Course-Section: ECON 101 0101 University of Maryland
Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS Baltimore County

Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS
Instructor: COOMBER, WILLIA

4. Were special techniques successful

3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 14 0

Enrollment: 42

Questionnaires: 20

Fall 2007

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 488

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2 0 2 1 1 4 10 4.06 1103/1639 3.93 4.12 4.27 4.08 4.06 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3 0 1 1 2 3 10 4.00 973/1397 3.96 4.17 4.28 4.18 4.00 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 2 4 1 1 2 5 5 3.86 1192/1583 3.68 3.94 4.19 4.01 3.86 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3 1 2 1 1 4 8 3.94 869/1532 3.78 3.95 4.01 3.88 3.94 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 5 1 2 1 2 4 5 3.64 1129/1504 3.42 3.74 4.05 3.78 3.64 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 3 0 1 3 2 4 7 3.76 1273/1612 3.99 4.25 4.16 4.10 3.76 8. How many times was class cancelled 5 0 0 0 6 7 2 3.73 1591/1635 4.35 4.58 4.65 4.56 3.73 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 10 0 1 0 3 4 2 3.60 1270/1579 3.59 3.89 4.08 3.95 3.60 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 5 0 0 0 3 1 11 4.53 770/1518 4.22 4.42 4.43 4.38 4.53 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 6 0 0 0 2 0 12 4.71 961/1520 4.55 4.65 4.70 4.61 4.71 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 6 0 0 0 2 3 9 4.50 597/1517 3.88 4.14 4.27 4.20 4.50 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 2 1 2 9 4.29 875/1550 4.03 4.25 4.22 4.17 4.29 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6 2 1 2 0 1 8 4.08 586/1295 3.47 3.71 3.94 3.84 4.08 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 1 0 494/1398 3.67 3.87 4.07 3.85 4.43 1 5 4.43 2 4 4.29 793/1391 3.89 4.15 4.30 4.07 4.29 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13 0 0 1 0

Frequency Distribution

14 1

0

0 1 1 4 4.50 647/1388 4.06 4.19 4.28 4.01 4.50

1 0 0 3 3.60 682/ 958 3.01 3.63 3.93 3.71 3.60

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	5	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	С	1	General	2	Under-grad	20	Non-major	19
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	5	_			
				?	1						

Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

Instructor:

Enrollment: 76

Baltimore County CARROLL, KATHLE Fall 2007

Page 489 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 39 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	1						Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	_	0	0		_	_	1.0	4 06	1100/1600	2 02	4 10	4 05	4 00	4 06
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	4	7	8	17		1103/1639		4.12		4.08	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	3	9	9	15		1090/1639	3.85	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	2	4	3	10	17	4.00			4.17	4.28	4.18	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	8	1	3	6	12	6		1317/1583		3.94	4.19	4.01	3.68
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	3	0	4	11	11	6		1189/1532		3.95	4.01	3.88	3.59
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	18	1	1	7	4	4		1200/1504		3.74	4.05		3.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	1	1	4	8	21	4.34	,		4.25	4.16	4.10	4.34
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	1	0	0	34		,		4.58	4.65	4.56	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	1	3	4	13	7	3.79	1148/1579	3.59	3.89	4.08	3.95	3.79
Lecture														
	_	0	0	_	^	_	0.7	4 60	E00/1E10	4 00	4 40	4 42	4 20	4 60
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	2	0	5	27	4.68	588/1518		4.42	4.43	4.38	4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	2	2	30	4.82	750/1520		4.65	4.70	4.61	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	2	2	3	10	17		1016/1517	3.88	4.14	4.27	4.20	4.12
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	3	5	10			1067/1550		4.25	4.22	4.17	4.03
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	22	2	1	3	3	3	3.33	1067/1295	3.47	3.71	3.94	3.84	3.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	3	3	5	9	3.86	908/1398	3.67	3.87	4.07	3.85	3.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	1	2	3	7	7		1094/1391	3.89	4.15	4.30	4.07	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	1	3	2	6	8		1056/1388		4.19	4.28	4.01	3.85
4. Were special techniques successful	19	14	2	0	0	2	2		****/ 958		3.63	3.93	3.71	****
i. Here special techniques successful			_	Ü	Ü	-	_	3.33	, ,,,	3.01	3.03	3.75	3.71	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	38	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 224	****	5.00	4.10	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	38	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.11	4.01	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 219	****	5.00	4.44	4.44	****

University of Maryland

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	1	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	 А	6	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General	5	Under-grad	39	Non-major	37
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	5						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	14	-			
				2	2						

Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

Instructor: MITCH, DAVID F

Enrollment: 42
Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 490 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

