	4.26	5.00
				d to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	336/1502		4.02	4.26	4.46	4.80
				d open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1489		4.10	4.29	4.52	5.00
4. Were sp	ecial ted	chniques succe	sstul		1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	235/1006	4.50	4.05	4.00	4.21	4.50
		Labora	tory															
1. Did the	lab inc	rease understa	nding o	f the material	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 226	****	4.83	4.20	4.61	***
		Self																
				what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	5.00	****
		ions make clea		_	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
_		cts with the i		_	4	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 46		****	4.45	4.92	****
		<pre></pre>			4	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 33		****	4.25	3.00	***
5. Were th	ere enoug	gh proctors for	r all t	he students	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	2.00	***
		Frequ	ency	Dist	cribu	ution	n											
Credits Ea	irned	Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ту	pe			Majors	<b>s</b>		
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 2							ed fo	or Ma	iors		0	 Graduat	 е	0	Majo	 or	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 2				\		,	-	-		-	-	) \		=
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera:	1				2	Under-q	rad	5	Non-	-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0									5				3	
Grad.						Ele	ectiv	ves				1	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ŗh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	nt	
	I 0						ner					2						
			? 0															

Course Section: ECON 467 0201 Title HEALTH ECONOMICS

Instructor: GOLDFARB, MARSH

Enrollment: 9 Questionnaires: 5

Course Section: ECON 475 0101 University of Maryland Title FINANCIAL INVSTMNT ANA Baltimore County

Instructor: ANORUO, EMMANUE

Enrollment: 63 Ouestionnaires: 37

Fall 2006 Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire Page 543

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Ouestions Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 1 1 5 15 15 4.14 1064/1669 4.14 4.20 4.23 4.39 4.14 0 0 1 0 3 11 22 4.43 648/1666 4.43 4.22 4.19 4.22 4.43 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 0 0 1 4 8 23 4.47 594/1421 4.47 4.27 4.24 4.38 4.47 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 3 0 2 4 11 17 4.26 790/1617 4.26 4.04 4.15 4.22 4.26 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 6 2 3 5 7 14 3.90 939/1555 3.90 3.98 4.00 4.08 3.90 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 6 0 3 5 9 14 4.10 838/1543 4.10 3.93 4.06 4.18 4.10 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 1 2 4 7 23 4.32 775/1647 4.32 4.31 4.12 4.14 4.32 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 1 0 0 0 12 24 4.67 1068/1668 4.67 4.67 4.67 4.70 4.67 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 2 0 1 4 15 8 4.07 871/1605 4.07 4.01 4.07 4.16 4.07 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 1 5 7 24 4.46 877/1514 4.46 4.53 4.39 4.45 4.46 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2 0 0 0 5 5 25 4.57 1135/1551 4.57 4.72 4.66 4.73 4.57 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 1 0 8 8 18 4.20 932/1503 4.20 4.22 4.24 4.27 4.20 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 1 2 1 8 7 16 4.00 1069/1506 4.00 4.27 4.26 4.29 4.00 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5 6 1 0 8 4 13 4.08 552/1311 4.08 3.81 3.85 3.88 4.08 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 24 0 1 0 5 2 5 3.77 1029/1490 3.77 3.86 4.05 4.26 3.77 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 24 0 1 1 3 2 6 3.85 1154/1502 3.85 4.02 4.26 4.46 3.85 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 24 0 0 0 3 4 6 4.23 930/1489 4.23 4.10 4.29 4.52 4.23 4. Were special techniques successful 24 6 0 1 2 0 4 4.00 \*\*\*\*/1006 \*\*\*\* 4.05 4.00 4.21 \*\*\*\* Frequency Distribution

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	23	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	37	Non-major	36
84-150	19	3.00-3.49	17	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	31	_			
				?	0						

#### Course Section: ECON 477 0101 University of Maryland Title DERIVATIVE SECURITIES Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007 Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: GETTER, DARYL

