PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

Title Instructor: MCCONNELL, VIRG

Enrollment: 38 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 468 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		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	0	0	0	1	3	0	7	4 10	1006/1481	4.15	4.20	4.29	4.14	4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	9	0	4.10	884/1481	4.15	4.21	4.23	4.14	4.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	,	9	4.20	893/1249	4.11	4.21	4.23	4.16	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	-	0	2	3	7	2		1197/1424	3.99	4.15	4.21	4.14	3.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	4	-	9	4.05	675/1396	3.83	3.96	3.98	3.89	4.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	1	2	2	6	4.17	626/1342	4.02	4.06	4.07	3.88	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	3	4	10	4.05	935/1459	4.18	4.30	4.16	4.17	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	421/1480	4.63	4.73	4.68	4.64	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	5	7	4	3.94	931/1450		4.01	4.09	3.97	3.94
J. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	-	U	U	U	,	,	-	3.71	931/1430	3.03	4.01	4.09	3.51	3.94
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	8	11	4.50	762/1409	4.52	4.49	4.42	4.36	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	7	13	4.65	975/1407	4.72	4.70	4.69	4.57	4.65
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	3	5	9	4.11	966/1399	4.18	4.22	4.26	4.23	4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	5	10	4.15	945/1400	4.38	4.27	4.27	4.19	4.15
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	0	0	3	1	7	4.36	365/1179	3.63	3.87	3.96	3.85	4.36
	_	-	-	-	-	_								
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	3	1	2	1	5	3.33	1059/1262	3.75	3.81	4.05	3.77	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	2	2	3	4	3.58	1082/1259	3.95	4.13	4.29	4.06	3.58
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	4	2	6	4.17	826/1256	4.14	4.21	4.30	4.08	4.17
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	1	2	1	3	2	3.33	671/ 788	3.12	3.67	4.00	3.80	3.33
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 246	****	****	4.20	3.93	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 249	****		4.11	3.95	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.33	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 240	****	****	4.20	4.20	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.04	4.02	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	6	C	7	General	2	Under-grad	20	Non-major	19
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
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	4	-		-	
				2	Λ						

Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

Instructor: MCCONNELL, VIRG

Enrollment: 34
Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 469 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Frequencies			;		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	0	0	1	1	6	3	6		1283/1481			4.29	4.14	3.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	6	5		1166/1481		4.21	4.23	4.18	3.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	10	4.41		4.11	4.30	4.27	4.14	4.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	0	6	5	4.25	740/1424		4.15	4.21	4.06	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	4	3	6	3.69	972/1396	3.83	3.96	3.98	3.89	3.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	11	0	2 2	0	1 5	2 7		1071/1342		4.06	4.07	3.88	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0		4.00	961/1459	4.18	4.30	4.16	4.17	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	1	3	6	17 3	5.00	1/1480	4.63	4.73	4.68	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	U	Τ	Т	3	О	3	3.64	1170/1450	3.83	4.01	4.09	3.97	3.04
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	739/1409	4.52	4.49	4.42	4.36	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	4	11		1091/1407	4.72	4.70	4.69	4.57	4.53
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	2	8	5	3.94	1058/1399	4.18	4.22	4.26	4.23	3.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	8	7	4.12	977/1400	4.38	4.27	4.27	4.19	4.12
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	3	2	1	2	1	2.56	1125/1179	3.63	3.87	3.96	3.85	2.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	2	5	2	3.80	862/1262	3.75	3.81	4.05	3.77	3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	3	1	5	3.90	978/1259	3.95	4.13	4.29	4.06	3.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	2	1	6	4.10	860/1256	4.14	4.21	4.30		4.10
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	1	2	4	2	3.78	526/ 788	3.12	3.67	4.00	3.80	3.78
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3 00	****/ 249	****	****	A 11	3.95	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	U	U	U		U	U	3.00	/ 249			7.11	3.93	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	4.75	4.49	4.54	***
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.42	4.53	4.18	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	***
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 41	****	****	4.26	****	***
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	2	0	1	3 67	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	1	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	2	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****
5. Here should chough proceeds for all the beautiful			J	J	J	J	_	3.00	, 21			1.02	1.55	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	3	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı

P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 5 ? 1

PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

Title

Instructor: COOMBER, WILLIA

Enrollment: 38 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 470 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

				Fre	equer	ncie	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	1	3	10	2	3.81	1218/1481	4.15	4.20	4.29	4.14	3.81
2.	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	8	4	3.94	1082/1481	4.06	4.21	4.23	4.18	3.94
3.	Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	6	5	3.88	992/1249	4.11	4.30	4.27	4.14	3.88
4.	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	3	5	5	4.00	959/1424	3.99	4.15	4.21	4.06	4.00
5.	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	1	6	6	4.21	536/1396	3.83	3.96	3.98	3.89	4.21
6.	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	0	1	8	3	3.71	1011/1342	4.02	4.06	4.07	3.88	3.71
7.	Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	3	6	4	3.63	1219/1459	4.18	4.30	4.16	4.17	3.63
8.	How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	14	2	4.13	1309/1480	4.63	4.73	4.68	4.64	4.13
9.	How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	4	5	1	3.45	1245/1450	3.83	4.01	4.09	3.97	3.45
	Lecture														
1.	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	727/1409	4.52	4.49	4.42	4.36	4.53
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4	10		1031/1407	4.72	4.70	4.69	4.57	4.60
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	883/1399	4.18	4.22	4.26	4.23	4.20
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	3		4.13	961/1400	4.38	4.27		4.19	4.13
	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	8		4.33			3.87			4.33
٥.	bid dadiovibadi ecomiques cimanoe jour diacisediaring	_	Ü	Ü	Ü	_	O	Ü	1.33	301/11/3	3.03	3.07	3.70	3.03	1.33
	Discussion														
	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	645/1262	3.75	3.81	4.05	3.77	4.14
	Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	2	0	2	3		1002/1259	3.95	4.13	4.29	4.06	3.86
	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	0	4		4.00	901/1256	4.14	4.21	4.30	4.08	4.00
4.	Were special techniques successful	9	4	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 788	3.12	3.67	4.00	3.80	****
	Laboratory														
1	Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	3.93	****
	Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 249	****	****	4.11	3.95	****
	Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.33	****
٥.	were necessary materials available for lab accivities		Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	J	_	3.00	, 212			1.10	1.55	
	Seminar														
1.	Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.75	4.49	4.54	****
2.	Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.42	4.53	4.18	****
3.	Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 63	****	4.25	4.44	4.17	****
4.	Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.42	4.35	4.14	****
5.	Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	3.75	3.92	3.80	***
1	Field Work	1 -	0	0	0	_	1	0	4 00	****/ 50	****	****	4 20	4 00	***
	Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 59		****	4.30	4.00	****
	Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	***		4.00	3.44	
	Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
	To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	****	****
5.	Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	****	****
	Self Paced														
1.	Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	***
	Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	***
	Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	***
	Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	***
	Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****

Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

Instructor: COOMBER, WILLIA

Enrollment: 38
Questionnaires: 16

Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 470 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

_

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	 А	 5	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 101 0401 Title

PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

Instructor: DASGUPTA, NANDI

Enrollment: 43 Questionnaires: 24 Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 471 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	9	11	4.25	844/1481	4.15	4.20	4.29	4.14	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	5	10	7	4.00	1000/1481	4.06	4.21	4.23	4.18	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	15	4.50	498/1249	4.11	4.30	4.27	4.14	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	17	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	533/1424	3.99	4.15	4.21	4.06	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	2	0	3	6	4	3.67	985/1396	3.83	3.96	3.98	3.89	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	16	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	434/1342	4.02	4.06	4.07	3.88	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	7	13	4.33	695/1459	4.18	4.30	4.16	4.17	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	631/1480	4.63	4.73	4.68	4.64	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	2	2	0	6	11	2	3.52	1216/1450	3.83	4.01	4.09	3.97	3.52
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	3	3	17	4.50	762/1409	4.52	4.49	4.42	4.36	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	23	4.92	450/1407	4.72	4.70	4.69	4.57	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	6	10	7	3.92	1086/1399	4.18	4.22	4.26	4.23	3.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	4	18	4.74	336/1400	4.38	4.27	4.27	4.19	4.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	20	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1179	3.63	3.87	3.96	3.85	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	2	1	1	2	4	3.50	995/1262	3.75	3.81	4.05	3.77	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	0	1	1	7	4.30	751/1259	3.95	4.13	4.29	4.06	4.30
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	2	0	0	3	5	3.90	984/1256	4.14	4.21	4.30	4.08	3.90
4. Were special techniques successful	14	8	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 788	3.12	3.67	4.00	3.80	****
		-	-	-	-	_	_		,					

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	А	10	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	5	Under-grad	24	Non-major	23
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	9	_			
				?	1						

Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

COBB, VINCENT

Instructor:

Enrollment: 32 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 472 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

				Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General														
	Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	5	6		1031/1481		4.20	4.29	4.14	4.07
	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	2	5	4	3.53	1309/1481	4.06	4.21	4.23	4.18	3.53
	Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	6	4	3.73	1056/1249	4.11	4.30	4.27	4.14	3.73
4.	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	1275/1424	3.99	4.15	4.21	4.06	3.50
5.	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	5	4	3	3.57	1042/1396	3.83	3.96	3.98	3.89	3.57
6.	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	934/1342	4.02	4.06	4.07	3.88	3.83
7.	Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	2	5	3	4	3.64	1210/1459	4.18	4.30	4.16	4.17	3.64
8.	How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	0	13	4.79	855/1480	4.63	4.73	4.68	4.64	4.79
9.	How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	6	2	3	3.58	1195/1450	3.83	4.01	4.09	3.97	3.58
	Lecture														
	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	4	3			1092/1409	4.52	4.49	4.42	4.36	4.15
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64		4.72	4.70	4.69	4.57	4.64
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	3	4			1002/1399	4.18	4.22	4.26	4.23	4.00
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	4		4.38	729/1400	4.38	4.27	4.27	4.19	4.38
5.	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	1	0	4	2	1	3.25	997/1179	3.63	3.87	3.96	3.85	3.25
1	Discussion	0	0	0	0	4	^	2	2 06	000/1060	2 75	2 01	4 05	2 77	2 06
	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	4	0	3	3.86	829/1262	3.75	3.81	4.05	3.77	3.86
	Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	6	1	0		1154/1259	3.95	4.13	4.29	4.06	3.14
	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	3	1	2		1090/1256	4.14	4.21	4.30	4.08	3.57
4.	Were special techniques successful	8	4	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 788	3.12	3.67	4.00	3.80	****
	Laboratory														
1	Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2 00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	3.93	****
	Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	3.95	****
	Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.33	****
	Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 240	****	****	4.20	4.20	****
	Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 217	****	****	4.04	4.02	****
٥.	were requirements for rap reports creatly specified		O	O	O	_	Ü	O	3.00	/ 21/			1.01	1.02	
	Seminar														
1.	Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.75	4.49	4.54	****
	Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 69	****	4.42	4.53	4.18	****
3.	Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 63	****	4.25	4.44	4.17	****
4.	Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 69	****	4.42	4.35	4.14	****
5.	Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	3.75	3.92	3.80	****
	Field Work														
1.	Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	***
	Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	***
3.	Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	***
4.	To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	,	****	****	4.26	****	***
5.	Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	****	****
	0.16 = 3														
-	Self Paced	1.4	•	0	0	-	•	_	2 00		also also also also	also also also also	4 55	4 40	als als als als
	Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****
	Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31		****	4.75	4.42	****
	Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51 ****/ 34	****	****	4.65	4.63	****
	Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14 14	0 0	0	0 1	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 34 ****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.67 4.58	****
э.	Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	U	U	Т	U	U	U	∠.00	/ 24			4.82	4.58	

Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

Instructor: COBB, VINCENT

Enrollment: 32

Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 472 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

Title Instructor: KAIKAI, ALPHA

Enrollment:

40 Questionnaires: 27

Spring 2006

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Page 473 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncie	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	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	1	0	0	0	1	10	15	4.54	522/1481	4.15	4.20	4.29	4.14	4.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	10	13	4.38	682/1481	4.06	4.21	4.23	4.18	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	8	13	4.27	734/1249	4.11	4.30	4.27	4.14	4.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	13	0	1	2	2	8	4.31	684/1424	3.99	4.15	4.21	4.06	4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	1	2	10	10	4.13	623/1396	3.83	3.96	3.98	3.89	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	19	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	384/1342	4.02	4.06	4.07	3.88	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	5	19	4.65	287/1459	4.18	4.30	4.16	4.17	4.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	21	5		1260/1480	4.63	4.73	4.68	4.64	4.19
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	6	10	6	4.00	836/1450	3.83	4.01	4.09	3.97	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	5	20	4.80	334/1409	4.52	4.49	4.42	4.36	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	4	20	4.76	804/1407	4.72	4.70	4.69	4.57	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	8	16	4.60	459/1399	4.18	4.22	4.26		4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	6	19	4.76	299/1400	4.38	4.27	4.27	4.19	4.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	15	1	1	1	1	6	4.00	590/1179	3.63	3.87	3.96	3.85	4.00
Discussion	10	0	1	0	_	4	0	4 00	610/1060	2 75	2 01	4 05	2 77	4 00
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	2	4	8	4.20	610/1262	3.75	3.81	4.05	3.77	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	•	1 1	4	10	4.60	509/1259	3.95	4.13	4.29	4.06	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.67	457/1256	4.14	4.21	4.30	4.08	4.67 ****
4. Were special techniques successful	12	11	U	U	U	3	1	4.25	****/ 788	3.12	3.67	4.00	3.80	^ ^ ^ ^
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	3.93	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	3.95	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.33	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.20	4.20	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	***	****	4.04	4.02	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.75	4.49	4.54	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.42	4.53	4.18	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	2	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 63	****	4.25	4.44	4.17	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	2	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 69	****	4.42	4.35	4.14	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	2	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 68	****	3.75		3.80	***
Field Work	0.4	0	_	_	0	1	0	0 00	****			4 20	4 00	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	2	0	0	1	0		****/ 59	***	****	4.30	4.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	2	0	0	1	0		****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	2	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 36			4.60	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	2	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 41	****	****	4.26	***	***
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	***	4.42	***	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	2	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	2	0	0	0	1	0	00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	***
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****

Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

Instructor: KAIKAI, ALPHA

Enrollment: 40
Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 473 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	12						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	5	Under-grad	27	Non-major	26
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	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	9				
				?	0						

University of Maryland PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS Baltimore County

Title KAIKAI, ALPHA Instructor:

Enrollment: 45 Questionnaires: 25

Spring 2006

Page 474 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

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

			Fre	eane	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		Mean
General	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2 02	1142/1401	4 1 5	4 00	4 00	1 11	2 00
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	8	8	8		1143/1481		4.20	4.29	4.14	3.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	10	7	8		1094/1481	4.06	4.21	4.23	4.18	3.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	8	3	10		1061/1249	4.11	4.30	4.27	4.14	3.72
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	5	4	2		1202/1424	3.99	4.15	4.21	4.06	3.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	9	5	7	3.70	965/1396	3.83	3.96	3.98	3.89	3.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	19	0	0	3	1	1		****/1342	4.02	4.06	4.07	3.88	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	5	4	15	4.42	,		4.30	4.16	4.17	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	18	5		1245/1480	4.63	4.73	4.68	4.64	4.22
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	5	10	3	3.89	989/1450	3.83	4.01	4.09	3.97	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	10	12	4.48	800/1409	4.52	4.49	4.42	4.36	4.48
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	766/1407	4.72	4.70	4.69	4.57	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	3	10	9	4.17	901/1399	4.18	4.22	4.26	4.23	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	12	7	4.13	961/1400	4.38	4.27	4.27	4.19	4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	17	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	726/1179	3.63	3.87	3.96	3.85	3.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	4	6	3	3.71	907/1262	3.75	3.81	4.05	3.77	3.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	5	3	6	4.07	875/1259	3.95	4.13	4.29	4.06	4.07
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	658/1256	4.14	4.21	4.30	4.08	4.43
4. Were special techniques successful	11	9	1	0	0	2	2		****/ 788		3.67	4.00	3.80	****
1. Were special techniques successivi	11	,	1	U	U	2	2	3.00	/ /00	3.12	3.07	4.00	3.00	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	3.93	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	2	1	1	0	1	2.40	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	3.95	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.33	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	3	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 240	****	****	4.20	4.20	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	***	****	4.04	4.02	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.75	4.49	4.54	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.42	4.53	4.18	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	4.25	4.44	4.17	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.42	4.35	4.14	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	3.75	3.92	3.80	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	1	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 41	****	****	4.80	****	***
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	2	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 31	****	****	4.42	***	****
J. Dia conferences help you early out fred activities	20	۷	J	U	U		_	1.07	, 31			1.74		
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 24	***	****	4.82	4.58	****

Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

Instructor: KAIKAI, ALPHA

Enrollment: 45
Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 474 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	В	12						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	1	Under-grad	25	Non-major	25
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

Instructor: CARROLL, KATHLE

Enrollment: 42
Questionnaires: 18

OLL, KATHLE Spr

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 475 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	395/1481	4.15	4.20	4.29	4.14	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	3	11	4.33	736/1481	4.15	4.21	4.23	4.14	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	3	14	4.61	393/1249	4.11	4.30	4.27	4.14	4.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	818/1424	3.99	4.15	4.21	4.06	4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	3	5	2	4		1228/1396	3.83	3.96	3.98	3.89	3.19
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	2	0	3	3	3.88	905/1342	4.02	4.06	4.07	3.88	3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	276/1459	4.18	4.30	4.16	4.17	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1480	4.63	4.73	4.68	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	9	4	4.13	751/1450	3.83	4.01	4.09	3.97	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	290/1409	4.52	4.49	4.42	4.36	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	682/1407	4.72	4.70	4.69	4.57	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0 1	0	4 2	4	9 14	4.29	792/1399	4.18	4.22	4.26 4.27	4.23	4.29 4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	14	1	0	2	1	1	4.50	591/1400 ****/1179	4.38	4.27 3.87	3.96	4.19 3.85	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	U	14	1	U	2	U		3.00	/11/9	3.03	3.07	3.90	3.05	
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	2	0	4	3	3.60	958/1262	3.75	3.81	4.05	3.77	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	4	0	6	4.20	821/1259	3.95	4.13	4.29	4.06	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	2	1	6	4.20	809/1256	4.14	4.21	4.30	4.08	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	8	8	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 788	3.12	3.67	4.00	3.80	***
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 249	****	****	4.11	3.95	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.33	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 41	****	****	4.26	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	***	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	***	***	4.82	4.58	***
Frequ	ency.	Dis	trib	ution	n									

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

PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

Title Instructor: COOMBER, WILLIA

Enrollment: 37 Questionnaire

Baltimore County Spring 2006

University of Maryland

Page 476 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

es:	14	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
-----	----	---------	--------	------------	---------------