Enrollment: 27 Questionnaires: 19

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 544

					Frequencies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect				
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	1	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	183/1669	4.83	4.20	4.23	4.39	4.83
2. Did th	e instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	xpected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	281/1666	4.72	4.22	4.19	4.22	4.72
3. Did th	ie exam qi	estions reflec	t the e	expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	557/1421	4.50	4.27	4.24	4.38	4.50
4. Did ot	her evalu	ations reflect	the ex	xpected goals	1	5	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	750/1617	4.31	4.04	4.15	4.22	4.31
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	2	6	0	2	1	1	7	4.18	622/1555	4.18	3.98	4.00	4.08	4.18
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	1	6	1	1	1	1	8	4.17	759/1543	4.17	3.93	4.06	4.18	4.17
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ained	2	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	532/1647	4.47	4.31	4.12	4.14	4.47
	-	was class canc			2	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1668		4.67		4.70	
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	201/1605	4.71	4.01	4.07	4.16	4.71
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instru	prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	223/1514	4.89	4.53	4.39	4.45	4.89		
2. Did th	e instruc	in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	567/1551	4.89	4.72	4.66	4.73	4.89		
3. Was le	cture mat	erial presente	d and e	explained clearly	2	0	0	1	0	4	12	4.59	482/1503	4.59	4.22	4.24	4.27	4.59
4. Did th	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	326/1506	4.78	4.27	4.26	4.29	4.78
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques en	hance y	your understanding	2	10	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	426/1311	4.29	3.81	3.85	3.88	4.29
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	7	4.50	445/1490	4.50	3.86	4.05	4.26	4.50
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.02	4.26	4.46	5.00
3. Did th	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair a	nd open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.10	4.29	4.52	5.00
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		11	3	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	307/1006	4.40	4.05	4.00	4.21	4.40
			Frequ	iency	/ Dist	trib	utio:	n										
Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad							Re	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27						Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	s	0	Graduat	е	1	Majo	or	0
28-55	0		0			<b>a</b>		1				2	TT		0	Man		1.0
56-83 84-150	0	2.00-2.99 3.00-3.49	3	C 5 D 0		Gei	nera	Т				2	Under-g	rad 1	.8	Non-	-major	19
84-150 Cmod	6	3.00-3.49	4	D 0		1	-a+ i					0	инии -	Maa.a. +	1			.1.

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	2	Under-grad	18	Non-major	19
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14	_			
				2	0						

Course Section: ECON 482 0101 University of Maryland Title INTERNATIONAL FINANCE

Baltimore County Fall 2006

MCINTYRE, KEVIN Instructor:

Enrollment: 42 Questionnaires: 32

Page 545 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

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

Questions			Fre	equei 2	ncie:	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General					_	_			0.10.11.550					
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	7	24	4.72	318/1669		4.20	4.23	4.39	4.72
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	8	20	4.50	549/1666	4.50	4.22	4.19	4.22	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	20	4.47	607/1421	4.47	4.27	4.24	4.38	4.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10 1	1	3	4	11	13 12	4.50	496/1617 839/1555	4.50 3.97	4.04 3.98	4.15 4.00	4.22	4.50 3.97
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	1	0	<del>4</del> 5	5	11	4.14	795/1543	4.14	3.98	4.00	4.08	3.97 4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	3	6	22	4.14	481/1647		4.31	4.12	4.16	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	25	4.78	926/1668	4.78	4.67	4.67	4.70	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	11		4.54				4.07		4.54
J. now would you grade the overall teaching cricetiveness	O	O	O	O	O		13	1.51	313/1003	1.51	1.01	1.07	1.10	1.51
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	28	4.90	189/1514	4.90	4.53	4.39	4.45	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	28	4.90	512/1551	4.90	4.72	4.66	4.73	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	4	25	4.74	289/1503	4.74	4.22	4.24	4.27	4.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	7	23	4.68	458/1506	4.68	4.27	4.26	4.29	4.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	18	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	214/1311	4.62	3.81	3.85	3.88	4.62
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	2	2	9	4.29	667/1490	4.29	3.86	4.05	4.26	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	1	0	2	3	8	4.21	907/1502		4.02	4.26	4.46	4.21
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	1	0	1	4	8	4.29	903/1489	4.29	4.10	4.29	4.52	4.29
4. Were special techniques successful	19	8	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/1006	****	4.05	4.00	4.21	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.70	4.38	4.74	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 92	****	4.50	4.22	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	4.27	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 98	****	4.30	3.95	3.86	****
The state of the s														
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.50	4.22	3.94	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.80	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.78	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	31	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.50	****
Self Paced														
	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	E 00	****
<ol> <li>Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned</li> <li>Did study questions make clear the expected goal</li> </ol>		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,	****	****		5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful			0	0	0	0	1		****/ 4 <i>6</i>	****	****	4.31 4.45	5.00 4.92	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful			0	0	0	0	1		,	****	****	4.45	3.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students		0	0	0	0	0	1		,	****	****	4.25	2.00	****
5. Were there enough proceeds for all the students	31	U	U	J	J	U	_	5.00	/ 29			7.37	2.00	
Frequ	ency	Dist	rib	ution	n									

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA	A	Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	1	Major	2	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	17							
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	6	General	7	Under-grad	31	Non-major	30	
84-150	15	3.00-3.49	10	D	0							
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	s there	e are not enough	ı	

P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 24 ? 0

Course Section: ECON 490 0101 University of Maryland ANALYTIC METHODS IN EC Baltimore County

Title Instructor: THOMAS, MARK S Fall 2006

Enrollment:	39			
Questionnaires:	32	Student Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

							Frequencies			Inst	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect		
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1															
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	om this course	0	0	1	0	5	12	14	4.19	1001/1669	4.34	4.20	4.23	4.39	4.19
		ctor make clear			0	0	1	0	4	12	15	4.25	881/1666		4.22	4.19	4.22	4.25
		estions reflec			0	1	0	0	3	10	18	4.48	582/1421		4.27	4.24	4.38	4.48
	_	ations reflect		_	0	16	1	0	2	4	9	4.25	801/1617	4.46	4.04	4.15	4.22	4.25
				what you learned	2	12	1	0	5	3	9	4.06	741/1555		3.98	4.00	4.08	4.06
	_	_		to what you learned	1	18	1	1	1	3	7	4.08	850/1543	4.37	3.93	4.06	4.18	4.08
	the grading system clearly explained						1	2	4	8	16	4.16	948/1647	4.54	4.31	4.12	4.14	4.16
	. How many times was class cancelled						0	0	0	0	31	5.00	1/1668	4.95	4.67	4.67	4.70	5.00
9. How wo	How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness					1	1	0	9	9	6	3.76	1202/1605	3.99	4.01	4.07	4.16	3.76
		Lectur	e															
1 Were t	the instri	actor's lecture		prepared	5	0	0	0	3	5	19	4.59	691/1514	4.60	4.53	4.39	4.45	4.59
		ctor seem inter			5	0	0	0	2	6	19		1083/1551		4.72	4.66	4.73	4.63
				explained clearly	5	0	0	0	4	5	18	4.52	546/1503		4.22	4.24	4.27	4.52
		es contribute t		-	5	0	0	0	6	4	17	4.41	770/1506		4.27	4.26	4.29	4.41
				our understanding	5	2	2	1	3	3	16	4.20	483/1311		3.81	3.85	3.88	4.20
		Discus	aion															
1 Did al	laga digan			what you learned	19	0	1	0	2	4	6	4.08	820/1490	3.54	3.86	4.05	4.26	4.08
				ed to participate	19	0	2	0	2	3	6		1154/1502		4.02	4.05	4.46	3.85
				nd open discussion	19	0	0	0	3	2	0	4.38	818/1489		4.10	4.29	4.52	4.38
		chniques succe		id open discussion	19	6	0	0	1	2	4		****/1006		4.05	4.00	4.21	****
1. 11010	opcorar co	John Pacca	55141			Ū	Ü	ŭ	_	_	-	1.15	, 1000		1.05	1.00		
Freq						Dis	trib	utior	ı									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade								Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 1 A 10					Red	quir	ed fo	or M	ajor	S	1	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	8	
28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 12					a		,				2	TTm d and an		2	Man		2.4	
56-83 3 2.00-2.99 4 C 6						Gei	nera	T				2	Under-g	rau 3	2	Non-	major	24

Page 546

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Credits E	Tarned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	12						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	С	6	General	2	Under-grad	32	Non-major	24
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	23	_			
				2	1						

Course Section: ECON 490 0201 University of Maryland Title ANALYTIC METHODS IN EC Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007 Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: THOMAS, MARK S

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 12

C	<b>a</b>	The second second second	0
Student	course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