							Fr	eque:	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1															
1. Did vo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	1	0	1	7	5	4.07	1024/1481	4.15	4.20	4.29	4.14	4.07
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	3	6	4	3.93	1094/1481	4.06	4.21	4.23	4.18	3.93
		uestions reflec			0	0	2	2	2	5	3		1144/1249		4.30	4.27	4.14	3.36
	_	uations reflect		_	0	0	1	1	3	2	7	3.93	1061/1424	3.99	4.15	4.21	4.06	3.93
				what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	5	7	4.29	476/1396	3.83	3.96	3.98	3.89	4.29
. Did wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	424/1342	4.02	4.06	4.07	3.88	4.3
		g system clearl			0	0	1	1	3	2	7	3.93	1030/1459	4.18	4.30	4.16	4.17	3.9
. How man	ny times	was class cand	elled		0	1	0	0	0	11	2	4.15	1288/1480	4.63	4.73	4.68	4.64	4.1
How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	ching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	973/1450	3.83	4.01	4.09	3.97	3.9
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	1013/1409	4.52	4.49	4.42	4.36	4.29
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	986/1407	4.72	4.70	4.69	4.57	4.64
				explained clearly	1	0	0	0	5	3	5	4.00	1002/1399		4.22	4.26	4.23	4.0
		es contribute t			0	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	681/1400		4.27	4.27	4.19	4.4
				our understanding	1	1	2	1	4	1	4	3.33				3.96	3.85	3.3
		Discus	sion															
l. Did cl	ass disc			what you learned	7	0	1	1	3	1	1	3.00	1146/1262	3.75	3.81	4.05	3.77	3.0
				ed to participate	7	0	1	0	3	1	2		1120/1259		4.13	4.29	4.06	3.4
				nd open discussion	7	0	0	0	2	4	1		1004/1256		4.21	4.30	4.08	3.8
		echniques succe		a open arbeablion	7	3	1	1	2	0	0	2.25	777/ 788		3.67	4.00	3.80	2.2
		Labora	torv															
l. Did th	e lab ind	crease understa	-	of the material	12	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	3.93	***
				ground information	13	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 249		****	4.11	3.95	***
		Semina	r															
2. Was th	e instru		_	lividual attention	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.42	4.53	4.18	***
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credits E	arned	Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Т	⁄pe			Majors	}		
00-27	6	A 8			quir					5	 Graduat		 0	Mada		2		
	0	0.00-0.99	1 0			ĸe	quir	eu I	OT IAI	a jor	D .	J	Graduat	-e	U	Majo	JΤ	2
28-55 56-83	-	1.00-1.99	2			C	0.00	1				1	IIndo		1.4	Morr	ma i a	10
	3 0	2.00-2.99	2			Ge	nera	Т				1	Under-9	jrau .	L4	non-	-major	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2 4	D 0 F 0		m 7	0 4 = 3 -					0	шшпп	Moone '	-hows			h
Grad.	U	3.50-4.00	4			ΕI	ecti [.]	ves				U		Means t			_	111
				P 0		0.	L					0	respons	ses to b	oe sign	nificar	1T	
				I 0		Ot.	her					9						
				? 0														

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

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 477

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: FALCON, JAIME Enrollment: 35

Questionnaires: 19

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	1	1	7	10	4.37	718/1481	4.15	4.20	4.29	4.14	4.37
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	14	4.58	434/1481	4.06	4.21	4.23	4.18	4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	369/1249	4.11	4.30	4.27	4.14	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	4	5	7	3.89	1101/1424	3.99	4.15	4.21	4.06	3.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	1	8	7	3.84	846/1396	3.83	3.96	3.98	3.89	3.84
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	2	7	7	3.84	927/1342	4.02	4.06	4.07	3.88	3.84
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	10	9	4.47	505/1459	4.18	4.30	4.16	4.17	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	421/1480	4.63	4.73	4.68	4.64	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	11	6	4.28	609/1450	3.83	4.01	4.09	3.97	4.28
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	603/1409	4.52	4.49	4.42	4.36	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	636/1407	4.72	4.70	4.69	4.57	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	545/1399	4.18	4.22	4.26	4.23	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	4	13	4.47	624/1400	4.38	4.27	4.27	4.19	4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	8	1	1	3	0	3	3.38	956/1179	3.63	3.87	3.96	3.85	3.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	Λ	Λ	1	7	5	4.31	537/1262	3.75	3.81	4.05	3.77	4.31
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	624/1259	3.95	4.13	4.29	4.06	4.46
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	554/1256	4.14	4.21	4.30	4.08	4.54
4. Were special techniques successful	7	9	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 788	3.12	3.67	4.00	3.80	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	2	A	7	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1	В	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	2	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	6	_			
				?	0						

Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS

Instructor: PRERO, AARON

Enrollment: 38

Questionnaires: 18

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland Page 478
Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006
Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

							Fre	equei	ncies			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1		General			0	0	0	-	_	_	0	2 00	1410/1401	4 00	4 00	4 00	4 1 4	2 00
		w insights,skil			0	0	2	1	7	6	2		1419/1481		4.20	4.29	4.14	3.28
		tor make clear			0	0	1	4	3	9	1		1380/1481	4.10	4.21	4.23	4.18	3.28
	_	estions reflect			0	0	0	2	4	8			1036/1249	4.23	4.30	4.27	4.14	3.78
		ations reflect			0	14	1	1	1	1	0		****/1424	3.97	4.15	4.21	4.06	
	-	-		what you learned	0	0	1	4	4	5	4		1145/1396	3.78	3.96	3.98	3.89	3.39
		-		o what you learned	0	13	2	1	1	1	0		1337/1342	3.65	4.06	4.07	3.88	2.20
		system clearly		inea	1	0	1	1	5	5 7	5		1183/1459	4.07	4.30	4.16	4.17	3.71
	-	was class cance			0	0	0	0 2	0				989/1480	4.48	4.73	4.68		4.61
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the overa.	ll teac	thing effectiveness	0	0	3	2	8	5	0	2.83	1394/1450	3.88	4.01	4.09	3.97	2.83
		Lecture	3															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lectures	s well	prepared	0	0	2	2	4	7	3	3.39	1315/1409	4.36	4.49	4.42	4.36	3.39
		tor seem intere			0	0	0	0	5	5	8	4.17	1283/1407	4.68	4.70	4.69	4.57	4.17
				explained clearly	0	0	2	4	4	6	2		1314/1399	4.12	4.22	4.26	4.23	3.11
		es contribute to		-	0	0	4	2	6	3			1325/1400	4.17	4.27	4.27	4.19	2.94
				our understanding	0	12	1	1	2	0			1021/1179		3.87	3.96		3.17
J. Dia aa	aiovibaai	ccemiiques em	idiice y	our unactionaling	Ū		-	_	-	Ü	_	3.17	1021,11,5	3.70	3.07	3.50	3.03	3.17
		Discus																
				what you learned	8	0	3	2	2	1	2		1202/1262	3.63	3.81	4.05	3.77	2.70
		_	_	ed to participate	8	0	1	2	3	0	4	3.40	1127/1259	4.06	4.13	4.29	4.06	3.40
		_		d open discussion	8	0	3	0	3	1	3		1165/1256	4.07	4.21	4.30	4.08	3.10
4. Were s	special te	chniques succes	ssful		8	8	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 788	3.63	3.67	4.00	3.80	****
		Laborat	rorv															
1. Did th	e lab inc	rease understar	_	of the material	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	3.93	****
			_	ground information	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 249	****	****	4.11	3.95	****
_	_	_		for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.33	****
	_	structor provide			17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 240	****	****	4.20	4.20	****
		_		early specified	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 217	****	****	4.04	4.02	****
1 Waxa a	agianod +	Semina		announced theme	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	2 00	****/ 68	****	4.75	4.49	4.54	****
	-	-		lividual attention	17	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 69	****	4.75	4.49	4.18	****
					17	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 63	****		4.33		****
	_	-		what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 69	****	4.25		4.17	****
_		ons contribute t		-		-	-	-	-	-	_		,		4.42	4.35	4.14	****
5. Were c	riteria I	for grading made	elear		17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	3.75	3.92	3.80	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arnod	Cum. GPA		Exposted Crades				D.C.	agona				т	20			Majora	
crearrs F	 atiiea	Expected Grades					sons				Ту.				Majors	, . – – – –		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	s	5	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	В 9				_										
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 3		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	8	Non-	-major	13
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1					ſh
		P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt			
				Ι 0		Otl	ner				1	1						
				? 1														

Course-Section: ECON 102 0201 University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 479

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

2 0 0 1 3.00 ****/ 788 3.63 3.67 4.00 3.80 ****

Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS Instructor: PRERO, AARON Spring 2006

Enrollment: 34 Ouestionnaires: 26

4. Were special techniques successful

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 1 0 1 0 6 10 8 3.96 1106/1481 4.00 4.20 4.29 4.14 3.96 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 1 1 8 7 8 3.80 1179/1481 4.10 4.21 4.23 4.18 3.80 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 0 1 2 7 4 11 3.88 988/1249 4.23 4.30 4.27 4.14 3.88 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 2 9 3 1 3 3 5 3.40 1298/1424 3.97 4.15 4.21 4.06 3.40 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 3 2 0 5 6 9 3.91 801/1396 3.78 3.96 3.98 3.89 3.91 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 13 0 0 4 4 4 4.00 755/1342 3.65 4.06 4.07 3.88 4.00 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 1 2 4 6 12 4.04 940/1459 4.07 4.30 4.16 4.17 4.04 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 14 11 4.44 1086/1480 4.48 4.73 4.68 4.64 4.44 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 10 0 0 3 4 7 2 3.50 1223/1450 3.88 4.01 4.09 3.97 3.50 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 3 0 1 0 4 5 13 4.26 1025/1409 4.36 4.49 4.42 4.36 4.26 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3 0 1 0 1 5 16 4.52 1091/1407 4.68 4.70 4.69 4.57 4.52 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4 0 1 1 3 8 9 4.05 987/1399 4.12 4.22 4.26 4.23 4.05 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 1 5 7 11 4.17 937/1400 4.17 4.27 4.27 4.19 4.17 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 16 0 2 3 1 1 3.14 1027/1179 3.70 3.87 3.96 3.85 3.14 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 12 0 0 1 3 4 6 4.07 684/1262 3.63 3.81 4.05 3.77 4.07 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11 0 0 1 2 4 8 4.27 777/1259 4.06 4.13 4.29 4.06 4.27 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0 0 0 4 0 11 4.47 614/1256 4.07 4.21 4.30 4.08 4.47

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	С	7	General	4	Under-grad	26	Non-major	24
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	1			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 102 0301 Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS

Instructor: THOMAS, MARK S

Enrollment: 21 Questionnaires: 12

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland Page 480 Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006 Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

									Fre	equei	ncies	3		Ins	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	new insights, ski	lls fro	m this cour	se	0	0	0	3	1	3	5	3.83	1206/1481	4.00	4.20	4.29	4.14	3.83
2.	Did t	the instr	ructor make clear	the ex	pected goal	S	0	0	1	2	2	1	6	3.75	1205/1481	4.10	4.21	4.23	4.18	3.75
3.	Did t	the exam	questions reflec	t the e	expected goa	ls	0	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	742/1249	4.23	4.30	4.27	4.14	4.25
4.	Did o	other eva	aluations reflect	the ex	pected goal	s	0	1	0	1	5	3	2	3.55	1261/1424	3.97	4.15	4.21	4.06	3.55
5.	Did a	assigned	readings contrib	ute to	what you le	arned	0	5	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	1250/1396	3.78	3.96	3.98	3.89	3.14
6.	Did v	written a	assignments contr	ibute t	o what you	learned	0	7	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	405/1342	3.65	4.06	4.07	3.88	4.40
7.	Was t	the gradi	ing system clearly	y expla	ined		0	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	919/1459	4.07	4.30	4.16	4.17	4.08
8.	How r	many time	es was class canc	elled			0	1	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	702/1480	4.48	4.73	4.68	4.64	4.91
9.	How v	would you	grade the overa	ll teac	ching effect	iveness	4	1	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	836/1450	3.88	4.01	4.09	3.97	4.00
			Lectur	e																
1.	Were	the inst		1	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	1019/1409	4.36	4.49	4.42	4.36	4.27			
2.	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						1	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	880/1407	4.68	4.70	4.69	4.57	4.73
			material presente		_	_	1	-	0	1	1	4	-	4.18	,		4.22	4.26	4.23	4.18
			res contribute to		-		1	0	0	0	2	2			647/1400		4.27		4.19	4.45
5.	Did a	audiovisu	ual techniques en	hance y	our underst	anding	2	2	2	3	1	2	0	2.38	1142/1179	3.70	3.87	3.96	3.85	2.38
			Discus	sion																
1.	Did o	class dis	scussions contrib	ute to	what you le	arned	9	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	931/1262	3.63	3.81	4.05	3.77	3.67
2.	Were	all stud	dents actively en	courage	ed to partic	ipate	9	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1067/1259	4.06	4.13	4.29	4.06	3.67
3.	Did t	the instr	ructor encourage :	fair ar	nd open disc	ussion	9	0	0	1	0	1			1069/1256		4.21		4.08	3.67
4.	Were	special	techniques succes	ssful			9	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 788	3.63	3.67	4.00	3.80	***
						Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Cr	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra									Rea	asons	3			Ty	pe			Majors	\$
																- 				
	0-27	2	0.00-0.99		A	7		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	4	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	0
	8-55	0	1.00-1.99		В	4														
-	6-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	1		Gei	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad 1	2	Non-	major	12

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

PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS

Title Instructor: COOMBER, WILLIA

Enrollment:

40 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 481 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
~~~~~														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	5	9	8	3.84	1199/1481	4.00	4.20	4.29	4.14	3.84
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	9	11	4.12	942/1481	4.10	4.21	4.23	4.18	4.12
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	1	9	11	4.04	877/1249	4.23	4.30	4.27	4.14	4.04
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	0	8	6	7	3.82	1152/1424	3.97	4.15	4.21	4.06	3.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	2	1	3	5	9	3.90	801/1396	3.78	3.96	3.98	3.89	3.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	4	4	6	7	3.42	1160/1342	3.65	4.06	4.07	3.88	3.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	6	2	5	3	9	3.28	1331/1459	4.07	4.30	4.16	4.17	3.28
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	1	1	1	16	4	3.91	1412/1480	4.48	4.73	4.68	4.64	3.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	5	9	4	3.84	1022/1450	3.88	4.01	4.09	3.97	3.84
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	5	6	13	4.33	968/1409	4.36	4.49	4.42	4.36	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	3	19	4.71	919/1407	4.68	4.70	4.69	4.57	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	9	5	8	3.95	1049/1399	4.12	4.22	4.26	4.23	3.95
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	3	3	5	12	4.13	961/1400	4.17	4.27	4.27	4.19	4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	2	1	2	4	11	4.05	573/1179	3.70	3.87	3.96	3.85	4.05
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	3	0	3	5	7	3.72	902/1262	3.63	3.81	4.05	3.77	3.72
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	4	2		4.22	803/1259	4.06	4.13	4.29	4.06	4.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	3	4		4.28	760/1256	4.07	4.21	4.30	4.08	4.28
4. Were special techniques successful	7	13	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	****/ 788	3.63	3.67	4.00	3.80	****
- ,														
Laboratory		_			_									
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 246	****	****	4.20	3.93	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	3.95	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.33	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 240	****	****	4.20	4.20	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.04	4.02	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	1	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 68	****	4.75	4.49	4.54	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 69	****	4.42	4.53	4.18	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 63	****	4.25	4.44	4.17	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 69	****	4.42	4.35	4.14	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	3.00	****/ 68	****	3.75	3.92	3.80	****
J. Were criteria for grading made crear	23	U	U	U	U		_	1.50	, 00		3.73	3.72	3.00	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 41	****	****	4.26	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 31	****	****	4.42	****	****
The same and the s		ŭ	-	,	_	ŭ	Ū		, 31					
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****

Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS

Instructor: COOMBER, WILLIA

Enrollment: 40
Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 481 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	 А	13	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	25	Non-major	25
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	1						

Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS

Instructor: COOMBER, WILLIA

Enrollment: 48
Questionnaires: 26

MBER, WILLIA Spring 2006

Page 482 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

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

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

			Fre	equei	ncie	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	4	5	9	8	3.81	1225/1481	4.00	4.20	4.29	4.14	3.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	8	11	4.12	950/1481	4.10	4.21	4.23	4.18	4.12
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	10	12	4.23	757/1249	4.23	4.30	4.27	4.14	4.23
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	6	10	7	3.88	1101/1424	3.97	4.15	4.21	4.06	3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	1	4	7	10	4.04	681/1396	3.78	3.96	3.98	3.89	4.04
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	5	7	4	8	3.52	1106/1342	3.65	4.06	4.07	3.88	3.52
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	0	5	5	13	3.96	995/1459	4.07	4.30	4.16	4.17	3.96
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	1	20	4	4.12	1309/1480	4.48	4.73	4.68	4.64	4.12
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	2	5	9	5	3.81	1055/1450	3.88	4.01	4.09	3.97	3.81
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	7	14	4.52	739/1409	4.36	4.49	4.42	4.36	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	0	21	4.83	682/1407	4.68	4.70	4.69	4.57	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	4	4	7	8	3.83	1135/1399	4.12	4.22	4.26	4.23	3.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	3	3	4	12	4.00	1017/1400	4.17	4.27	4.27	4.19	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	2	2	6	10	4.20	487/1179	3.70	3.87	3.96	3.85	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	3	1	3	2	3	3.08	1136/1262	3.63	3.81	4.05	3.77	3.08
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	1	3	2	6	4.08	872/1259	4.06	4.13	4.29	4.06	4.08
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion			1	0	2	2	7	4.17	826/1256	4.07	4.21	4.30	4.08	4.17
4. Were special techniques successful			1	1	1	2	1	3.17	****/ 788	3.63	3.67	4.00	3.80	****

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors		
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	1	
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	10							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	5	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	26	Non-major	25	
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n	
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant		
				I	0	Other	11					
				?	1							

Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS

Instructor:

Enrollment: 34

Spring 2006 GINDLING, THOMA

Page 483 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 21 Student Course Evaluation Questionna	ire

			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	1	0	1	4	15	4.52	531/1481	4.00	4.20	4.29	4.14	4.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	264/1481	4.10	4.21	4.23	4.18	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	236/1249	4.23	4.30	4.27	4.14	4.76
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	354/1424	3.97	4.15	4.21	4.06	4.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	4	4	5	6	3.55	1054/1396	3.78	3.96	3.98	3.89	3.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	2	0	4	3	6	3.73	999/1342	3.65	4.06	4.07	3.88	3.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	5	12	4.40	611/1459	4.07	4.30	4.16	4.17	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	770/1480	4.48	4.73	4.68	4.64	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	0	6	10	4.47	375/1450	3.88	4.01	4.09	3.97	4.47
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	Λ	1	2	18	4.81	334/1409	4.36	4.49	4.42	4.36	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	19	4.86	614/1407	4.68	4.70	4.69	4.57	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	3	17	4.71	311/1399	4.12	4.22	4.26	4.23	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	361/1400		4.27	4.27	4.19	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	16	1	1	0	1	2		****/1179		3.87	3.96	3.85	****
J. Did addiovisual eccliniques childrice your understanding	O	10	_	_	O	_		3.10	/ 11/ /	3.70	3.07	3.70	3.03	
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	4	2	2	3.56	976/1262	3.63	3.81	4.05	3.77	3.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	1	3	1	4	3.89	987/1259	4.06	4.13	4.29	4.06	3.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	636/1256	4.07	4.21	4.30	4.08	4.44
4. Were special techniques successful	12	5	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	****/ 788	3.63	3.67	4.00	3.80	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	Ο	1	Ο	Ω	3 00	****/ 68	****	4.75	4.49	4.54	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 69		4.42	4.53	4.18	****
2. Has the imperator available for individual deterition	20	J	J	-	J	J	5	2.00	, 05		1.12	1.55	1.10	

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	4	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

University of Maryland PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS

Title Instructor: GOLDFARB, MARSH

Enrollment: 45 Questionnaires: 28 Spring 2006

Page 484 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

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

Baltimore County

			Fre	equer	ncie	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	9	16	4.46	600/1481	4.00	4.20	4.29	4.14	4.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	20	4.61	399/1481	4.10	4.21	4.23	4.18	4.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	21	4.68	322/1249	4.23	4.30	4.27	4.14	4.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	18	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	509/1424	3.97	4.15	4.21	4.06	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	5	5	14	4.07	662/1396	3.78	3.96	3.98	3.89	4.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	18	1	0	2	4	3	3.80	956/1342	3.65	4.06	4.07	3.88	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	3	3	21	4.67	276/1459	4.07	4.30	4.16	4.17	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	18	9	4.33	1158/1480	4.48	4.73	4.68	4.64	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	0	1	10	6	4.29	588/1450	3.88	4.01	4.09	3.97	4.29
Lecture														
<ol> <li>Were the instructor's lectures well prepared</li> </ol>	4	0	0	1	2	1	20	4.67	559/1409	4.36	4.49	4.42	4.36	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	2	21	4.83	659/1407	4.68	4.70	4.69	4.57	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	4	2		4.58	480/1399	4.12	4.22	4.26	4.23	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	5	17	4.63	468/1400	4.17	4.27	4.27	4.19	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	13	1	0	0	0	9	4.60	208/1179	3.70	3.87	3.96	3.85	4.60
Discussion	1	•	0	-		0		2 00	055/1060	2 62	2 01	4 05	2 55	2 00
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	4	2	4	3.82	855/1262	3.63	3.81	4.05	3.77	3.82
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	556/1259	4.06	4.13	4.29	4.06	4.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	2	1	3	5	4.00	901/1256	4.07	4.21	4.30	4.08	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	17	8	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 788	3.63	3.67	4.00	3.80	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	26	1	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	3.93	****
5	26	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 249	****	****	4.20	3.95	****
<ol> <li>Were you provided with adequate background information</li> <li>Were necessary materials available for lab activities</li> </ol>	26	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 249	****	****	4.11	4.33	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	26	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.33	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	26 26	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 217	****	****	4.20	4.20	****
5. Were requirements for tab reports crearry specified	20	Τ	U	U	U	1	U	4.00	/ 21/			4.04	4.02	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	4.75	4.49	4.54	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 69	****	4.42	4.53	4.18	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 63	****	4.25	4.44	4.17	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 69	****	4.42	4.35	4.14	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 68	****	3.75	3.92	3.80	****
J J														
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	***	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	1	0	1	1.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	***

Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS

Instructor: GOLDFARB, MARSH

Enrollment: 45
Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 484 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS

Instructor: KORNILOV, GUERM

Enrollment: 36 Questionnaires: 31

### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 485 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	2	12	15	4.29	792/1481	4.00	4.20	4.29	4.14	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	9	18	4.42	646/1481	4.10	4.21	4.23	4.18	4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	3	1	8	17	4.23	757/1249	4.23	4.30	4.27	4.14	4.23
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	2	1	2	8	12	4.08	918/1424	3.97	4.15	4.21	4.06	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	5	7	16	4.23	519/1396	3.78	3.96	3.98	3.89	4.23
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	3	2	7	10	4.09	701/1342	3.65	4.06	4.07	3.88	4.09
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	9	17	4.43	565/1459	4.07	4.30	4.16	4.17	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	7	21	4.69	936/1480	4.48	4.73	4.68	4.64	4.69
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	1	4	7	13	4.28	599/1450	3.88	4.01	4.09	3.97	4.28
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	4	23	4.63	603/1409	4.36	4.49	4.42	4.36	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	2	26	4.80	728/1407	4.68	4.70	4.69	4.57	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	6	20	4.55	513/1399	4.12	4.22	4.26	4.23	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	3	4	20	4.33	791/1400	4.17	4.27	4.27	4.19	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	1	3	7	18	4.33	384/1179	3.70	3.87	3.96	3.85	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	4	3	12	4.42	418/1262	3.63	3.81	4.05	3.77	4.42
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	1	3	3	12	4.37	708/1259	4.06	4.13	4.29	4.06	4.37
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	4	2	13	4.47	603/1256	4.07	4.21	4.30	4.08	4.47
4. Were special techniques successful	12	11	2	0	1	1	4	3.63	577/ 788	3.63	3.67	4.00	3.80	3.63
1									,					
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	3.95	****
									,					
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 68	****	4.75	4.49	4.54	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.42	4.53	4.18	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	1	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 69	****	4.42	4.35	4.14	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 68	****	3.75	3.92	3.80	****
		_			-	-	_		,					
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	29	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	29	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	29	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 41	****	****	4.26	****	****
1. 10 what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2,7	_	U	U	O	_	O	1.00	, 11			1.20		
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	29	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	29	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****
5. Here there chaugh proceeds for all the stauchts	رے	_	5	5	5	J	_	5.00	, 21			1.02	1.50	

Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS

Instructor: KORNILOV, GUERM

Enrollment: 36
Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 485 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits 1	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	 7	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	15						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	6	C	6	General	1	Under-grad	31	Non-major	31
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	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	15				
				?	0						

PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I

Title

Instructor: ST MARTIN, JEAN

Enrollment: 39 Questionnaires: 25

### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 486 JUN 13, 2006 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	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	19	4.68	384/1481	4.48	4.20	4.29	4.14	4.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	19	4.76	219/1481	4.61	4.21	4.23	4.18	4.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	21	4.80	203/1249	4.60	4.30	4.27	4.14	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	533/1424	4.35	4.15	4.21	4.06	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	3	4	5	8	3.76	909/1396	4.08	3.96	3.98	3.89	3.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	5	4	8	4.18	615/1342	4.12	4.06	4.07	3.88	4.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	4	18	4.60	344/1459	4.72	4.30	4.16	4.17	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1480	4.93	4.73	4.68	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	259/1450	4.45	4.01	4.09	3.97	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	5	18	4.71	500/1409	4.70	4.49	4.42	4.36	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1407	4.68	4.70	4.69	4.57	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	6	18	4.75	267/1399	4.62	4.22	4.26	4.23	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	0	22	4.79	262/1400	4.66	4.27	4.27	4.19	4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	17	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	223/1179	3.90	3.87	3.96	3.85	4.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	1	3	7	4.25	570/1262	3.97	3.81	4.05	3.77	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	841/1259	4.17	4.13	4.29	4.06	4.15
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	1	3	2	6	4.08	868/1256	4.19	4.21	4.30	4.08	4.08
4. Were special techniques successful	12	8	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/ 788	4.00	3.67	4.00	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	3.93	***
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	3.95	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.33	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.20	4.20	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.04	4.02	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.75	4.49	4.54	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 69	****	4.42	4.53	4.18	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 63	****	4.25	4.44	4.17	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 69	****	4.42	4.35	4.14	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	3.75	3.92	3.80	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	0.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****

Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I

Instructor: ST MARTIN, JEAN

Enrollment: 39
Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 486 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	14						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	25	Non-major	17
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
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	22				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 121 0201 University of Maryland Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I

Instructor: ST MARTIN, JEAN

Enrollment: 42 Questionnaires: 25

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 487 Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006 Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

	Ouestions							_	ncies		_		ructor		e Dept			
		Question	5		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	_	m this course	0	0	0	1	0	4	20	4.72	340/1481	4.48	4.20	4.29	4.14	4.72
_	-	ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	4	20	4.76	219/1481	4.61		4.23	4.18	4.76
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	0	2	4	19	4.68	322/1249	4.60	4.30	4.27	4.14	4.68
	_	uations reflect		_	0	9	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	318/1424	4.35	4.15	4.21	4.06	4.63
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	3	2	0	2	6	12	4.18	564/1396	4.08	3.96	3.98	3.89	4.18
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	1	9	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	343/1342	4.12	4.06	4.07	3.88	4.47
		g system clearl			0	0	0	0	2	1	22	4.80	161/1459	4.72	4.30	4.16	4.17	4.80
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	1	0	24	4.92	561/1480	4.93	4.73	4.68	4.64	4.92
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	119/1450	4.45	4.01	4.09	3.97	4.86
		Lectur																
1. Were t	he instru	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	169/1409	4.70	4.49	4.42	4.36	4.92
2. Did th	oid the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1407	4.68	4.70	4.69	4.57	5.00
3. Was le	Was lecture material presented and explained clear						0	0	1	3	20	4.79	223/1399	4.62	4.22	4.26	4.23	4.79
4. Did th	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	73/1400	4.66	4.27	4.27	4.19	4.96
5. Did au	diovisual	l techniques en	nance y	our understanding	2	14	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	233/1179	3.90	3.87	3.96	3.85	4.56
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	3	11	4.60	295/1262	3.97	3.81	4.05	3.77	4.60
2. Were a	ıll studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	10	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	304/1259	4.17	4.13	4.29	4.06	4.80
3. Did th	ne instruc	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	248/1256	4.19	4.21	4.30	4.08	4.87
4. Were s	special te	echniques succe	ssful		11	12	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 788	4.00	3.67	4.00	3.80	****
				Frequ	ıency	/ Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	;		
00-27						Ked	quir	ea I	or Ma	ı Jor	S	U	Graduat	е	0	Majo	)r.	0
28-55						<b>a</b>		1				1	TTm d and to		) F	Mar		٥٢
56-83 84-150	5	2.00-2.99 3.00-3.49	5 5	C 5 D 0		Gei	nera	Т				1	Under-g	rad 2	25	Non-	major	25
	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0						ecti					1	#### - :	Moona +	homo -	nc+		·h
Grad.	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0						ECLI	ves				Т	respons				_	111
	Р 0 т 0						her				_	21	respons	בט נט ג	e sign	ıııcan	ıL	
				Ι 0	Oti	uer				2	: T							

Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I

Instructor: ST MARTIN, JEAN

Enrollment: 40 Questionnaires: 24

### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 488 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	0	0	10	12	4.39	688/1481	4.48	4.20	4 20	4.14	4.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	7	15	4.57	446/1481	4.40	4.21	4.29 4.23	4.14	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	ρ	14	4.52	479/1249	4.60	4.30	4.27	4.14	4.52
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	437/1424	4.35	4.15	4.21	4.06	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	3	3	7	5	3.78	901/1396	4.08	3.96	3.98	3.89	3.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	10	1	1	2	3	6	3.92	858/1342	4.12	4.06	4.07	3.88	3.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	1	0	5	16	4.64	310/1459	4.72	4.30	4.16	4.17	4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	0	0	22	4.83	811/1480	4.93	4.73	4.68	4.64	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	1	0	0	5	8	4.36	525/1450	4.45	4.01	4.09	3.97	4.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	5	17	4.77	383/1409	4.70	4.49	4.42	4.36	4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	705/1407	4.68	4.70	4.69	4.57	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	0	6	15	4.59	469/1399	4.62	4.22	4.26	4.23	4.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	4	15	4.52	571/1400	4.66	4.27	4.27	4.19	4.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	18	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1179	3.90	3.87	3.96	3.85	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	0	0	4	6	4.00	708/1262	3.97	3.81	4.05	3.77	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	1	1	2	7	4.08	872/1259	4.17	4.13	4.29	4.06	4.08
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	1	0	4	6	4.08	868/1256	4.19	4.21	4.30	4.08	4.08
4. Were special techniques successful	12	10	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 788	4.00	3.67	4.00	3.80	***
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	3.95	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	1.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****
Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ition	n									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	5	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	24	Non-major	19
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	1			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	16				
				2	Ω						

Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I

Instructor: COLE, RICHARD

Enrollment: 37

Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 489 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

				eque		s		Inst	tructor	Course	_	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	Λ	3	5	16	4.54	513/1481	4.48	4.20	4.29	4.14	4.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	20	4.79	192/1481	4.61	4.21	4.23	4.18	4.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4		4.75	245/1249	4.60	4.30	4.27	4.14	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	1	2	6	9	4.28	717/1424	4.35	4.15	4.21	4.06	4.28
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	2	5	14	4.41	380/1396	4.08	3.96	3.98	3.89	4.41
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	1	4	5	5	3.93	845/1342	4.12	4.06	4.07	3.88	3.93
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	91/1459	4.72	4.30	4.16	4.17	4.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	631/1480	4.93	4.73	4.68	4.64	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	13	8	4.26	620/1450	4.45	4.01	4.09	3.97	4.26
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	383/1409	4.70	4.49	4.42	4.36	4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	2	8	10	4.29	1245/1407	4.68	4.70	4.69	4.57	4.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	7	15	4.68	349/1399	4.62	4.22	4.26	4.23	4.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	4	17	4.68	397/1400	4.66	4.27	4.27	4.19	4.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	3	2	3	4	3	3.13	1029/1179	3.90	3.87	3.96	3.85	3.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	1	1	4	5	3.92	788/1262	3.97	3.81	4.05	3.77	3.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	1	0	3	-	4.17	836/1259	4.17	4.13	4.05	4.06	4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	0	2	1		4.17	773/1256	4.17	4.13	4.29	4.08	4.17
4. Were special techniques successful	12	6	0	0	2	2		4.00	394/ 788	4.19	3.67	4.00		4.23
4. Wele special techniques successful	12	U	U	U	2	2	2	1.00	334/ 700	1.00	3.07	1.00	3.00	1.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	3.93	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	3.95	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.33	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.20	4.20	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.04	4.02	****
Seminar	0.2	0	0	0	_	_	1	F 00	****/		2 75	2 00	2 00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	0	Τ	5.00	****/ 68	****	3.75	3.92	3.80	^ ^ * *
Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio	n									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	 8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5	C	6	General	3	Under-grad	24	Non-major	23
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	16				
				2	0						

Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I

Instructor: COLE, RICHARD

Enrollment: 37
Questionnaires: 25

LE, RICHARD Spring 2006

Page 490 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

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

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

			Fre	equei	ncie	S		Tnst	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	3	0	1	1	4	6	10	4 05	1043/1481	4.48	4.20	4.29	4.14	4.05
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	4	10	8	4.18	892/1481	4.61	4.21	4.23	4.18	4.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	2	3	5	12	4.23	765/1249	4.60	4.30	4.27	4.14	4.23