Page 547

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	4 50	E00/1660	1 21	4 20	4 02	4 20	4 50
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2		8	4.50	590/1669	4.34	4.20	4.23	4.39	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	Τ	0	5	6	4.33	777/1666	4.29	4.22	4.19	4.22	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	392/1421	4.58	4.27	4.24	4.38	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	323/1617	4.46	4.04	4.15	4.22	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	1	0	1	4	3.86	980/1555	3.96	3.98	4.00	4.08	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	250/1543	4.37	3.93	4.06	4.18	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	100/1647	4.54	4.31	4.12	4.14	4.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	713/1668	4.95	4.67	4.67	4.70	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	725/1605	3.99	4.01	4.07	4.16	4.22
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	Ο	1	8	4.60	679/1514	4.60	4.53	4.39	4.45	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	512/1551	4.76	4.72	4.66	4.73	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	347/1503	4.61	4.22	4.24	4.27	4.70
	2	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	547/1506	4.50	4.22	4.26	4.29	4.70
<u>-</u>		-	0		Τ.	2	7							
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	Τ	2	0	0	3	3.33	1027/1311	3.77	3.81	3.85	3.88	3.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	0	1	0	2	3.00	1328/1490	3.54	3.86	4.05	4.26	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	632/1502	4.17	4.02	4.26	4.46	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion			0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1489	4.69	4.10	4.29	4.52	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful			0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1006	****	4.05	4.00	4.21	****
Frequ		Dist	rib	ution	n									

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	12	Non-major	9
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	10	-			
				?	0						

Course Section: ECON 600 0101

POLICY CONSQ:ECON ANAL

Ingtrugtor: MUTTED DVAN I

24

Instructor: Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 18

Title

MUTTER, RYAN L

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2006

Page 548 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				requencies		:		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NΑ	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course		0	0	2	0	7	9	4.28	889/1669	4.28	4.20	4.23	4.35	4.28
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	494/1666		4.22	4.19	4.19	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	594/1421	4.47	4.27	4.24	4.33	4.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	841/1617		4.04	4.15	4.24	4.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	3	10	4.11	698/1555	4.11	3.98	4.00	4.07	4.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	832/1543		3.93	4.06	4.27	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	7	9	4.33	759/1647	4.33	4.31	4.12	4.15	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.67	4.67	4.83	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	4	7		4.06	877/1605		4.01	4.07	4.13	
1 2	_	_		•	_	-	_		,					
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	739/1514	4.56	4.53	4.39	4.37	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	307/1551	4.94	4.72	4.66	4.72	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	6	8	4.22	905/1503	4.22	4.22	4.24	4.22	4.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	642/1506		4.27	4.26	4.24	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	3	1	5	0	3		1155/1311			3.85	3.89	
J. Did addiovisual eccuniques emance your understanding	O	O	5	_	5	O	5	2.72	1133/1311	2.72	3.01	3.03	3.05	2.72
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	5	4	5	3 69	1078/1490	3.69	3.86	4.05	4.18	3.69
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	2	4	1	8		1172/1502	3.81	4.02	4.26	4.46	3.81
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	920/1489	4.25	4.10	4.29	4.44	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	2	15	1	0	0	0	Ó		****/1006	****	4.05	4.00	4.11	****
1. Were special ecciniques successful	_	13	_	O	U	U	U	1.00	71000		1.05	1.00	1.11	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 226	****	4.83	4.20	4.47	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.83	4.19	4.41	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 225	****	4.33	4.50	4.65	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 223	****	4.80	4.35	4.48	****
1. Did the lab imperated provide approxime	10	O	Ü	0	_	Ü	_	1.00	, 223		1.00	1.55	1.10	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 112	****	4.70	4.38	4.39	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.38	***
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 92	****	4.50	4.22	4.36	***
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	4.23	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 98	****	4.30	3.95	3.93	****
5. Here criteria for grading made orear	10	O	Ü	0	Ü	-	_	1.50	, 50		1.50	3.75	3.75	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	3.50	4.22	4.53	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 52	****	****	4.06	4.57	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.90	****
. Was the instructor available for consultation . To what degree could you discuss your evaluations		0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.31	****
Did conferences help you carry out field activities		0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.55	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities		U	5	5	5	_	J	1.00	, 30			1.55	1.55	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.45	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.40	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.61	***
The state of the s		Ŭ	-	,	-	_	J		, 10					