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	8	0	0	5	5	4		1061/1424		4.15	4.21	4.06	3.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	1	1	0	4	3	12	4.25	502/1396	4.08	3.96	3.98	3.89	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	8	1	0	3	2	7	4.08	713/1342	4.12	4.06	4.07	3.88	4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	3	1	17	4.67	276/1459	4.72	4.30	4.16	4.17	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1480	4.93	4.73	4.68	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	0	4	5	7	4.19	702/1450	4.45	4.01	4.09	3.97	4.19
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	4	4	13	4.32	990/1409	4.70	4.49	4.42	4.36	4.32
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	1	1	6	13	4.32	1232/1407	4.68	4.70	4.69	4.57	4.32
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	3	0	3	15	4.27	810/1399	4.62	4.22	4.26	4.23	4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	1	5	14	4.36	754/1400	4.66	4.27	4.27	4.19	4.36
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	8	1	4	2	3	4	3.36	964/1179	3.90	3.87	3.96	3.85	3.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	4	2	2	5	3	3.06	1138/1262	3.97	3.81	4.05	3.77	3.06
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	1	7	1	6	3.63	1075/1259	4.17	4.13	4.29	4.06	3.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	2	5	1	7	3.69	1064/1256	4.19	4.21	4.30	4.08	3.69
4. Were special techniques successful	9	12	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/ 788	4.00	3.67	4.00	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	3.93	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	3.95	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 68	***	4.75	4.49	4.54	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	***	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****
Frequ	iency	Dist	ribu	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ty	pe			Majors	

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1	В	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	25	Non-major	24
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING II

Instructor: HARDY, TIMOTHY

Enrollment: 30

Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Spring 2006

Page 491

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies

Instructor

			FT	eque	ncıe	:S		Inst	tructor	Course	е рерт	OMBC.	телет	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
Conomal															
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	3	11	4.33	749/1481	4.01	4.20	4.29	4.14	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	11	6	4.28	801/1481		4.21	4.23	4.18	4.28	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	334/1249		4.30	4.27	4.14	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	8		4.18	829/1424		4.15	4.21	4.06	4.18	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4		4.56	269/1396		3.96	3.98	3.89	4.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned		2	0	1	4	6	4	3.87	912/1342		4.06	4.07	3.88	3.87	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	6		4.67			4.30	4.16	4.17	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11			1126/1480		4.73	4.68		4.39	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	-	0	0	1	2	8	-	4.00	836/1450		4.01	4.09	3.97		
Lecture	1	0	0	0	2	2	10	4 50	670/1400	4 10	4 40	4 40	1 26	4 50	
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	-	0	-	2	3	12	4.59	670/1409		4.49	4.42	4.36	4.59	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	545/1407		4.70	4.69	4.57	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	7	8	4.29	792/1399		4.22	4.26	4.23	4.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	5	8	4.18	929/1400		4.27	4.27	4.19	4.18	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	3	2	6	5	3.81	753/1179	3.56	3.87	3.96	3.85	3.81	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	4	5	5	3.93	770/1262	3.52	3.81	4.05	3.77	3.93	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	10	4	4.20	821/1259	4.12	4.13	4.29	4.06	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	614/1256	4.24	4.21	4.30	4.08	4.47	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	1	2	6	3	0	2.92	729/ 788	2.92	3.67	4.00	3.80	2.92	
Seminar	1 17	_	0	^	0	1	_	4 00	****/ 68	****	4 75	4 40	4 54	****	
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	, 00		4.75	4.49	4.54		
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention		0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69		4.42	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 63		4.25	4.44	4.17		
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	1.00			4.42	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	3.75	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	***	****	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	***	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	***	***	
Colf Dogod															
Self Paced	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	/ EE	1 10	****	
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16				1	0	1		,		****	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****		4.75	4.42		
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 34		****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****	
Fre	quency	y Dis	strib	utio	n										
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade	s 			Rea	ason 	.s			Type			Majors			
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 3		Re	equir	ed f	or M	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	1	
28-55 3 1.00-1.99 0 B 11															
56-83 3 2.00-2.99 5 C 2		Ge	enera	1				1	Under-g	rad 1	L8	Non-	major	17	
84-150 4 3.00-3.49 3 D 0			_											_	
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 5 F 0		E	lecti	ves			0 #### - Means there are not enough								

P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 14 0

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

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Title Instructor: DAVIS, MARY B

Enrollment: 36 Questionnaires: 27 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 492

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

							Frequencies					Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	Dept UMBC Le		Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course						0	0	0	6	8	12	4.23	870/1481	4.01	4.20	4.29	4.14	4.23
		ctor make clear			1 1	0	0	0	1	7	18	4.65	336/1481	4.05	4.21	4.23	4.18	4.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals						0	0	0	2	6	18	4.62	393/1249	4.33	4.30	4.27	4.14	4.62
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals						10	0	0	4	6	6	4.13		3.85	4.15	4.21	4.06	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned						4	0	0	5	8	9		564/1396		3.96	3.98	3.89	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned						9	0	0	5	2	10		511/1342	3.83	4.06	4.07	3.88	4.29
		g system clearl			1	0	0	0	0	3	23		113/1459	4.37	4.30	4.16	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled					1	0	0	0	0	17	9		1152/1480		4.73	4.68	4.64	4.35
				hing effectiveness	8	0	0	0	3	6	10		515/1450	3.69	4.01	4.09	3.97	4.37
	1 1 1	,		J									,					
		Lectur	е															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	0	1	1	3	21	4.69	514/1409	4.18	4.49	4.42	4.36	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject					1	0	0	0	0	6	20	4.77	804/1407	4.50	4.70	4.69	4.57	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly					1	0	1	1	3	4	17	4.35	743/1399	3.97	4.22	4.26	4.23	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					1	0	0	2	1	4	19	4.54	561/1400	3.87	4.27	4.27	4.19	4.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding				2	11	0	1	3	6	4	3.93	671/1179	3.56	3.87	3.96	3.85	3.93	
	Discussion																	
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned				-	15	0	1	1	2	4			887/1262		3.81			3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate					15	0	0	0	3	4		4.17	836/1259	4.12	4.13	4.29	4.06	4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion				16	0	0	0	3	4		4.09	864/1256		4.21	4.30	4.08	4.09	
4. Were special techniques successful			17	8	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 788	2.92	3.67	4.00	3.80	****		
				Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	S			Туре				Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 11		Re	guir	ed f	or M	ajor	s	1	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	в 6			-			_						,		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	6	C 8		Ge:	nera	1				1	Under-q	rad 2	27	Non-	-major	26
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	8	D 0									5				3	-
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### - Means there a			are not enough		h
	-			P 0		_							responses to be significant					
				I O		Ot.	her				2	:3			3			
				3 0		001101					_	-						

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

3.50-4.00

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Instructor: DAVIS, MARY B

Enrollment: 40
Questionnaires: 19

Grad.

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 493 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

	Questions		Frequencies NR NA 1 2 3 4 5				5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Dept Mean Mean				Sect Mean		
1. Did you gain new i	-		0	0	0	0	1	7	11	4.53	,		4.20	4.29	4.14	4.53
2. Did the instructor	0	0	0	1	0	8	10	4.42	632/1481	4.05	4.21	4.23	4.18	4.42		
<ol><li>Did the exam quest</li></ol>	0	0	0	1	1	2	15	4.63	369/1249	4.33	4.30	4.27	4.14	4.63		
<ol> <li>Did other evaluati</li> </ol>	0	7 4	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	740/1424	3.85	4.15	4.21	4.06	4.25		
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned					0	1	1	4	9	4.40	380/1396	4.10	3.96	3.98	3.89	4.40
6. Did written assign	0	5 0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	454/1342	3.83	4.06	4.07	3.88	4.36		
7. Was the grading system clearly explained					0	0	0	4	15	4.79	175/1459	4.37	4.30	4.16	4.17	4.79
8. How many times was class cancelled					0	0	0	10	9	4.47	1065/1480	4.33	4.73	4.68	4.64	4.47
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness				0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	567/1450	3.69	4.01	4.09	3.97	4.31
Lecture																
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared					0	0	1	7	10	4.50	762/1409	4.18	4.49	4.42	4.36	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject				0	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	1019/1407	4.50	4.70	4.69	4.57	4.61
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly				0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	513/1399	3.97	4.22	4.26	4.23	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned				0	0	0	3	4	11	4.44	658/1400	3.87	4.27	4.27	4.19	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding			2	5	1	1	2	3	5	3.83	739/1179	3.56	3.87	3.96	3.85	3.83
Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned				0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	842/1262	3.52	3.81	4.05	3.77	3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate				0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	895/1259	4.12	4.13	4.29	4.06	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion				0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	826/1256		4.21	4.30	4.08	4.17
4. Were special techniques successful			13 13	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 788		3.67	4.00	3.80	****
		Frequ	onas	. Diat	-rih	ı+ i oı	2									
		rrequ	lency	DISC	LIDU	101	1									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades					Reasons						Туј	<b>p</b> e		Majors		
00-27 0	0.00-0.99	 0 A 10	Required for Majors						s	0	Graduat	 ate 0		Major		1
28-55 3	1.00-1.99	0 в 5		Required for hajors										5		
56-83 4	2.00-2.99	3 C 4		General						0 Under-grad 19			Non-major		18	
84-150 2	3.00-3.49	5 D 0									3				-	

Electives

Other

0

17

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

0

0

0

Ρ

I

Course-Section: ECON 122 0401 University of Maryland Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING II

Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Instructor: GERKIN, ELIZABE Enrollment: 48

Questionnaires: 31

JUN 13, 2006 Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

Page 494

			Fr	eque	ncie	:S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	5	3	16	3	4	2.94	1464/1481	4.01	4.20	4.29	4.14	2.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	6	5	11	6	3	2.84	1450/1481	4.05	4.21	4.23	4.18	2.84
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	2	12	6	7	3.40	1136/1249	4.33	4.30	4.27	4.14	3.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	12	4	5	4	0	5	2.83	1393/1424	3.85	4.15	4.21	4.06	2.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	4	2	7	4	6	3.26	1195/1396	4.10	3.96	3.98	3.89	3.26
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	14	4	3	5	0	4	2.81	1316/1342	3.83	4.06	4.07	3.88	2.81
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	4	3	14	1	7	3.14	1362/1459	4.37	4.30	4.16	4.17	3.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	23	5	4.10	1324/1480	4.33	4.73	4.68	4.64	4.10
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	10	5	8	2	0	2.08	1442/1450	3.69	4.01	4.09	3.97	2.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	6	6	6	8	4	2.93	1370/1409	4.18	4.49	4.42	4.36	2.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	2	3	5	11	9	3.73	1346/1407	4.50	4.70	4.69	4.57	3.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	5	9	8	6	2	2.70	1369/1399	3.97	4.22	4.26	4.23	2.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	14	4	4	4	4	2.33	1383/1400	3.87	4.27	4.27	4.19	2.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	5	5	9	5	1	2.68	1111/1179	3.56	3.87	3.96	3.85	2.68
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	4	1	0	3	1	2.56	1218/1262	3.52	3.81	4.05	3.77	2.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	2	0	2	3	0	2.86	****/1259	4.12	4.13	4.29	4.06	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	25	0	1	1	1	3	0	3.00	****/1256	4.24	4.21	4.30	4.08	****
4. Were special techniques successful	25	5	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 788	2.92	3.67	4.00	3.80	****

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	2	 А	12	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	6	C	7	General	1	Under-grad	31	Non-major	29
84-150	13	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	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	25	_			
				?	4						

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

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 14

GERKIN, ELIZABE

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 495

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies						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	0	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	896/1481	4.21	4.20	4.29	4.29	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	4	5	3	3.92	1106/1481	3.92	4.21	4.23	4.23	3.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	5	4.14	824/1249	4.14	4.30	4.27	4.28	4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	706/1424	4.29	4.15	4.21	4.27	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	395/1396	4.38	3.96	3.98	4.00	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	251/1342	4.58	4.06	4.07	4.12	4.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	1	4	6	3.93	1030/1459	3.93	4.30	4.16	4.17	3.93
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	561/1480	4.93	4.73	4.68	4.65	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	2	7	1	3.90	973/1450	3.90	4.01	4.09	4.10	3.90
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	6	3	4 00	1152/1409	4.00	4.49	4.42	4.43	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	3	7		1076/1407	4.55	4.70	4.69	4.67	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	4	5	3		1086/1399	3.92	4.22	4.26	4.27	3.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	2	5	3		1145/1400	3.75	4.27	4.27	4.28	3.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	705/1179	3.89	3.87	3.96	4.02	3.89
Discussion														
	7	0	1	0	2	1	2	2 71	007/1060	3.71	3.81	4.05	4.14	2 71
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	J	5	3.71	907/1262 402/1259					3.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.71	658/1256	4.71 4.43	4.13	4.29	4.34	4.71 4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	1	1		4	4.43	335/ 788	4.43	3.67	4.30	4.34	4.43
4. Were special techniques successiul	/	Τ.	U	Т	Т	U	4	4.1/	333/ 188	4.1/	3.0/	4.00	4.07	+.⊥/
Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	n									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	С	1	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	13
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	9	-			
				2	0						

Course-Section: ECON 302 0101 University of Maryland Title INTERMED ACCOUNTING II Baltimore County CROTEAU, MARCIA

Spring 2006

Instructor:

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 22

Ctudent	Course	Fraluation	Ouestionnaire

Page 496

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncie	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	10	9	4.27	818/1481	4.27	4.20	4.29	4.29	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	13	4.50	517/1481	4.50	4.21	4.23	4.23	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	7	13	4.45	561/1249	4.45	4.30	4.27	4.28	4.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	9	11	4.36	607/1424	4.36	4.15	4.21	4.27	4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	285/1396	4.53	3.96	3.98	4.00	4.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	2	7	9	4.15	638/1342	4.15	4.06	4.07	4.12	4.15
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	2	17	4.64	310/1459	4.64	4.30	4.16	4.17	4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	351/1480	4.95	4.73	4.68	4.65	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	3	8	5	4.00	836/1450	4.00	4.01	4.09	4.10	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	6	14	4.55	716/1409	4.55	4.49	4.42	4.43	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	705/1407	4.82	4.70	4.69	4.67	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	5	13	4.36	723/1399	4.36	4.22	4.26	4.27	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	6	13	4.45	647/1400	4.45	4.27	4.27	4.28	4.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	291/1179	4.47	3.87	3.96	4.02	4.47
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	666/1262	4.11	3.81	4.05	4.14	4.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	729/1259	4.33	4.13	4.29	4.34	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	992/1256	3.89	4.21	4.30	4.34	3.89
4. Were special techniques successful	13	5	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/ 788	****	3.67	4.00	4.07	****

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA	A	Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	9	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	В	9						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	22	Non-major	21
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	11	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	20	-			
				?	0						

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

Instructor: BRADLEY, MICHAE Spring 2006

Ρ

I

0

0

1

Enrollment: 33

Questionnaires: 15 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

					Frequencies								ructor	Course	_		Level	
		Questions	}		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1 Did voi	u dain ne	w insights,skil		om this course	0	0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	678/1481	4.27	4.20	4.29	4.29	4.40
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	481/1481	4.38	4.21	4.23	4.23	4.53
		estions reflect		_	0	0	0	0	4	3	8	4.27	734/1249	4.32	4.30	4.27	4.28	4.27
	_	ations reflect			0	9	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	645/1424	4.20	4.15	4.21	4.27	4.33
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	5	6	4.13	613/1396	4.23	3.96	3.98	4.00	4.13
				to what you learned	0	8	1	0	1	3	2	3.71	1011/1342	3.97	4.06	4.07	4.12	3.71
		system clearly		-	0	0	0	0	3	5	7		766/1459	4.38	4.30	4.16	4.17	4.27
8. How man	ny times	was class cance	lled		0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.73	4.68	4.65	5.00
				ching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	515/1450	4.17	4.01	4.09	4.10	4.36
		Lecture	-															
		ctor's lectures			0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	450/1409	4.76	4.49	4.42	4.43	4.73
		tor seem intere		-	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	591/1407	4.82	4.70	4.69	4.67	4.87
				explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	6	6	4.13	938/1399	4.21	4.22	4.26	4.27	4.13
		s contribute to		-	0	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	561/1400	4.43	4.27	4.27	4.28	4.53
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques enh	ance y	your understanding	2	7	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	590/1179	3.89	3.87	3.96	4.02	4.00
		Discuss																
1 Did ala				what you learned	8	0	0	0	4	2	1	3.57	969/1262	3.73	3.81	4.05	4.14	3.57
				ed to participate	0	0	1	0	1	2	3		1002/1259	4.08	4.13	4.05		3.86
				nd open discussion	8	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	754/1256	4.28	4.13	4.30		4.29
		chniques succes		id Open discussion	8	3	0	1	0	2		3.75	533/ 788		3.67	4.00		3.75
T. WELE B	peciai ce	ciniiques succes	blui		O	J	U		U	2		3.75	3337 700	3.02	3.07	4.00	1.07	3.73
				Freq	ıency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors						s	0	Graduat	9	0	Majo	r	3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	В 5														
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C 4	General							0	Under-g	rad 1	.5	Non-	major	12
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives							0	#### - 1	Means t	here a		enoug	jh

Other

14

Page 497

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

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

Instructor: BRADLEY, MICHAE Spring 2006

Enrollment: 35 Questionnaires: 18

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 498

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies						Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	9	7	4.35	729/1481	4.27	4.20	4.29	4.29	4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	8	7	4.29	779/1481	4.38	4.21	4.23	4.23	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	10	6	4.29	710/1249	4.32	4.30	4.27	4.28	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	12	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	557/1424	4.20	4.15	4.21	4.27	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	4	9	4.29	467/1396	4.23	3.96	3.98	4.00	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1 2	11	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	592/1342	3.97	4.06	4.07	4.12	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	671/1459	4.38	4.30	4.16	4.17	4.35
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.73	4.68	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5 5	0	0	0	1	9	3	4.15	732/1450	4.17	4.01	4.09	4.10	4.15
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	400/1409	4.76	4.49	4.42	4.43	4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	682/1407	4.82	4.70	4.69	4.67	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	4	9	4.29	792/1399	4.21	4.22	4.26	4.27	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	511/1400	4.43	4.27	4.27	4.28	4.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	12	1	1	0	0	3	3.60	860/1179	3.89	3.87	3.96	4.02	3.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	0	1	3	4	3.70	913/1262	3.73	3.81	4.05	4.14	3.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	2	1	6	4.10	867/1259	4.08	4.13	4.29	4.34	4.10
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	860/1256	4.28	4.21	4.30	4.34	4.10
4. Were special techniques successful	8	7	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 788	3.82	3.67	4.00	4.07	****
Fred	quency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades	3			Rea	ason	s			Tvi	ne.			Maiors	<b>.</b>

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	С	2	General	4	Under-grad	18	Non-major	13
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11	-			
				2	1						

Course-Section: ECON 311 0301

INTERM MICROECON ANALY

Title Instructor: LORD, WILLIAM

Enrollment: 79 Questionnaires: 35

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland Page 499 Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006 Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncie	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
~~~~~														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	8	11	14	4.06	1037/1481	4.27	4.20	4.29	4.29	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	15	16	4.31	758/1481	4.38	4.21	4.23	4.23	4.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	11	20	4.40	624/1249	4.32	4.30	4.27	4.28	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	19	1	1	3	5	6	3.88	1108/1424	4.20	4.15	4.21	4.27	3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	1	5	8	14	4.25	502/1396	4.23	3.96	3.98	4.00	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	24	1	0	2	1	5	4.00	755/1342	3.97	4.06	4.07	4.12	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	11	21	4.53	436/1459	4.38	4.30	4.16	4.17	4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	34	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.73	4.68	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	2	0	0	6	13	6	4.00	836/1450	4.17	4.01	4.09	4.10	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	3	27	4.78	367/1409	4.76	4.49	4.42	4.43	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	5	26	4.78	766/1407	4.82	4.70	4.69	4.67	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	2	7	5	17	4.19	883/1399	4.21	4.22	4.26	4.27	4.19
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	5	0	8	18	4.16	945/1400	4.43	4.27	4.27	4.28	4.16
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	3	0	4	8	15	4.07	570/1179	3.89	3.87	3.96	4.02	4.07
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	2	4	3	12	3.91	788/1262	3.73	3.81	4.05	4.14	3.91
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	4	0	5	15	4.29	757/1259	4.08	4.13	4.29	4.34	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	2	2	3	17	4.46	625/1256	4.28	4.21	4.30	4.34	4.46
4. Were special techniques successful	11	15	1	1	1	1	5	3.89	492/ 788	3.82	3.67	4.00	4.07	3.89
- ,														
Laboratory		_					_							****
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	32	1	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 246	****	****	4.20	4.20	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	33	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	33	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.36	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	33	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 240	****	****	4.20	3.96	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	33	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.04	4.11	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	1	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 68	****	4.75	4.49	4.70	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	33	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 69	****	4.42	4.53	4.66	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	33	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 63	****	4.25	4.44	4.56	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	33	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.42	4.35	4.48	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	33	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 68	****	3.75	3.92	4.43	****
J. Were criteria for grading made crear	55	1	U	U	U	U	_	3.00	, 00		3.73	3.72	1.13	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	33	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.48	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	33	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	33	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.33	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	33	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 41	****	****	4.26	3.90	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	33	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.00	****
The same and the s		-	-	-	-	ŭ	_		, 31					
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.88	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	33	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	33	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.88	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	33	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	33	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.67	****

Course-Section: ECON 311 0301

Title INTERM MICROECON ANALY

Instructor: LORD, WILLIAM

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 35

79

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2006

Frequency Distribution

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	7
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	16						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	6	C	7	General	1	Under-grad	34	Non-major	28
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	12	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	e are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	ignificant	
				I	0	Other	31				
				?	2						

Page 499 JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

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

INTERM MACROECON ANALY Baltimore County CINYABUGUMA, MA Spring 2006

D

Ρ

I

?

0

0

0

Instructor: CINY Enrollment: 35 Questionnaires: 23

84-150

Grad.

4

0

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 500 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

	Ouestions			.	377	Fre		ncies	5	-		ructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
	Question	ıs		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	Genera	1															
1. Did you gain	new insights, ski	-	om this course	0	0	0	0	3	7	13	4.43	639/1481	3.97	4.20	4.29	4.29	4.43
	cuctor make clear			0	0	0	2	1	2	18	4.57	446/1481	4.04	4.21	4.23	4.23	4.57
3. Did the exam	questions reflec	t the	expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	219/1249	4.18	4.30	4.27	4.28	4.78
4. Did other eva	luations reflect	the ex	xpected goals	0	3	0	2	2	5	11	4.25	740/1424	4.05	4.15	4.21	4.27	4.25
5. Did assigned	readings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	2	0	1	5	3	12	4.24	519/1396	3.63	3.96	3.98	4.00	4.24
6. Did written a	assignments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	1	2	0	2	3	6	9	4.10	695/1342	4.17	4.06	4.07	4.12	4.10
7. Was the grad:	ng system clearl	y expla	ained	0	0	1	0	1	4	17	4.57	390/1459	4.13	4.30	4.16	4.17	4.57
8. How many time	es was class cand	elled		2	0	0	0	1	0	20	4.90	702/1480	4.84	4.73	4.68	4.65	4.90
9. How would you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	4	1	0	1	6	5	6	3.89	989/1450	3.79	4.01	4.09	4.10	3.89
	Lectur																
	ructor's lecture			2	0	0	2	2	3	14	4.38	913/1409	4.27	4.49	4.42	4.43	4.38
	ructor seem inter		_	1	0	0	1	1	5	15		1076/1407	4.54	4.70	4.69	4.67	4.55
	_		explained clearly	2	0	1	2	1	6	11	4.14		4.05	4.22	4.26	4.27	4.14
	res contribute t		-	1	0	1	0	2	3	16	4.50	591/1400		4.27	4.27		4.50
5. Did audiovisu	ual techniques er	hance y	your understanding	1	11	3	0	2	2	4	3.36	960/1179	3.90	3.87	3.96	4.02	3.36
	Discus					_			_	_		505/4060					
			what you learned	13	0	Τ	0	1	Τ	./	4.30	537/1262	3.63	3.81	4.05	4.14	
			ed to participate	12	0	0	2	1	2	6	4.09	869/1259	3.98	4.13	4.29	4.34	4.09
			nd open discussion	12	0	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	984/1256	3.97	4.21	4.30	4.34	3.91
4. Were special	techniques succe	essiul		13	4	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	394/ 788	4.00	3.67	4.00	4.07	4.00
			P			1											
			Frequ	lency	DIS	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	<u>.</u>	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	oe			Majors	l
													- 				
00-27 0	0.00-0.99	0	A 11		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	s	2	Graduate	е	0	Majo	r	1
28-55 3	1.00-1.99	1	в 7														
56-83 5	2.00-2.99	5	C 1	General				2	Under-g	rad 2	23	Non-	major	22			

Electives

16

Other

Course-Section: ECON 312 0201 University of Maryland Title INTERM MACROECON ANALY

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 501

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: THOMAS, MARK S Enrollment: 44

Questionnaires: 29

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	Ο	Ο	3	10	10	5	3 61	1324/1481	3.97	4.20	4.29	4.29	3.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	5	8	6	7		1365/1481	4.04	4.21	4.23	4.23	3.39
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	6	10	7	4		1163/1249	4.18	4.30	4.27	4.28	3.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	20	1	2	1	2	2		1333/1424		4.15	4.21	4.27	3.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	16	4	1	4	2	1		1360/1396	3.63	3.96	3.98	4.00	2.58
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	22	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	****/1342	4.17	4.06	4.07	4.12	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	5	6	8	6		1297/1459	4.13	4.30	4.16	4.17	3.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	27	4.96	281/1480	4.84	4.73	4.68	4.65	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	2	11	10	2	3.38	1272/1450	3.79	4.01	4.09	4.10	3.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	6	15	5	3.82	1234/1409	4.27	4.49	4.42	4.43	3.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	7	9	12	4.18	1281/1407	4.54	4.70	4.69	4.67	4.18
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	7	5	9	7	3.57	1223/1399	4.05	4.22	4.26	4.27	3.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	2	6	9	8	3.61	1204/1400	4.12	4.27	4.27	4.28	3.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	2	5	7	9	4.00	590/1179	3.90	3.87	3.96	4.02	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	1	6	2	2	3.25	1081/1262		3.81	4.05	4.14	3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17 17	0	0	0	5	4	3		1012/1259	3.98	4.13	4.29	4.34	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion			0	0	7	3	2		1088/1256	3.97	4.21	4.30	4.34	3.58
4. Were special techniques successful	17	8	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	****/ 788	4.00	3.67	4.00	4.07	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	11						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	5	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	29	Non-major	28
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	24	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 312 0301 University of Maryland Title INTERM MACROECON ANALY

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 502

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	42		
Questionnaires:	22	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	ionnaire

Instructor: THOMAS, MARK S

	Ouestions), TD	377		_	ncies	5	_		ructor	Course	_					
			Question	S 		NR	NA		2	3	4 	5 	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
			Genera	1															
1. Di	id you	gain ne	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	1	1	7	7	6	3.73	1271/1481	3.97	4.20	4.29	4.29	3.73
2. Di	id the	instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	1	9	6	6	3.77	1194/1481	4.04	4.21	4.23	4.23	3.77
3. Di	id the	exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	2	0	0	1	6	6	7	3.95	936/1249	4.18	4.30	4.27	4.28	3.95
4. Di	id oth	er evalı	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	11	0	0	2	6	2	4.00	959/1424	4.05	4.15	4.21	4.27	4.00
5. Di	id ass	igned re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	9	0	4	1	3	4	3.58	1036/1396	3.63	3.96	3.98	4.00	3.58
6. Di	id wri	tten as:	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	. 1	13	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	755/1342	4.17	4.06	4.07	4.12	4.00
7. Wa	as the	grading	g system clearly	y expla	ined	1	0	1	1	6	6	7	3.81	1125/1459	4.13	4.30	4.16	4.17	3.81
8. Ho	ow man	y times	was class canc	elled		2	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	421/1480	4.84	4.73	4.68	4.65	4.95
9. Ho	ow wou	ld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	7	0	0	1	5	5	4	3.80	1055/1450	3.79	4.01	4.09	4.10	3.80
			T	_															
1 1.7.	+b		Lectur uctor's lecture	_		3	0	0	2	4	4	9	4 05	1137/1409	4 07	4 40	4 40	4.43	4.05
			ctor's lecture			3	0	0	2 0	4	_	-		1137/1409		4.49	4.42	4.43	4.05
				xplained clearly	3	0	0	2	4	0			1002/1399		4.70	4.09	4.07	4.47	
				3	0	2	1	0	9	7		1002/1399			4.27	4.27	3.95		
			es contribute t		our understanding	3	-	0	1	4	5			661/1179		3.87		4.20	
נע .כ	iu auu	IOVISUa.	i teciniques en	nance y	our understanding	3	4	U	Т	4	5	5	3.93	001/11/9	3.90	3.07	3.90	4.02	3.93
			Discus	sion															
1. Di	id cla	ss disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	11	0	0	2	3	5	1	3.45	1014/1262	3.63	3.81	4.05	4.14	3.45
2. ₩∈	ere al	l stude	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	11	0	2	0	4	4	1	3.18	1150/1259	3.98	4.13	4.29	4.34	3.18
3. Di	id the	instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	11	0	0	2	3	2	4	3.73	1052/1256	3.97	4.21	4.30	4.34	3.73
4. W∈	ere sp	ecial to	echniques succe	ssful		11	8	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 788	4.00	3.67	4.00	4.07	****
					Frec	uency	/ Dis	trib	atio	n									
					•														
Credi	its Ea	rned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	5
00-2	 27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	 3	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r)r	2
28-5	55	1	1.00-1.99	0	в 7			-			_								
56-8	83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C 7		Ge:	nera	l				1	Under-g	rad 2	2	Non-	major	20
84-1	150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D 0													-	
Grad	d.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 1			1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh				
					P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
					I 0		Ot:	her				1	6	_					
					? 0														

Course-Section: ECON 312 0401

Title INTERM MACROECON ANALY

Instructor: ANORUO, EMMANUE

Enrollment: 37
Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 503 JUN 13, 2006 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	Mear
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	10	5	4.11	996/1481	3.97	4.20	4.29	4.29	4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	603/1481	4.04	4.21	4.23	4.23	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	270/1249	4.18	4.30	4.27	4.28	4.72
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	248/1424	4.05	4.15	4.21	4.27	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	1	1	4	8	4.13	613/1396	3.63	3.96	3.98	4.00	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	394/1342	4.17	4.06	4.07	4.12	4.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	217/1459	4.13	4.30	4.16	4.17	4.72
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	10	4.56	1020/1480	4.84	4.73	4.68	4.65	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	2	0	0	3	8	4	4.07	803/1450	3.79	4.01	4.09	4.10	4.07
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	290/1409	4.27	4.49	4.42	4.43	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	300/1407	4.54	4.70	4.69	4.67	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	567/1399	4.05	4.22	4.26	4.27	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	658/1400	4.12	4.27	4.27	4.28	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	3	6	8	4.29	411/1179	3.90	3.87	3.96	4.02	4.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	995/1262	3.63	3.81	4.05	4.14	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	276/1259	3.98	4.13	4.29	4.34	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	457/1256	3.97	4.21	4.30	4.34	4.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	4.20	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	4.23	****
Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades			Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	i	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 11		Red	 quire	ed fo	 or M	ajor	 `s	1	Graduat	 e	0	 Majo		4

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	11	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	14
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	0						

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

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Instructor: PALMATEER, JASO

Enrollment: 77
Questionnaires: 46

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 504 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

								_	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
		Questio	ns			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mear
		Gener	 al																
1. Did yo	ou gain n	ew insights,sk	ills fro	om this co	urse	1	0	0	0	8	18	19	4.24	857/1481	4.24	4.20	4.29	4.29	4.24
		ctor make clea				1	0	0	3	5	14	23	4.27	811/1481	4.27	4.21	4.23	4.23	4.27
3. Did th	ne exam q	uestions refle	ct the e	expected g	oals	2	0	1	1	8	11	23	4.23	765/1249	4.23	4.30	4.27	4.28	4.23
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflec	t the ex	spected go	als	1	5	0	3	6	16	15	4.07	923/1424	4.07	4.15	4.21	4.27	4.07
5. Did as	ssigned re	eadings contri	bute to	what you	learned	1	20	3	4	3	7	8	3.52	1071/1396	3.52	3.96	3.98	4.00	3.52
6. Did wr	ritten as:	signments cont	ribute t	o what yo	u learned	1	10	0	2	7	10	16	4.14	649/1342	4.14	4.06	4.07	4.12	4.14
7. Was th	ne gradin	g system clear	ly expla	ained		1	0	2	2	3	9	29	4.36	671/1459	4.36	4.30	4.16	4.17	4.36
8. How ma	any times	was class can	celled			1	0	0	0	0	31	14	4.31	1171/1480	4.31	4.73	4.68	4.65	4.31
9. How wo	ould you	grade the over	all tead	ching effe	ctiveness	8	1	0	1	13	13	10	3.86	1005/1450	3.86	4.01	4.09	4.10	3.86
		Lectu	re																
1 Were +	he instr	uctor's lectur		prepared		3	0	0	0	4	7	32	4.65	574/1409	4.65	4.49	4.42	4.43	4.65
		ctor seem inte			iect	2	0	1	0	3	13	27		1130/1407	4.48	4.70	4.69	4.67	4.48
					_	4	0	0	2	6	8	26	4.38	703/1399		4.22	4.26	4.27	4.38
		e material presented and explained clearly stures contribute to what you learned					0	1	2	7	8	26	4.27			4.27	4.27	4.28	4.27
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandir						0	0	1	8	15	19	4.21			3.87		4.02	
J. Dia au	actovibac	r ccciniiques e	imanee j	your under	Beariaring	3	O	O	_	O	13	1)	1.21	100/11/5	1.21	3.07	3.50	1.02	1.21
		Discu																	
		ussions contri		-		25	0	0	2	6	6	7	3.86	829/1262		3.81	4.05	4.14	3.86
		nts actively e	_	_	-	25	0	3	2	4	5	7	3.52	1091/1259	3.52	4.13	4.29	4.34	3.52
		ctor encourage		nd open di	scussion	25	0	0	3	5	5			1004/1256		4.21	4.30	4.34	3.86
4. Were s	special to	echniques succ	essful			25	4	0	2	3	5	7	4.00	394/ 788	4.00	3.67	4.00	4.07	4.00
					Freq	uency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GP.	A	Expect	ed Grades				Re	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	5
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	20		Re	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	S	1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	6
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	17				_						_				
56-83	12	2.00-2.99	13	С	6		Ge	nera	1				3	Under-g	rad 4	:6	Non-	major	40
84-150	17	3.00-3.49	13	D	0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives 1		1	#### - 1				_	gh					
				P	0				respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt						
				I	0		Ot]	her				3	88						
				?	0														

Course-Section: ECON 374 0101 University of Maryland Title FUND FINANCIAL MGMT

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Instructor: ANORUO, EMMANUE

Enrollment: 63 Questionnaires: 30

Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire
beadene	Course	Evaluacion	Quescionnaire

Page 505

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	2	3	13	10	4.11	1006/1481	4.11	4.20	4.29	4.29	4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	11	15	4.46	574/1481	4.46	4.21	4.23	4.23	4.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	5	21	4.68	322/1249	4.68	4.30	4.27	4.28	4.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	4	0	0	4	9	11	4.29	695/1424	4.29	4.15	4.21	4.27	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	0	0	7	8	9	4.08	655/1396	4.08	3.96	3.98	4.00	4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	12	0	2	0	5	9	4.31	494/1342	4.31	4.06	4.07	4.12	4.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	0	6	21	4.68	264/1459	4.68	4.30	4.16	4.17	4.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	7	21	4.75	880/1480	4.75	4.73	4.68	4.65	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	2	0	0	6	10	7	4.04	814/1450	4.04	4.01	4.09	4.10	4.04
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	2	2.4	4.79	367/1409	4.79	4.49	4.42	4.43	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	5	21	4.68	952/1407	4.68	4.70	4.69	4.67	4.68
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	7	19	4.61	459/1399	4.61	4.22	4.26	4.27	4.61
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	2	0	10	15	4.41	704/1400	4.41	4.27	4.27	4.28	4.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	2	3	5	14	4.29	411/1179	4.29	3.87	3.96	4.02	4.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	2	2	4	6	3.80	862/1262	3.80	3.81	4.05	4.14	3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	0	2	4	8	4.20	821/1259	4.20	4.13	4.29	4.34	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	680/1256	4.40	4.21	4.30	4.34	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	15	9	2	0	2	0	2	3.00	****/ 788	****	3.67	4.00	4.07	****

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	5	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	29	Non-major	26
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	12	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	25	_			
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 382 0101 University of Maryland Title ASIAN ECONOMIC HIST MITCH, DAVID F

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Instructor:

Enrollment: 45 Questionnaires: 24

Page 506 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

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	0	0	2	10	12	4.42	665/1481	4.42	4.20	4.29	4.29	4.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	9	10	4.17	909/1481	4.17	4.21	4.23	4.23	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	5	15	4.42	611/1249	4.42	4.30	4.27	4.28	4.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	2	9	9	4.24	762/1424	4.24	4.15	4.21	4.27	4.24
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	6	7	9	3.92	791/1396	3.92	3.96	3.98	4.00	3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	12	6	4.00	755/1342	4.00	4.06	4.07	4.12	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	5	5	14	4.38	647/1459	4.38	4.30	4.16	4.17	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	631/1480	4.91	4.73	4.68	4.65	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	1	2	10	5	4.06	808/1450	4.06	4.01	4.09	4.10	4.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	6	14	4.48	800/1409	4.48	4.49	4.42	4.43	4.48
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	682/1407	4.83	4.70	4.69	4.67	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	4	10	8	4.04	987/1399	4.04	4.22	4.26	4.27	4.04
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	8	13	4.48	624/1400	4.48	4.27	4.27	4.28	4.48
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	5	5	10	4.25	442/1179	4.25	3.87	3.96	4.02	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	2	2	5	7	4.06	687/1262	4.06	3.81	4.05	4.14	4.06
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	2	5	8	4.25	783/1259	4.25	4.13	4.29	4.34	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	4	4	8	4.25	773/1256	4.25	4.21	4.30	4.34	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	9	6	2	0	4	2	1	3.00	713/ 788	3.00	3.67	4.00	4.07	3.00

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	В	11						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	8	Under-grad	24	Non-major	8
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ECON 387 0101

Title ECON DEVEL LATIN AMER

Instructor: GINDLING, THOMA

Enrollment:

38 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 507 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncie	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	6	13	4.39	688/1481	4.39	4.20	4.29	4.29	4.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	9	11	4.30	769/1481	4.30	4.21	4.23	4.23	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	17	4.61	405/1249	4.61	4.30	4.27	4.28	4.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	2	7	11	4.45	509/1424	4.45	4.15	4.21	4.27	4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	5	7	7	3.61	1025/1396	3.61	3.96	3.98	4.00	3.61
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	13	7	4.13	660/1342	4.13	4.06	4.07	4.12	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	5	14	4.43	565/1459	4.43	4.30	4.16	4.17	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13	10	4.43	1093/1480	4.43	4.73	4.68	4.65	4.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	1	1	10	8	4.25	630/1450	4.25	4.01	4.09	4.10	4.25
. 3														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	21	4.87	246/1409	4.87	4.49	4.42	4.43	4.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	1	21	4.83	682/1407	4.83	4.70	4.69	4.67	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	6	14	4.48	601/1399	4.48		4.26	4.27	4.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	17	4.74	336/1400	4.74	4.27	4.27	4.28	4.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1		1	0	1	0			****/1179	****		3.96	4.02	****
5. 21d ddd15.12dd1 555m114d55 5manoc 75d1 dhae125dhaing	_		_	Ū	_	ŭ		3.00	,,		3.07	3.70	1.02	
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	1	4	3	5	3.71	907/1262	3.71	3.81	4.05	4.14	3.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	809/1259	4.21	4.13	4.29	4.34	4.21
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	0	5		4.43	658/1256	4.43		4.30	4.34	4.43
4. Were special techniques successful	9	11	0	1	0	0	2		****/ 788	****	3.67	4.00	4.07	****
1. Were special commiques successful			Ü	_	Ü	Ü	_	1.00	, , , , ,		3.07	1.00	1.07	
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	4.23	****
2. Here for provided with adequate background information		ŭ	Ů	ŭ	Ü	ŭ	_	5.00	, 210				1.25	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.75	4.49	4.70	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 69	****	4.42	4.53	4.66	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 63	****	4.25	4.44	4.56	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	2	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 68	****	3.75	3.92	4.43	****
J. Were criteria for grading made crear	20	2	U	O	U	U	_	3.00	, 00		3.73	3.72	1.15	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.48	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.33	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	3.90	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out freid activities	21	_	U	U	Т	U	U	3.00	/ 31			4.42	4.00	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.88	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.88	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.75	4.88	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.88	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	1	0	1	0	0	U T		****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	Z T	Т	U	Т	U	U	U	∠.00	/ 24			4.02	4.0/	

Course-Section: ECON 387 0101

Title ECON DEVEL LATIN AMER

Instructor: GINDLING, THOMA

Enrollment: 38
Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 507 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	 А	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	11						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C	1	General	6	Under-grad	23	Non-major	16
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 405 0101 University of Maryland Title BENEFIT-COST EVALUATIO