Course Section: ECON 600 0101

Title POLICY CONSQ:ECON ANAL

Instructor:

MUTTER, RYAN L

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 18 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 548 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	2	 А	10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	13	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	5	Non-major	18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	13	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Course Section: ECON 601 0101 Title

MICROECONOMIC ANALYSIS

Instructor: BRADLEY, MICHAE

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 10

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 549 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies							Inst	tructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	5	3	4 10	1103/1669	4 10	4 20	4 23	4.35	4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	3	3		1432/1666		4.22	4.19	4.19	3.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	_		863/1421		4.27	4.24	4.33	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals		2	1	0	3	1			1414/1617	3.43	4.04	4.15	4.24	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	5	3			1373/1555		3.98	4.00	4.07	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	1	1	2	1		1226/1543		3.93	4.06	4.27	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	896/1647	4.22	4.31	4.12	4.15	4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	2		1400/1668		4.67	4.67	4.83	4.22
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	2	2	2	0	3.00	1501/1605	3.00	4.01	4.07	4.13	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	1118/1514	4.20	4.53	4.39	4.37	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	8		788/1551		4.72	4.66	4.72	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	2	5	1		1330/1503		4.22	4.24	4.22	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	1	2			1368/1506		4.27		4.24	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	3	1	2			1100/1311				3.89	
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	1	3	0	3.00	1328/1490	3.00	3.86	4.05	4.18	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	2	0	4	0		1357/1502		4.02	4.26	4.46	3.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	2	2	1	1		1379/1489		4.10	4.29	4.44	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	5	0	0	0	0	1		****/1006		4.05	4.00	4.11	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	Ο	1	5 00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.38	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 92	****	4.50		4.36	****
Field Work														
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	***	****	4.39	4.90	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	6	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	4	Non-major	10
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	7	_			
				?	1						

Course Section: ECON 611 0101 University of Maryland Title ECONOMETRICS I Baltimore County

Instructor: GINDLING, THOMA Fall 2006

Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 15

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 550 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Frequencies		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean			Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	293/1669	4.73	4.20	4.23	4.35	4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	439/1666	4.60	4.22	4.19	4.19	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	5	6	4.00	969/1421	4.00	4.27	4.24	4.33	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	3	10	4.57	424/1617	4.57	4.04	4.15	4.24	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	316/1555	4.54	3.98	4.00	4.07	4.54
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	290/1543	4.62	3.93	4.06	4.27	4.62
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	0	4	8	4.21	907/1647	4.21	4.31	4.12	4.15	4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.67	4.67	4.83	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	268/1605	4.64	4.01	4.07	4.13	4.64
T a about														
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	260/1514	4 00	4.53	4.39	4.37	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.80	360/1514			4.39		4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.73	917/1551 412/1503	4.73 4.64	4.72 4.22	4.24	4.72 4.22	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	471/1506	4.67	4.22	4.24	4.24	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	0	5	8		214/1311			3.85	3.89	4.62
5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	U	2	U	U	U	5	0	4.02	214/1311	4.02	3.01	3.03	3.09	4.02
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	445/1490	4.50	3.86	4.05	4.18	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	632/1502	4.50	4.02	4.26	4.46	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	596/1489	4.60	4.10	4.29	4.44	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	307/1006	4.40	4.05	4.00	4.11	4.40
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	37/ 226	4.83	4.83	4.20	4.47	4.83
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	40/ 233	4.83	4.83	4.19	4.41	4.83
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	146/ 225	4.33	4.33	4.50	4.65	4.33
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	61/ 223	4.80	4.80	4.35	4.48	4.80
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 206	5.00	5.00	4.15	4.39	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.70	4.38	4.39	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.38	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 92	****	4.50	4.22	4.36	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	4.23	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 98	****	4.30	3.95	3.93	****
		_	-		-	-	_		,					
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.50	4.22	4.53	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	4.57	***
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.90	***
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.31	***
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.55	***
-														
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.45	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.40	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.61	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.60	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	5.00	****

Course Section: ECON 611 0101
Title ECONOMETRICS I
Instructor: GINDLING, THOMA

16

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 550 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	•	Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	3	 А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	5	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	10	Non-major	15
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	1						