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 508

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: FARROW, SCOTT

Enrollment: 44 Questionnaires: 33

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	-						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	1	0	0	3	7	13	9	3.88	1180/1481	3.88	4.20	4.29	4.45	3.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	12	11	6		1275/1481		4.21	4.23	4.32	3.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	10	14	6	3.81	1022/1249	3.81	4.30	4.27	4.44	3.81
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	12	15	4.28	706/1424	4.28	4.15	4.21	4.35	4.28
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	3	15	10	3.94	772/1396	3.94	3.96	3.98	4.09	3.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learne	1 2	0	0	1	7	11	12	4.10	701/1342	4.10	4.06	4.07	4.21	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	7	6	17	4.19	836/1459	4.19	4.30	4.16	4.25	4.19
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	31	4.97	281/1480	4.97	4.73	4.68	4.74	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivenes	8 8	0	0	0	8	8	9	4.04	814/1450	4.04	4.01	4.09	4.28	4.04
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	3	9	17	4.40	891/1409	4.40	4.49	4.42	4.51	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	1	3	25	4.73	861/1407		4.70	4.69	4.79	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	9	10	10		1039/1399		4.22	4.26	4.36	3.97
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	6	10	12		1017/1400		4.27	4.27	4.38	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	5	1	2	7	10	4	3.58			3.87	3.96	4.07	3.58
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	4	7	3	3.73	897/1262	3.73	3.81	4.05	4.33	3.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	777/1259		4.13	4.29	4.57	4.27
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	614/1256		4.21	4.30	4.60	4.47
4. Were special techniques successful	18	1	0	0	5	4	5	4.00	394/ 788		3.67	4.00	4.26	
Fro	quency	. Dia	+ rib	t i o	'n									
FIE	<u>a</u> uency	DIS	CIID	ucio)11									

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GP	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	4	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	14						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	7	C	5	General	8	Under-grad	29	Non-major	23
84-150	17	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	17	_			
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 408 0101 University of Maryland Title MANAGERIAL ECONOMICS Baltimore County Instructor: DASGUPTA, NANDI Spring 2006

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 21

47

University of Maryland Page 509
Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006
Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 1 0 0 1 2 12 5 4.05 1037/1481 4.05 4.20 4.29 4.45 4.02 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 5 5 11 4.29 79/1481 4.29 4.21 4.23 4.32 4.24 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 1 2 17 4.67 334/1249 4.67 4.30 4.27 4.44 4.64 5. Did ossigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 3 1 4 5 7 3.60 1025/1396 3.60 3.96 3.98 4.09 3.66 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 4 0 1 1 1 1 4 4.14 649/1342 4.14 4.06 4.07 4.21 4.17 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 2 0 5 14 4.48 505/1459 4.48 4.30 4.16 4.25 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 5 3 8 4.19 702/1450 4.19 4.01 4.09 4.28 4.19 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 0 5 3 8 4.19 702/1450 4.19 4.01 4.09 4.28 4.11 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 0 2 6 12 4.50 762/1409 4.50 4.49 4.42 4.51 4.52 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 1 3 3 16 4.75 823/1407 4.75 4.70 4.69 4.79 4.73 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 13 0 2 1 0 3 3.67 840/1179 3.67 3.87 3.96 4.07 3.68 Discussion Discussion Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors Frequency Distribution							Frequencies				s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 1 0 0 1 1 2 12 5 4.05 1037/1481 4.05 4.20 4.29 4.45 4.02 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 5 5 11 4.29 790/1481 4.29 4.21 4.23 4.32 4.23 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 1 1 2 17 4.67 334/1249 4.67 4.30 4.27 4.44 4.64 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.1			Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 5 5 5 11 4.29 790/1481 4.29 4.21 4.23 4.32 4.24 4.25 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 15 0 0 2 1 3 4.67 334/1249 4.67 4.30 4.27 4.44 4.6 5. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 15 0 0 2 1 3 4.17 840/1424 4.17 4.15 4.21 4.35 4.1 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 3 1 4 5 7 3.60 1025/1396 3.60 3.96 3.98 4.09 3.6 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 4 0 1 1 1 4 4.14 649/1342 4.14 4.06 4.07 4.21 4.35 4.1 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 2 0 5 14 4.48 505/1459 4.48 4.30 4.16 4.25 4.4 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 0 5 3 8 4.19 702/1450 4.19 4.01 4.09 4.25 4.4 8. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 5 3 8 4.19 702/1450 4.19 4.01 4.09 4.28 4.1 8. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 5 3 8 4.19 702/1450 4.19 4.01 4.09 4.28 4.1 8. Was the grading system clearly repeated 1 0 0 0 0 2 6 12 4.50 762/1409 4.50 4.49 4.42 4.51 4.5 4.5 1.2			 Genera	.1															
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 1 1 2 17 4.67 334/1249 4.67 4.30 4.27 4.44 4.6 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 15 0 0 2 1 3 4.17 840/1424 4.17 4.15 4.21 4.35 4.1 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 3 1 4 5 7 3.60 1025/1396 3.60 3.96 4.09 3.6 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 14 0 1 1 1 1 4 4.14 649/1342 4.14 4.06 4.07 4.21 4.1 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 2 0 5 14 4.48 505/1459 4.48 4.30 4.16 4.25 4.4 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 0 6 14 4.70 928/1480 4.70 4.73 4.68 4.74 4.7 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 0 5 3 8 4.19 702/1450 4.19 4.01 4.09 4.28 4.1 Lecture	1. Did you	u gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	1	0	0	1	2	12	5	4.05	1037/1481	4.05	4.20	4.29	4.45	4.05
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 15 0 0 2 1 3 4.17 840/1424 4.17 4.15 4.21 4.35 4.1 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 3 1 4 5 7 3.60 1025/1396 3.60 3.98 3.98 4.09 3.7 4.21 4.15 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 3 1 4 5 7 3.60 1025/1396 3.60 3.98 4.09 3.98 4.09 3.7 4.17 840/1424 4.17 4.15 4.21 4.35 4.1 5. Did assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 1 1 1 4 4.14 649/1342 4.14 4.06 4.07 4.21 4.1 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 2 0 5 14 4.48 505/1459 4.48 4.30 4.16 4.25 4.4 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 0 6 14 4.70 9.28/1480 4.70 4.73 4.68 4.74 4.7 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 0 5 3 8 4.19 702/1450 4.19 4.01 4.09 4.28 4.1 8. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 0 5 3 8 4.19 702/1450 4.19 4.01 4.09 4.28 4.1 8. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 0 5 3 8 4.19 702/1450 4.19 4.01 4.09 4.28 4.1 8. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 0 5 3 8 4.19 702/1450 4.19 4.01 4.09 4.28 4.1 8. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 0 5 3 8 8 4.19 702/1450 4.19 4.01 4.09 4.28 4.1 8. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 0 5 3 8 8 4.19 702/1450 4.19 4.01 4.09 4.28 4.1 8. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 0 1 3 3 16 4.75 823/1407 4.75 4.70 4.69 4.79 4.7 4.3 8.4 1.1 8. 1	2. Did the	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	5	5	11	4.29	790/1481	4.29	4.21	4.23	4.32	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 3 1 4 5 7 3.60 1025/1396 3.60 3.96 3.98 4.09 3.6 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 14 0 1 1 1 4 4.14 649/1342 4.14 4.06 4.07 4.21 4.18 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 6 14 4.70 928/1480 4.70 4.73 4.68 4.74 4.79 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 0 5 3 8 4.19 702/1450 4.19 4.01 4.09 4.28 4.1	3. Did the	e exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	17	4.67	334/1249	4.67	4.30	4.27	4.44	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 14 0 1 1 1 4 4.14 649/1342 4.14 4.06 4.07 4.21 4.1 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 2 0 5 14 4.48 505/1459 4.48 4.30 4.16 4.25 4.4 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 6 14 4.70 928/1480 4.70 4.73 4.68 4.74 4.79 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 0 5 3 8 4.19 702/1450 4.19 4.01 4.09 4.28 4.1 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 0 2 6 12 4.50 762/1409 4.50 4.49 4.42 4.51 4.5 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 1 3 16 4.75 823/1407 4.75 4.70 4.69 4.79 4.7 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 2 2 4 12 4.30 829/1400 4.30 4.27 4.27 4.38 4.3 4.01 did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 2 2 4 12 4.30 829/1400 4.30 4.27 4.27 4.38 4.3 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 13 0 2 1 0 3 3.67 840/1179 3.67 3.87 3.96 4.07 3.6 Discussion Discussion Discussion Lecture Lecture Discussion Discussion Discussion Frequency Distribution Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors Type Majors Type Majors Major 5 5 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 7	4. Did otl	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	15	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	840/1424	4.17	4.15	4.21	4.35	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 2 0 5 14 4.48 505/1459 4.48 4.30 4.16 4.25 4.48 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 6 14 4.70 928/1480 4.70 4.73 4.68 4.74 4.7 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 0 5 3 8 4.19 702/1450 4.19 4.01 4.09 4.28 4.1 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 0 2 6 12 4.50 762/1409 4.50 4.49 4.42 4.51 4.5 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 1 3 16 4.75 823/1407 4.75 4.70 4.69 4.79 4.7 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 1 2 6 11 4.35 733/1399 4.35 4.22 4.26 4.36 4.3 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 2 2 4 12 4.30 829/1400 4.30 4.27 4.27 4.38 4.3 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 13 0 2 1 0 3 3.67 840/1179 3.67 3.87 3.96 4.07 3.6 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 18 0 0 0 0 2 0 1 3.67 ****/1262 **** 3.81 4.05 4.33 *** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 18 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 ****/1259 **** 4.13 4.29 4.57 *** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 18 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 ****/1256 **** 4.21 4.30 4.60 *** 4. Were special techniques successful 18 2 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/788 **** 3.67 4.00 4.26 *** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors Frequency Distribution	5. Did as:	signed r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	1	3	1	4	5	7	3.60	1025/1396	3.60	3.96	3.98	4.09	3.60
8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 6 14 4.70 928/1480 4.70 4.73 4.68 4.74 4.79 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 0 5 3 8 4.19 702/1450 4.19 4.01 4.09 4.28 4.19 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 0 2 6 12 4.50 762/1409 4.50 4.49 4.42 4.51 4.5	6. Did wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	14	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	649/1342	4.14	4.06	4.07	4.21	4.14
Lecture Lect	7. Was the	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	2	0	5	14	4.48	505/1459	4.48	4.30	4.16	4.25	4.48
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 2 6 12 4.50 762/1409 4.50 4.49 4.42 4.51 4.5 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 1 3 16 4.75 823/1407 4.75 4.70 4.69 4.79 4.7 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 2 2 4 12 4.30 829/1400 4.30 4.27 4.27 4.38 4.3 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 13 0 2 1 0 3 3.67 840/1179 3.67 3.87 3.96 4.07 3.6 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 18 0 0 0 2 0 1 3.67 ****/1262 **** 3.81 4.05 4.33 *** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 18 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 ****/1259 **** 4.13 4.29 4.57 *** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 18 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	8. How max	ny times	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	928/1480	4.70	4.73	4.68	4.74	4.70
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 2 6 12 4.50 762/1409 4.50 4.49 4.42 4.51 4.52 Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 1 3 16 4.75 823/1407 4.75 4.70 4.69 4.79 4.7 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 1 2 6 11 4.35 733/1399 4.35 4.22 4.26 4.36 4.3 4.24 4.25 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 13 0 2 1 0 3 3.67 840/1179 3.67 3.87 3.96 4.07 3.0 4.07 3.0 4.07	9. How wor	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	5	0	0	0	5	3	8	4.19	702/1450	4.19	4.01	4.09	4.28	4.19
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 1 3 16 4.75 823/1407 4.75 4.70 4.69 4.79 4.73 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 1 2 6 11 4.35 733/1399 4.35 4.22 4.26 4.36 4.3 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 2 2 4 12 4.30 829/1400 4.30 4.27 4.27 4.38 4.3 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 13 0 2 1 0 3 3.67 840/1179 3.67 3.87 3.96 4.07 3.6 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 18 0 0 0 2 0 1 3.67 ****/1262 **** 3.81 4.05 4.33 *** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 18 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 ****/1259 **** 4.13 4.29 4.57 *** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 18 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 ****/1256 **** 4.21 4.30 4.60 *** 4. Were special techniques successful 18 2 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 788 **** 3.67 4.00 4.26 *** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 0 0-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 11 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 5 0 0-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 B 7			Lectur	·e															
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 1 2 6 11 4.35 733/1399 4.35 4.22 4.26 4.36 4.36 4.36 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 2 2 4 12 4.30 829/1400 4.30 4.27 4.27 4.38 4.35 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 13 0 2 1 0 3 3.67 840/1179 3.67 3.87 3.96 4.07 3.67 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 18 0 0 0 2 0 1 3.67 ****/1262 **** 3.81 4.05 4.33 *** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 18 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 ****/1259 **** 4.13 4.29 4.57 *** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 18 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 ****/1256 **** 4.21 4.30 4.60 *** 4. Were special techniques successful 18 2 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/788 **** 3.67 4.00 4.26 *** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors O0-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 11 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 5 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 7	1. Were th	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	1	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	762/1409	4.50	4.49	4.42	4.51	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 2 2 4 12 4.30 829/1400 4.30 4.27 4.27 4.38 4.35 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 13 0 2 1 0 3 3.67 840/1179 3.67 3.87 3.96 4.07 3.67 Discussion Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 18 0 0 0 2 0 1 3.67 ****/1262 **** 3.81 4.05 4.33 *** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 18 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 ****/1259 **** 4.13 4.29 4.57 *** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 18 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 ****/1256 **** 4.21 4.30 4.60 *** 4. Were special techniques successful 18 2 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/788 **** 3.67 4.00 4.26 *** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 11 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 5 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 7	2. Did the	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	823/1407	4.75	4.70	4.69	4.79	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 13 0 2 1 0 3 3.67 840/1179 3.67 3.87 3.96 4.07 3.67 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 18 0 0 0 2 0 1 3.67 ****/1262 **** 3.81 4.05 4.33 *** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 18 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 ****/1259 **** 4.13 4.29 4.57 *** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 18 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 ****/1256 **** 4.21 4.30 4.60 *** 4. Were special techniques successful 18 2 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 788 **** 3.67 4.00 4.26 *** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 11 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 5 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 7	3. Was led	cture ma	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	6	11	4.35	733/1399	4.35	4.22	4.26	4.36	4.35
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 18 0 0 0 2 0 1 3.67 ****/1262 **** 3.81 4.05 4.33 *** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 18 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 ****/1259 **** 4.13 4.29 4.57 *** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 18 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 ****/1256 **** 4.21 4.30 4.60 *** 4. Were special techniques successful 18 2 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 788 **** 3.67 4.00 4.26 *** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 11 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 5 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 7	4. Did the	e lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	1	0	0	2	2	4	12	4.30	829/1400	4.30	4.27	4.27	4.38	4.30
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 18 0 0 0 2 0 1 3.67 ****/1262 **** 3.81 4.05 4.33 *** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 18 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 ****/1259 **** 4.13 4.29 4.57 *** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 18 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 ****/1256 **** 4.21 4.30 4.60 *** 4. Were special techniques successful 18 2 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 788 **** 3.67 4.00 4.26 *** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 11 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 5 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 7	5. Did aud	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	2	13	0	2	1	0	3	3.67	840/1179	3.67	3.87	3.96	4.07	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 18 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 ***/1259 **** 4.13 4.29 4.57 *** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 18 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 ***/1256 **** 4.21 4.30 4.60 *** 4. Were special techniques successful 18 2 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ***/ 788 **** 3.67 4.00 4.26 *** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 11 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 5 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 7			Discus	sion															
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 18 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 ***/1256 **** 4.21 4.30 4.60 *** 4. Were special techniques successful 18 2 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 788 **** 3.67 4.00 4.26 *** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 11 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 5 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 7	1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	18	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1262	****	3.81	4.05	4.33	****
4. Were special techniques successful 18 2 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 788 **** 3.67 4.00 4.26 *** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 11 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 5 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 7	2. Were a	ll stude	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	18	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1259	****	4.13	4.29	4.57	****
Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 11 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 5 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 7	3. Did the	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	18	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1256	****	4.21	4.30	4.60	****
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 11 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 5 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 7	4. Were sp	pecial to	echniques succe	ssful		18	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 788	****	3.67	4.00	4.26	****
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 11 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 5 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 7					Frequ	uency Distribution													
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 7	Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades	-					s			Туј	pe			Majors	5
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 7	00 07																		
						Required for Majo				ajor	S	U	Graduat	е	U	мајс	or.	5	
	28-55 56-83	3	2.00-2.99		C 3	General						2	IIndox	~~d ~	11	More	mo i o	16	
56-83 3 2.00-2.99 5 C 3 General 2 Under-grad 21 Non-major 16 84-150 8 3.00-3.49 8 D 0				5		General						∠	unaer-g	rau z	· T	NOU-	ına jor	16	
** *** * * * *** *** * * * * * * * * *					= -	Flogtivos							0	#### 1	Moona +	horo o	ro not	onous	rh
P 0 Electives 0 #### - Mean's there are not enough responses to be significant	Grau.	U	3.30-4.00	4		Electives							U					_	111
I 0 Other 18							Other					1	.8	I CEPOIIS	L	.c bigi			

Course-Section: ECON 412 0101

Title TOPICS IN MACROECONOMI

GRIBBIN, JOSEPH

Instructor:

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 13

Baltimore County Spring 2006

University of Maryland

Page 510 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				equer		3			ructor	Course	_	UMBC		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	362/1481	4.69	4.20	4.29	4.45	4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	517/1481	4.50	4.21	4.23	4.32	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	1	9	4.46	548/1249	4.46	4.30	4.27	4.44	4.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	4	6	4.17	840/1424	4.17	4.15	4.21	4.35	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	3	9	4.46	330/1396	4.46	3.96	3.98	4.09	4.46
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	0	1	8	4.27	527/1342	4.27	4.06	4.07	4.21	4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	792/1459	4.23	4.30	4.16	4.25	4.23
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.73	4.68	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	1	0	3	4	3.89	989/1450	3.89	4.01	4.09	4.28	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	290/1409	4.83	4.49	4.42	4.51	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	400/1407	4.92	4.70	4.69	4.79	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	2	0	10	4.38	703/1399	4.38	4.22	4.26	4.36	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	0	10	4.38	729/1400	4.38	4.27	4.27	4.38	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	243/1179	4.54	3.87	3.96	4.07	4.54
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	645/1262	4.14	3.81	4.05	4.33	4.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	764/1259	4.29	4.13	4.29	4.57	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	532/1256	4.57	4.21	4.30	4.60	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 788	***	3.67	4.00	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	37/ 68	4.75	4.75	4.49	4.68	4.75
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	1	2	1	8	4.33	52/ 69	4.33	4.42	4.53	4.64	4.33
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	2	9	4.50	31/ 63	4.50	4.25	4.44	4.49	4.50
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	3	8	4.42	39/ 69	4.42	4.42	4.35	4.53	4.42
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	2	1	0	4	5	3.75	43/ 68	3.75	3.75	3.92	4.10	3.75

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	12	Non-major	9
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	5	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	mificant	
				I	0	Other	12	-			
				2	0						

Course-Section: ECON 414 0101 Title PUBLIC POLICY TOWARD B

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Instructor: CARROLL, KATHLE Enrollment:

16 Questionnaires: 13

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 511 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

			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	0	4	9	4.69	362/1481	4.69	4.20	4.29	4.45	4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	10	4.62	386/1481	4.62	4.21	4.23	4.32	4.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	393/1249	4.62	4.30	4.27	4.44	4.62
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	310/1424	4.64	4.15	4.21	4.35	4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	4	1	4	3.31	1181/1396	3.31	3.96	3.98	4.09	3.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	277/1342	4.55	4.06	4.07	4.21	4.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	242/1459	4.69	4.30	4.16	4.25	4.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.73	4.68	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	1	0	5	4	4.20	692/1450	4.20	4.01	4.09	4.28	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	275/1409	4.85	4.49	4.42	4.51	4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	400/1407	4.92	4.70	4.69	4.79	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	0	3	9	4.46	613/1399	4.46	4.22	4.26	4.36	4.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	4	8	4.38	729/1400	4.38	4.27	4.27	4.38	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	340/1179	4.40	3.87	3.96	4.07	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	645/1262	4.14	3.81	4.05	4.33	4.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	532/1259	4.57	4.13	4.29	4.57	4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	256/1256	4.86	4.21	4.30	4.60	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	318/ 788	4.20	3.67	4.00	4.26	4.20
Frequ	lency	Dis	trib	ation	n									

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

Course-Section: ECON 421 0101 University of Maryland Title

Baltimore County INTRO TO ECONOMETRICS

Instructor: DASGUPTA, NANDI

Enrollment: 45 Questionnaires: 19

Spring 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 512 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

			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	1	0	1	0	1	7	9	4.28	818/1481	4.28	4.20	4.29	4.45	4.28
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	5	9	4.22	854/1481	4.22	4.21	4.23	4.32	4.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	5	11	4.44	573/1249	4.44	4.30	4.27	4.44	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	2	9	6	4.24	762/1424	4.24	4.15	4.21	4.35	4.24
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	0	3	4	8	4.13	623/1396	4.13	3.96	3.98	4.09	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	8	7	4.29	511/1342	4.29	4.06	4.07	4.21	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	4	12	4.50	460/1459	4.50	4.30	4.16	4.25	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	729/1480	4.89	4.73	4.68	4.74	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	567/1450	4.31	4.01	4.09	4.28	4.31
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	3	12	4.44	839/1409	4.44	4.49	4.42	4.51	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	659/1407	4.83	4.70	4.69	4.79	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	2	2	1	12	4.17	910/1399	4.17	4.22	4.26	4.36	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	2	2	11	4.11	977/1400	4.11	4.27	4.27	4.38	4.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	12	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	****/1179	****	3.87	3.96	4.07	****
Discussion	1.0	•	-	-	-	_	_	2 42	1006/1060	2 42	2 01	4 05	4 22	2 42
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	Τ	Τ	1	2	2		1026/1262		3.81	4.05	4.33	3.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	7	3 1	3	4.29	764/1259 901/1256	4.29	4.13	4.29	4.57	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful	12 12	5	1	0	3	U T	3 1	4.00	****/ 788	4.00 ****	4.21 3.67	4.30	4.60 4.26	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	12	5	1	U	U	U	1	3.00	/ /00		3.07	4.00	4.20	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	4.45	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	3.87	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.45	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.20	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.04	3.86	****
Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ution	ı									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	•	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	19	Non-major	12
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 444 0101 Title

University of Maryland HIST OF ECON THOUGHT I Baltimore County BRADLEY, MICHAE Spring 2006

Instructor: Enrollment:

14

Questionnaires: 8

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 513 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

							Fre	equei	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 v	zou gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	439/1481	4.63	4.20	4.29	4.45	4.63
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	374/1481	4.63	4.21	4.23	4.32	4.63
		uestions reflec		-	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	381/1249	4.63	4.30	4.27	4.44	4.63
	_	uations reflect		_	1	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	165/1424	4.83	4.15	4.21	4.35	4.83
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	90/1396		3.96	3.98	4.09	4.88
	_	_		o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	135/1342	4.75	4.06	4.07	4.21	4.75
		g system clearl			1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	378/1459	4.57	4.30	4.16	4.25	4.57
		was class canc			1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.73	4.68	4.74	5.00
	-			hing effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	119/1450	4.86	4.01	4.09	4.28	4.86
1		Lectur		1	0	0	0	0	•	2	_	4 62	610/1400	4 60	4 40	4 40	4 51	4 62
		uctor's lecture			0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	618/1409	4.63	4.49	4.42	4.51	4.63
		ctor seem inter		3	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.70	4.69	4.79	5.00
				xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	267/1399	4.75	4.22	4.26	4.36	4.75
		es contribute t		-	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	198/1400	4.86	4.27	4.27	4.38	4.86
5. Did a	audiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	6	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	590/1179	4.00	3.87	3.96	4.07	4.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did o	class disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	507/1262	4.33	3.81	4.05	4.33	4.33
				d to participate	2	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	588/1259	4.50	4.13	4.29	4.57	4.50
		_	_	d open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	457/1256		4.21	4.30	4.60	4.67
		echniques succe			2	4	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	394/ 788		3.67	4.00	4.26	4.00
	-	-																
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27		0.00.0.00								iors	. – – –				1			
28-55	0 0	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0 0	A 2 B 3		Red	quir	eu I	OT Mg	Jors	5	0	Graduat	E	1	Majo)T	6
28-55 56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	В 3 С 2		Cos	nera:	1				2	Under-q	rad	7	Mon	major	2
84-150	4	3.00-2.99	0	D 0		Gei	nera.	т				4	onder-9.	Lau	/	NOII-	ına Jor	۷
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	Б 0 F 0		. רים	ectiv	a				0	#### - 1	Moana +	horo o	ro not	onous	h
Grau.	Τ.	3.30-4.00	۷	P 0		E.I.	ECLT,	ves				U	respons				_	11
				I 0		O+1	her					6	respons	es to D	e sign	ııııcan	I L	
				Ι 0		OEI	ner.					O						

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Course-Section: ECON 467 0101 University of Maryland HEALTH ECONOMICS GOLDFARB, MARSH

Page 514

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	54			
Questionnaires:	43	Student Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Title

Instructor:

							Fr	eque:	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questio	ns		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Gener	 al															
1. Did vo	ou gain n	ew insights,sk		om this course	1	0	0	0	2	11	29	4.64	417/1481	4.64	4.20	4.29	4.45	4.64
		ctor make clea			1	0	0	1	5	10	26	4.45	589/1481	4.45	4.21	4.23	4.32	4.45
		uestions refle			0	0	0	1	3	12	27	4.51	488/1249	4.51	4.30	4.27	4.44	4.51
	_	uations reflec		_	0	21	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	271/1424	4.68	4.15	4.21	4.35	4.68
5. Did as	ssigned re	eadings contri	bute to	what you learned	3	0	2	2	8	11	17	3.97	735/1396	3.98	3.96	3.98	4.09	3.97
6. Did wr	ritten as:	signments cont	ribute t	to what you learned	3	27	0	2	0	2	9	4.38	424/1342	4.38	4.06	4.07	4.21	4.38
7. Was th	ne gradin	g system clear	ly expla	ined	2	1	0	1	5	15	19	4.30	732/1459	4.30	4.30	4.16	4.25	4.30
8. How ma	any times	was class can	celled		3	0	0	0	3	28	9	4.15	1288/1480	4.15	4.73	4.68	4.74	4.15
9. How wo	ould you	grade the over	all tead	ching effectiveness	10	1	0	1	4	13	14	4.25	630/1450	4.25	4.01	4.09	4.28	4.25
		Lectu	re															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lectur	es well	prepared	2	0	0	0	1	8	32	4.76	417/1409	4.76	4.49	4.42	4.51	4.76
		ctor seem inte			2	0	0	0	1	5	35	4.83	682/1407	4.83	4.70	4.69	4.79	4.83
				explained clearly	2	0	0	1	3	7	30	4.61	459/1399	4.61	4.22	4.26	4.36	4.61
		es contribute			2	0	0	0	3	5	33	4.73	336/1400	4.73	4.27	4.27	4.38	4.73
5. Did au	udiovisua	l techniques e	nhance y	our understanding	5	27	0	0	5	0	6	4.09	560/1179	4.09	3.87	3.96	4.07	4.09
		Discu	ssion															
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contri	bute to	what you learned	26	0	2	1	3	3	8	3.82	849/1262	3.82	3.81	4.05	4.33	3.82
				ed to participate	26	0	1	0	2	4	10			4.29	4.13	4.29	4.57	4.29
				nd open discussion	26	0	1	1	2	3	10	4.18	820/1256	4.18	4.21	4.30	4.60	4.18
		echniques succ		-	26	13	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 788	****	3.67	4.00	4.26	****
				Frequ	iency	/ Dist	trib	utio:	n									
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GP.	Δ	Expected Grades				Re	ason	S			Ту	ne			Majors	
																		. – – – –
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A 9		Red	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s	1	Graduat	e	3	Majo	or	12
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 21														
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	11	C 7		Gei	nera	1				8	Under-g	rad 4	10	Non-	-major	31
84-150	21	3.00-3.49	10	D 0		_						_						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	11	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1				_	jh .
				P 0		0.1					_		respons	es to b	e sign	niicar	1T	
				I 0		Otl	ner				2	26						

Course-Section: ECON 471 0101 University of Maryland
Title MONEY & CAPITAL MARKET Baltimore County

Title MONEY & CAPITAL MARKET Baltimore Count Instructor: Morris, Russell Spring 2006

Enrollment: 46

Questionnaires: 29

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 515

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

									Fre	equei	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
			Questions	5			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
			Genera	 1																
1.	Did you	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this cour	cse	0	0	1	1	3	10	14	4.21	909/1481	4.21	4.20	4.29	4.45	4.21
2. 1	Did the	e instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	kpected goal	ls	1	0	1	1	5	6	15	4.18	900/1481	4.20	4.21	4.23	4.32	4.18
3. 1	Did the	e exam qu	estions reflect	t the e	expected goa	als	0	0	2	0	4	7	16	4.21	781/1249	4.28	4.30	4.27	4.44	4.21
4.	Did oth	her evalı	uations reflect	the ex	kpected goal	ls	1	9	1	1	3	6	8	4.00	959/1424	4.36	4.15	4.21	4.35	4.00
5.	Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you le	earned	0	1	1	1	5	8	13	4.11	643/1396	4.09	3.96	3.98	4.09	4.11
6. 1	Did wr:	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	to what you	learned	2	8	1	2	6	5	5	3.58	1084/1342	3.60	4.06	4.07	4.21	3.58
7.	Was the	e grading	g system clearly	y expla	ained		1	0	1	1	5	5	16	4.21	809/1459	4.36	4.30	4.16	4.25	4.21
8.	How mar	ny times	was class cance	elled			1	0	0	1	0	2	25	4.82	811/1480	4.91	4.73	4.68	4.74	4.82
9. 1	How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effect	civeness	7	1	1	0	7	6	7	3.86	1014/1450	3.97	4.01	4.09	4.28	3.86
			Lecture	9																
1. 1	Were th	he instru	actor's lectures	s well	prepared		1	0	1	0	3	8	16	4.36	946/1409	4.60	4.49	4.42	4.51	4.36
2. 1	Did the	e instruc	ctor seem inter	ested :	in the subje	ect	1	0	0	1	2	6	19	4.54	1084/1407	4.73	4.70	4.69	4.79	4.54
3. 1	Was led	cture mat	terial presented	d and e	explained cl	learly	1	0	1	1	5	7	14	4.14	929/1399	4.24	4.22	4.26	4.36	4.14
4.	Did the	e lecture	es contribute to	o what	you learned	f	2	0	2	3	2	4	16	4.07	994/1400	4.11	4.27	4.27	4.38	4.07
5. 1	Did aud	diovisual	l techniques enl	nance y	your underst	anding	3	18	1	0	4	1	2	3.38	956/1179	3.56	3.87	3.96	4.07	3.38
			Discus	sion																
1. 1	Did cla	ass discu	ussions contrib	ute to	what you le	earned	15	0	0	1	1	6	6	4.21	596/1262	4.11	3.81	4.05	4.33	4.21
2.	Were a	ll studer	nts actively end	courage	ed to partio	cipate	16	0	0	1	3	2	7	4.15	841/1259	4.58	4.13	4.29	4.57	4.15
3. 1	Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage :	fair ar	nd open disc	cussion	17	0	0	0	3	1	8	4.42	669/1256	4.46	4.21	4.30	4.60	4.42
4.	Were sp	pecial te	echniques succes	ssful			17	7	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	****/ 788	****	3.67	4.00	4.26	****
						Freq	uency	7 Dist	trib	utio	n									
Cred	dits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades				Pe:	ason	c c			Ту	ne			Majors	1
												 								, . – – – –
	-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	10		Red	quir	ed fo	or M	ajor	`s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	0
	-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	10		_							1					
56	-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	5		Gei	nerai	L				0	Under-g	rad 2	29	Non-	major	29

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	10	Required for Majors	0	 Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	С	5	General	0	Under-grad	29	Non-major	29
84-150	16	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	25	_			
				2	1						

Course-Section: ECON 471 0201 Title

MONEY & CAPITAL MARKET

Instructor: Morris, Russell

Enrollment: 22 Questionnaires: 15

Spring 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 516 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

							Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1 Did vo	nı gain n	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	1	0	1	1	1	2	9	4.21	896/1481	4.21	4.20	4.29	4.45	4.21
_	-	ctor make clear			1	0	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	865/1481		4.21	4.23	4.32	4.21
		uestions reflec			1	0	0	0	4	1	9	4.36	663/1249		4.30	4.27	4.44	4.36
	_	uations reflect		_	1	3	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	240/1424		4.15	4.21	4.35	4.73
				what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	5	6	4.07	662/1396		3.96	3.98	4.09	4.07
	-	-		what you learned	1	6	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	1060/1342		4.06	4.07	4.21	3.63
		g system clearl		2	1	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	460/1459	4.36	4.30	4.16	4.25	4.50
		was class canc			1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1480	4.91	4.73	4.68	4.74	5.00
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	786/1450	3.97	4.01	4.09	4.28	4.09
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	the instr	uctor's lecture	s well p	prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	275/1409	4.60	4.49	4.42	4.51	4.85
		ctor seem inter		_	2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	400/1407	4.73	4.70	4.69	4.79	4.92
		-		xplained clearly	3	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	753/1399		4.22	4.26	4.36	4.33
		es contribute to	_	-	2	0	0	0	4	3	6	4.15	945/1400		4.27	4.27	4.38	4.15
5. Did au	udiovisua	l techniques en	hance yo	our understanding	2	9	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	793/1179	3.56	3.87	3.96	4.07	3.75
		Discus																
				what you learned	7	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	708/1262			4.05	4.33	4.00
				d to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1259		4.13	4.29	4.57	5.00
				d open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	571/1256		4.21	4.30	4.60	4.50
4. Were s	special to	echniques succe	ssiul		7	5	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 788	****	3.67	4.00	4.26	****
		Semina	_								_							
	-	_		announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.00	****/ 68		4.75	4.49	4.68	****
				ividual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 69		4.42	4.53	4.64	****
	_	-		what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 63		4.25	4.44	4.49	****
_		ons contribute		you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 69 ****/ 68		4.42	4.35	4.53	****
5. were c	riteria :	for grading made	e clear		14	0	U	U	U	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	***	3.75	3.92	4.10	* * * *
				Frequ	iency	7 Dist	tribu	utio	n									
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А б		Red	quire	ed f	or Ma	 ajor	:s	0	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 5														
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C 2		Ger	nera:	1				1	Under-g	rad 1	L5	Non-	major	14
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	7	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				0	#### -		chere a		enoug	jh

Other

12

Ρ

I

?

0

0

1

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

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 517

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: COATES, DENNIS Enrollment: 37

Questionnaires: 21

Student Cour	rse Evaluat	ion 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	0	1	0	5	15	4.62	450/1481	4.62	4.20	4.29	4.45	4.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	16	4.62	386/1481	4.62	4.21	4.23	4.32	4.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	1	17	4.57	432/1249	4.57	4.30	4.27	4.44	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	3	15	4.48	473/1424	4.48	4.15	4.21	4.35	4.48
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	7	12	4.48	321/1396	4.48	3.96	3.98	4.09	4.48
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	10	8	4.24	557/1342	4.24	4.06	4.07	4.21	4.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	19	4.86	131/1459	4.86	4.30	4.16	4.25	4.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.73	4.68	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	9	7	4.35	525/1450	4.35	4.01	4.09	4.28	4.35
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.81	334/1409	4.81	4.49	4.42	4.51	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject		0	0	0	0	4	16	4.81	804/1409	4.81	4.49	4.42		4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	5 4	15	4.76	445/1399	4.76	4.70	4.69	4.79 4.36	4.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	-4	15	4.62	421/1400	4.62	4.22	4.27	4.38	4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	16	0	1	U T	1	1		****/1179	****	3.87	3.96	4.30	****
5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	10	U	1	U	1	1	3.07	/11/9		3.07	3.90	4.07	
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	467/1262	4.38	3.81	4.05	4.33	4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	987/1259	3.89	4.13	4.29	4.57	3.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	1	0	2	4	3.88	996/1256	3.88	4.21	4.30	4.60	3.88
4. Were special techniques successful	13	3	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/ 788	****	3.67	4.00	4.26	****
Freq	iency	, Dist	crib	ution	ı									
•	-													
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	son	.s			Ту]	pe 			Majors	
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 9		Rec	quire	ed fo	or M	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	1
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 7														
56-83 3 2.00-2.99 1 C 3		Ger	nera:	1				2	Under-g	rad 2	21	Non-	major	20

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	2	Under-grad	21	Non-major	20
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	17				
				2	1						

Course-Section: ECON 478 0101

Title REAL ESTATE ECON AND F

Instructor: GETTER, DARYL

Enrollment: 55 Questionnaires: 44 Spring 2006

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Page 518 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				_	ncies	3			ructor		e Dept		Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mear
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	9	32	4.70	362/1481	4.70	4.20	4.29	4.45	4.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	6	35	4.77	219/1481	4.77	4.21	4.23	4.32	4.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	2	7	32	4.60	405/1249	4.60	4.30	4.27	4.44	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	7	1	3	3	7	22	4.28	717/1424	4.28	4.15	4.21	4.35	4.28
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	29	0	2	2	1	9	4.21	536/1396	4.21	3.96	3.98	4.09	4.2
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	11	0	3	4	8	16	4.19	592/1342	4.19	4.06	4.07	4.21	4.19
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	1	5	35	4.76	189/1459	4.76	4.30	4.16	4.25	4.76
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	2	0	1	39	4.83	797/1480	4.83	4.73	4.68	4.74	4.83
$9.\ \mbox{How would}$ you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	2	0	0	1	5	28	4.79	144/1450	4.79	4.01	4.09	4.28	4.79
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	1	39	4.93	150/1409	4.93	4.49	4.42	4.51	4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	0	40	4.95	250/1407	4.95	4.70	4.69	4.79	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	0	3	37	4.85	170/1399	4.85	4.22	4.26	4.36	4.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	2	38	4.88	177/1400	4.88	4.27	4.27	4.38	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	26	0	1	0	4	8	4.46	291/1179	4.46	3.87	3.96	4.07	4.46
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	29	0	1	0	2	1	11	4.40	437/1262	4.40	3.81	4.05	4.33	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	29	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	380/1259	4.73	4.13	4.29	4.57	4.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	29	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	382/1256	4.73	4.21	4.30	4.60	4.73
4. Were special techniques successful	29	9	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	****/ 788	****	3.67	4.00	4.26	***
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	3.87	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.42	4.53	4.64	***
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	4.25	4.44	4.49	****
Self Paced														
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	5.00	****
Frequ	ıency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27 2 0.00-0.99 1 A 10		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	 ajor	 s	2	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	3

Credits E	Credits Earned	Cum. GP	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	10	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	23						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	7	C	6	General	7	Under-grad	44	Non-major	41
84-150	25	3.00-3.49	12	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	13	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	31				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 481 0101

Title INTERNATIONAL TRADE TH

Instructor: TAKACS, WENDY E

Enrollment: 31
Questionnaires: 21

Grad.