Course Section: ECON 652 0101 Un Title ECONOMICS OF HEALTH

Title ECONOMICS OF HEAL' Instructor: GOLDFARB, MARSH

Enrollment: 14
Questionnaires: 13

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 551 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

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

			Fre	Frequencies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC Level		Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	556/1669	4.54	4.20	4.23	4.35	4.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	425/1666	4.62	4.22	4.19	4.19	4.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	607/1421	4.46	4.27	4.24	4.33	4.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	496/1617	4.50	4.04	4.15	4.24	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	516/1555	4.31	3.98	4.00	4.07	4.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	783/1543	4.14	3.93	4.06	4.27	4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	270/1647	4.69	4.31	4.12	4.15	4.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	570/1668	4.92	4.67	4.67	4.83	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	8	3	4.27	666/1605	4.27	4.01	4.07	4.13	4.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	Λ	0	5	8	4.62	663/1514	4.62	4.53	4.39	4.37	4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	986/1551	4.69	4.72	4.66	4.72	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	742/1503	4.38	4.22	4.24	4.22	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	789/1506	4.38	4.27	4.26	4.24	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	n	n	1	1	3	4.40	333/1311	4.40	3.81	3.85	3.89	4.40
J. Did addiovisual techniques emiance your understanding	U	O	U	U		1	J	1.10	333/1311	1.10	3.01	3.03	3.05	1.10
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	2	2	4	3.80	1003/1490	3.80	3.86	4.05	4.18	3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	2	3	4		1117/1502	3.90	4.02	4.26	4.46	3.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	800/1489	4.40	4.10	4.29	4.44	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	3	9	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1006	****	4.05	4.00	4.11	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	Λ	0	Λ	1	E 00	****/ 112	****	4.70	4.38	4.39	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.38	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	4.23	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	n	0	0	1		****/ 98	****	4.30	3.95	3.93	****
J. MOTO CITEGITA FOR GRANTING MADE CITEAL	14	U	U	U	U	U	_	5.00	, 90		1.50	3.93	3.93	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	9	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	4	Non-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

#### Course Section: ECON 661 0101 University of Maryland Title MICROECON: PUBLIC FINAN Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007 Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: COATES, DENNIS

Enrollment: 4 Questionnaires: 3

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 552

							Frequencies		Instructor		Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect			
		Question	.s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1															
1. Did voi	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1669	5.00	4.20	4.23	4.35	5.00
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.22	4.19	4.19	5.00
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.27	4.24	4.33	5.00
	_	uations reflect			0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	717/1617	4.33	4.04	4.15	4.24	4.33
				what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1555	5.00	3.98	4.00	4.07	5.00
				o what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1543	5.00	3.93	4.06	4.27	5.00
	7. Was the grading system clearly explained				0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1647	5.00	4.31	4.12	4.15	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled				0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.67	4.67	4.83	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness				0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	239/1605	4.67	4.01	4.07	4.13	4.67	
		Lectur	0															
1 Were +1	he instr	actor's lecture		nrenared	0	0	0	0	0	Λ	3	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.53	4.39	4.37	5.00
					0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.72	4.66	4.72	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly				0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.22	4.24	4.22	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned				-	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.27	4.26	4.24	5.00
				our understanding	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1311			3.85	3.89	5.00
		Discus			_					•	_							
				what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1490	5.00	3.86	4.05	4.18	5.00
		_	_	d to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.02	4.26	4.46	5.00
				d open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.10	4.29	4.44	5.00
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssiul		1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1006	5.00	4.05	4.00	4.11	5.00
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	\$
00-27 28-55	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		ке	quir	ea I	or Ma	a jors	5	0	Graduat	=	2	Majo	or.	0
	0 0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0 C 0		<b>a</b>		,				1	TT		1	Man		2
56-83 84-150	0	2.00-2.99 3.00-3.49	0 0	C 0 D 0	General						Τ.	Under-g	rau	1	Non-	major	3	
84-150 Grad.	2	3.50-3.49	1	D 0 F 0		TO 7	0 a t d .					0	инии з	Moona +	homo -	n-+	0200111	-h
Grau.	4	3.50-4.00	Т	P 0	Electives					U	#### - Means there are not end responses to be significant			_	ìII			
				I 0		O+1	her					1	respons	es co L	e sigi	ıııcaı.	I C	
				Ι 0		OLI	uer					<b>T</b>						