1

3.50-4.00

5

F

Р

I

?

0

0

1

Baltimore County Spring 2006

University of Maryland

Page 519 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

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

Questions						Fr	eque:	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
						1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General															
1. Did yo	u gain n	ew insights, skills from	om this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	450/1481	4.62	4.20	4.29	4.45	4.62
		ctor make clear the ex		0	0	0	0	3	2	16	4.62	386/1481	4.62	4.21	4.23	4.32	4.62
3. Did th	le exam q	uestions reflect the e	expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	15	4.57	432/1249	4.57	4.30	4.27	4.44	4.57
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect the ex	spected goals	0	13	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	740/1424	4.25	4.15	4.21	4.35	4.25
		eadings contribute to		1	4	1	1	3	3	8	4.00	707/1396	4.00	3.96	3.98	4.09	4.00
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contribute t	o what you learned	1	13	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	384/1342	4.43	4.06	4.07	4.21	4.43
7. Was th	e gradin	g system clearly expla	ined	1	0	0	0	3	3	14	4.55	402/1459	4.55	4.30	4.16	4.25	4.55
8. How ma	ny times	was class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	702/1480	4.90	4.73	4.68	4.74	4.90
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overall tead	ching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	296/1450	4.56	4.01	4.09	4.28	4.56
	Lecture																
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lectures well	prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	334/1409	4.81	4.49	4.42	4.51	4.81
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject				0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	250/1407	4.95	4.70	4.69	4.79	4.95
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly				0	0	0	3	2	16	4.62	445/1399	4.62	4.22	4.26	4.36	4.62
4. Did th	. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly . Did the lectures contribute to what you learned				0	0	0	2	2	17	4.71	361/1400	4.71	4.27	4.27	4.38	4.71
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques enhance y	our understanding	0	15	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	177/1179	4.67	3.87	3.96	4.07	4.67
		Discussion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contribute to	what you learned	9	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	305/1262	4.58	3.81	4.05	4.33	4.58
		nts actively encourage		10	0	1	0	2	0	8	4.27	770/1259	4.27	4.13	4.29	4.57	4.27
		ctor encourage fair ar		10	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	549/1256	4.55	4.21	4.30	4.60	4.55
4. Were s	pecial t	echniques successful	-	10	8	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 788	***	3.67	4.00	4.26	****
		Field Work															
1. Did fi	eld expe	rience contribute to w	hat you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	***	****	4.30	4.93	****
			Frequ	ıency	7 Dist	trib	utio:	n									
Charlier Found Charles Charles Charles							_					_					
Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade						Re	asons	5 			Ту:	pe 			Majors	
00-27					Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s	1	Graduat	е	1	Majo	or	8
	28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 8						_						_				
56-83					Ger	nera	1				6	Under-g	rad 2	20	Non-	-major	13
84-150																	

Electives

Other

0

11

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

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

Instructor: MCINTYRE, KEVIN Spring 2006

Enrollment: 44 Questionnaires: 31

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 520

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	6	5	20	4.45	613/1481	4.45	4.20	4.29	4.45	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	8	19	4.42	646/1481	4.42	4.21	4.23	4.32	4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	10	19	4.60	405/1249	4.60	4.30	4.27	4.44	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	1	9	14	4.54	395/1424	4.54	4.15	4.21	4.35	4.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	1	7	7	10	4.04	681/1396	4.04	3.96	3.98	4.09	4.04
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	1	6	5	9	4.05	731/1342	4.05	4.06	4.07	4.21	4.05
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	3	6	20	4.59	367/1459	4.59	4.30	4.16	4.25	4.59
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	0	18	9	4.33	1158/1480	4.33	4.73	4.68	4.74	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	1	9	13	4.52	319/1450	4.52	4.01	4.09	4.28	4.52
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	Ο	0	0	5	2.4	4.83	304/1409	4.83	4.49	4.42	4.51	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	6	23	4.79	747/1407	4.79	4.70	4.69	4.79	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	6	22	4.72	300/1399	4.72	4.22	4.26	4.36	4.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	5	23	4.76	312/1400	4.76	4.27	4.27	4.38	4.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	20	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	307/1179	4.44	3.87	3.96	4.07	4.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	330/1262	4.54	3.81	4.05	4.33	4.54
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	1	1	2	2	7	4.00	895/1259	4.00	4.13	4.29	4.57	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	1	1	0	11	4.62	506/1256	4.62	4.21	4.30	4.60	4.62
4. Were special techniques successful	18	10	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 788	****	3.67	4.00	4.26	****

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	 А	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	6	C	8	General	3	Under-grad	31	Non-major	27
84-150	16	3.00-3.49	10	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	24				
				?	2						

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

Title THOMAS, MARK S Spring 2006

3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 12 0

4. Were special techniques successful

Instructor:

Enrollment: 38 Ouestionnaires: 20

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 521

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 1 0 3 2 4 6 4 3.32 1413/1481 3.32 4.20 4.29 4.45 3.32 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 1 1 3 8 6 3.89 1124/1481 3.89 4.21 4.23 4.32 3.89 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 0 0 1 7 4 7 3.89 984/1249 3.89 4.30 4.27 4.44 3.89 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 5 1 3 1 5 4 3.57 1251/1424 3.57 4.15 4.21 4.35 3.57 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 4 5 0 3 1 5 3.07 1278/1396 3.07 3.96 3.98 4.09 3.07 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 2 3 3 4 3 3 3.00 1269/1342 3.00 4.06 4.07 4.21 3.00 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 2 0 0 1 1 5 11 4.44 550/1459 4.44 4.30 4.16 4.25 4.44 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 0 0 1 0 0 17 4.83 797/1480 4.83 4.73 4.68 4.74 4.83 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 1 1 1 7 4 0 3.08 1346/1450 3.08 4.01 4.09 4.28 3.08 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 0 1 3 3 11 4.33 968/1409 4.33 4.49 4.42 4.51 4.33 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2 0 3 0 3 5 7 3.72 1347/1407 3.72 4.70 4.69 4.79 3.72 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 0 2 4 6 6 3.89 1105/1399 3.89 4.22 4.26 4.36 3.89 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 3 0 2 2 2 9 3.82 1113/1400 3.82 4.27 4.27 4.38 3.82 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 3 1 0 3 6 4 3.86 726/1179 3.86 3.87 3.96 4.07 3.86 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 12 0 2 1 0 2 3 3.38 1044/1262 3.38 3.81 4.05 4.33 3.38 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 12 0 2 1 2 1 2 3.00 1162/1259 3.00 4.13 4.29 4.57 3.00

Frequency Distribution

12 6

1

0

2 2 1 2 3.13 1162/1256 3.13 4.21 4.30 4.60 3.13

0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 788 **** 3.67 4.00 4.26 ****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	PA Expected Grad			Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	20	Non-major	14
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13	_			
				?	1						

Course-Section:	ECON 493 0601	University of Maryland	Page 522
Title	INDIV RESEARCH IN ECON	Baltimore County	JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:	COATES, DENNIS	Spring 2006	Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	1	
Questionnaires:	1	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Instr	uctor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.20	4.29	4.45	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.21	4.23	4.32	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.15	4.21	4.35	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1396	5.00	3.96	3.98	4.09	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.06	4.07	4.21	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.30	4.16	4.25	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.73	4.68	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1450	5.00	4.01	4.09	4.28	5.00

Credits E	Credits Earned		1	Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	0	Non-major	1	
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0							
Grad.	1	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	0					
				2	0							

Course-Section: ECON 600 0101

POLICY CONSQ:ECON ANAL

Title Instructor: MUTTER, RYAN L

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 14 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 523 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			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	1	1	3	2	7	3.93	1143/1481	3.93	4.20	4.29	4.28	3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	4	4	4	3.57	1296/1481	3.57	4.21	4.23	4.11	3.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	6	2	3.43	1132/1249	3.43	4.30	4.27	4.24	3.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	840/1424	4.17	4.15	4.21	4.16	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	8	5	4.29	476/1396	4.29	3.96	3.98	4.00	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	592/1342	4.20	4.06	4.07	4.18	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	2	5	4	3.71	1177/1459	3.71	4.30	4.16	4.01	3.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.73	4.68	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	2	5	5	2	3.50	1223/1450	3.50	4.01	4.09	3.96	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	946/1409	4.36	4.49	4.42	4.36	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	899/1407	4.71	4.70	4.69	4.73	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	4	4	4	3.64	1203/1399	3.64	4.22	4.26	4.16	3.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	2	7	3.93	1074/1400	3.93	4.27	4.27	4.17	3.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	12	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1179	***	3.87	3.96	3.81	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	5	2	1	3.20	1092/1262	3.20	3.81	4.05	4.07	3.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	867/1259	4.10	4.13	4.29	4.30	4.10
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion			0	1	2	2	5	4.10	860/1256	4.10	4.21	4.30	4.33	4.10
4. Were special techniques successful	4	9	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 788	****	3.67	4.00	3.97	***

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	10	Major	0	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	8							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	4	Non-major	14	
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0							
Grad.	10	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n	
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant		
				I	0	Other	14	_				
				?	0							

Course-Section: ECON 602 0101 University of Maryland
Title MACROECONOMIC ANALYSIS Baltimore County
Instructor: CINYABUGUMA, MA Spring 2006

Baltimore County
Spring 2006

Page 524

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	10		
Questionnaires:	10	Student Course Evaluation Questionnair	re

I

?

0

						Frequencies				Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	Questions			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
		Genera	1															
1. Did vo	1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course						0	2	1	4	3	3.80	1225/1481	3.80	4.20	4.29	4.28	3.80
_	-	ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	4	4	2		1179/1481	3.80	4.21	4.23	4.11	3.80
		uestions reflec		-	0	0	0	0	4	3	3	3.90	980/1249		4.30	4.27	4.24	3.90
	_	uations reflect		_	0	4	0	1	4	0	1	3.17	1347/1424		4.15	4.21	4.16	3.17
				what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	3	2	3.50	1083/1396	3.50	3.96	3.98	4.00	3.50
	-	-		o what you learned	0	3	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	755/1342	4.00	4.06	4.07	4.18	4.00
		g system clearl		_	0	0	1	0	5	2	2	3.40	1297/1459	3.40	4.30	4.16	4.01	3.40
8. How max	ny times	was class cand	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.73	4.68	4.74	5.00
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	.ll tead	hing effectiveness	2	1	0	1	3	3	0	3.29	1299/1450	3.29	4.01	4.09	3.96	3.29
1 Were t	he instr	Lectur uctor's lecture		prepared	Λ	0	1	0	2	4	2	3 80	1238/1409	3.80	4.49	4.42	4.36	3.80
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	2	Ω	4.80	728/1407	4.80	4.70	4.69	4.73	4.80
				explained clearly	0	0	1	2	2	3	2		1285/1399		4.22	4.26	4.16	3.30
		es contribute t			0	0	2	2	2	2	2		1312/1400		4.27	4.27	4.17	3.00
				our understanding	0	5	0	2	1	1	1		1011/1179		3.87	3.96		3.20
J. Dia au	alovibaa	r cccinirques en	mance j	our understanding	O	3	Ü	2	_	_	_	3.20	1011/11/2	3.20	3.07	3.50	3.01	3.20
		Discus																
				what you learned	2	0	2	0	1	4	1		1081/1262		3.81		4.07	3.25
		_	_	d to participate	2	0	0	0	3	0	5	4.25	783/1259		4.13	4.29	4.30	4.25
		_		d open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	837/1256		4.21	4.30	4.33	4.14
4. Were s	pecial to	echniques succe	ssful		2	6	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 788	****	3.67	4.00	3.97	****
				Frequ	iency	, Dist	trib	ution	n									
O		G., GD.		The section of the section				Doo		_			m				M = = = = = =	
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	· 	Expected Grades					asons	3 :			Ту	pe 			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	5	0	Graduat	е	5	Majo	or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1		Ger	nera:	l				0	Under-g	rad	5	Non-	-major	10
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0														
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### -				_	ιh
Р 0												responses to be sign				nificar		

Other

8

Course-Section: ECON 612 0101
Title ECONOMETRICS II
Instructor: COATES, DENNIS

15

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 525 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

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

		Ouestions	S		NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General																			
-		ew insights,ski			1	0	1	0	0	5	6	4.25	844/14		4.25	4.20	4.29	4.28	4.25
		ctor make clear		_	1	0	0	1	0	7	4	4.17	909/14		4.17	4.21	4.23	4.11	4.17
	_	uestions reflect			1	6	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	810/12		4.17	4.30	4.27	4.24	4.17
		uations reflect			1	2	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	684/14		4.30	4.15	4.21	4.16	4.30
	_	-		what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	5	4		707/13		4.00	3.96	3.98	4.00	4.00
		-		o what you learned	1	1 1	0	0	0 2	4	7	4.64	214/13		4.64	4.06	4.07	4.18	4.64
		g system clearly		inea	2	U T	0	0	0	4	7	1.15	535/14		4.45 4.64	4.30	4.16	4.01	4.45
	-	was class cance grade the overal		hing effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	5	-	4.64	974/14 662/14		4.04	4.73 4.01	4.68	3.96	4.64 4.22
				5															
1 Wome	the instan	Lecture actor's lectures		nanarad	2	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	603/14	0.0	4.64	4.49	4.42	4.36	4.64
		ctor's lecture:			1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/14		5.00	4.49	4.42	4.36	5.00
				explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	417/13		4.64	4.70	4.09	4.16	4.64
		es contribute to		-	1	0	0	0	3	5	-	4.08	991/14		4.08	4.27	4.27	4.17	4.08
				our understanding	1	2	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	487/11		4.20	3.87	3.96	3.81	4.20
J. Dia c	addiovibadi	r ccciniiques cin	idiicc y	our understanding	_	2	Ü	O	2	-	_	1.20	10 / / 11	. 1)	1.20	3.07	3.50	3.01	1.20
		Discus	sion																
				what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	570/12		4.25	3.81	4.05	4.07	4.25
		-	_	d to participate	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	358/12		4.75	4.13	4.29	4.30	4.75
		_		d open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	194/12		4.92	4.21	4.30	4.33	4.92
4. Were	special te	echniques succes	ssful		2	3	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	495/ 7	88	3.88	3.67	4.00	3.97	3.88
		Semina	r																
1. Were	assigned t	opics relevant	to the	announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	68	****	4.75	4.49	4.23	****
2. Was t	the instruc	ctor available i	Eor ind	ividual attention	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	69	****	4.42	4.53	4.46	****
3. Did n	research pr	rojects contribu	ate to	what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	63	****	4.25	4.44	4.44	****
_	•	ons contribute t		-	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	69	****	4.42	4.35	4.16	****
5. Were	criteria f	for grading made	e clear		12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	68	****	3.75	3.92	3.71	****
		Self I	Paced																
1. Did s	self-paced	system contribu	ute to	what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	55	****	****	4.55	4.38	****
2. Did s	study quest	tions make clear	r the e	xpected goal	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	31	****	****	4.75	4.95	****
3. Were	your conta	acts with the in	nstruct	or helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	51	****	****	4.65	4.54	****
4. Was t	the feedbac	ck/tutoring by p	proctor	s helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	34	****	****	4.83	5.00	****
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utior	ı										
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	sons	3				Тур	e			Majors	;
00-27	 2	0.00-0.99	 0	A 4			 mir	ed fo	or Ma	ior		0	 Gradu	ate		6	Majo	 r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 3		1000	7411	-u = (- 1·1C	⊥∪ر.	~	,	Siddl		-	~	1100		O
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	L				1	Under	-gr	ad	7	Non-	-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0															
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	3	F 0 P 0		Ele	ecti	<i>r</i> es				0			Means t			_	ŗh
				P 0		O+1	202					9	respo	nise	es to b	e sign	ıııcan	IL	
				? 0		Other						J							

Course-Section: ECON 699 0101

Title SEM. ECON. POLICY ANAL

Instructor: MITCH, DAVID

Enrollment: 9

Questionnaires: 8

CH, DAVID Spi

Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 526 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

		Frequencies					Inst	cructor	Course Dept		t UMBC Level		Sect	
Questions			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	1		1193/1481		4.20	4.29	4.28	3.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	2	1	2		1355/1481	3.43	4.21	4.23	4.11	3.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	0	1		****/1249	****	4.30	4.27	4.24	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	959/1424	4.00	4.15	4.21	4.16	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	1	0	0	0		****/1396	****	3.96	3.98	4.00	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	112/1342	4.80	4.06	4.07	4.18	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	0	3	1	0	1	2.80	1412/1459	2.80	4.30	4.16	4.01	2.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.73	4.68	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	1	4	1	3.71	1133/1450	3.71	4.01	4.09	3.96	3.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	2	2	Λ	3 00	1356/1409	3.00	4.49	4.42	4.36	3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	4			4.67	4.70	4.69	4.73	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	3	2	0		1325/1399	3.00	4.22	4.26	4.16	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	1	3	0		1312/1400	3.00	4.27	4.27	4.17	3.00
·														
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	610/1262	4.20	3.81	4.05	4.07	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	509/1259	4.60	4.13	4.29	4.30	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	516/1256	4.60	4.21	4.30	4.33	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 788	****	3.67	4.00	3.97	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	4.75	4.49	4.23	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	36/ 69	4.50	4.42	4.53	4.46	4.50
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	45/ 63	4.00	4.25	4.44	4.44	4.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 69	****	4.42	4.35	4.16	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 68	****	3.75	3.92	3.71	****
J. Note official for grading made officer	J	_	J	U	_	U	J	3.00	, 00		3.75	3.72	5.71	

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