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
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	10	10	8	3.93	1229/1639	3.93	4.12	4.27	4.08	3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	7	13	8	4.04	1067/1639	3.85	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.04
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	20	4.61	417/1397	3.96	4.17	4.28	4.18	4.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	3	3	8	11	4.08	953/1583	3.68	3.94	4.19	4.01	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	7	8	9	3.81	981/1532	3.78	3.95	4.01	3.88	3.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	3	6	5	10	3.59	1159/1504	3.42	3.74	4.05	3.78	3.59
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	4	10			934/1612	3.99	4.25	4.16	4.10	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	3	24	4.79	840/1635	4.35	4.58	4.65	4.56	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	7	13	3	3.75	1170/1579	3.59		4.08	3.95	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	4	11	11	4.19	1148/1518	4.22	4.42	4.43	4.38	4.19
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	5	21	4.81	802/1520	4.55	4.65	4.70	4.61	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	4	4	6			1083/1517	3.88		4.27	4.20	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	1	9			920/1550	4.03	4.25	4.22	4.17	4.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	14	2	2	4	0	3		1158/1295	3.47	3.71			3.00
J. Did addiovisual techniques emmance your understanding	5	11	2		-	U	J	3.00	1130/1293	3.17	3.71	3.94	3.01	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	3	1	3	2	4	3 23	1213/1398	3.67	3.87	4.07	3.85	3.23
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	2	1	1	4	4		1197/1391	3.89	4.15	4.30	4.07	3.58
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	1	1	4	2	4		1162/1388	4.06	4.19	4.28	4.01	3.58
4. Were special techniques successful	16	2	3	1	3	1	2	2.80	888/ 958	3.01		3.93	3.71	2.80
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	3	1	3	1	2	2.00	000/ 930	3.01	3.03	3.93	3.71	2.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/ 224	****	5.00	4.10	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.10	4.01	****
	27	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 219	****	5.00		4.44	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	27	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 215	****		4.44		****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	27	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 198	****	5.00	4.35	4.43 4.25	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	U	U	U	U	U	Τ	5.00	***/ 198	* * * *	5.00	4.18	4.25	
Seminar														
	0.77	0	0	0	^	0	1	F 00	****/ OF	****	4 75	4 50	4 50	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 85	****	4.75	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82		5.00	4.52	4.12	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.39	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.16	3.90	****
-1.111														
Field Work		_	_	_	_									****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	3.61	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.05	3.51	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.79	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	4.69	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****

Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

Instructor: MITCH, DAVID F

Enrollment: 42
Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 490 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	10	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	11						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	4	Under-grad	28	Non-major	27
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

Title Instructor: DICKSON, LISA

Enrollment: 40 Questionnaires: 32 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 491 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	1						Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	5	7	18	4.35	797/1639	3.93	4.12	4.27	4.08	4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	3	10	16	4.29	822/1639	3.85	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	1	7	10	11	3.87	1105/1397	3.96	4.17	4.28	4.18	3.87
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	1	1	4	13	8	3.96	1069/1583	3.68	3.94	4.19	4.01	3.96
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	3	8	7	8	3.67	1136/1532	3.78	3.95	4.01	3.88	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	3	9	10	5	3.37	1284/1504	3.42	3.74	4.05	3.78	3.37
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	4	7	18	4.32	731/1612		4.25	4.16	4.10	4.32
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	23	8		1350/1635	4.35	4.58	4.65	4.56	4.26
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	6	14	5	3.96	955/1579	3.59	3.89	4.08	3.95	3.96
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	2	9	18	4.47	863/1518	4.22	4.42	4.43	4.38	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	4	26	4.87	648/1520	4.55	4.65	4.70	4.61	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	5	11	13	4.20	947/1517	3.88	4.14	4.27	4.20	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	3	4	2	21	4.37	805/1550	4.03	4.25	4.22	4.17	4.37
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	19	2	0	2	5	2	3.45	1006/1295	3.47	3.71	3.94	3.84	3.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	4	6	8	4.11	735/1398	3.67	3.87	4.07	3.85	4.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	1	4	6	9	4.15	895/1391	3.89	4.15	4.30	4.07	4.15
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	2	9	9	4.35	771/1388	4.06	4.19	4.28	4.01	4.35
4. Were special techniques successful	12	10	2	1	4	3	0	2.80	888/ 958	3.01	3.63	3.93	3.71	2.80

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	 7	0.00-0.99	4	А	7	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	32	Non-major	29
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	20	_			
					0						

PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

Title Instructor:

Enrollment: 79 Questionnaires: 52

CARPENTER, ROBE Fall 2007

Page 492 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

	Frequencies				Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	TIMBC	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	1	3	12	22	14	3.87	1281/1639	3.93	4.12	4.27	4.08	3.87
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	8	17	24	4.19	915/1639	3.85	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	10	15	24	4.15	888/1397	3.96	4.17	4.28	4.18	4.15
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	29	2	3	5	5	7	3.55	1390/1583	3.68	3.94	4.19	4.01	3.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	1	0	5	16	25	4.36	478/1532	3.78	3.95	4.01	3.88	4.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	43	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	****/1504	3.42	3.74	4.05	3.78	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	2	9	14	25	4.24	837/1612	3.99	4.25	4.16	4.10	4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	2	25	17	6	3.49	1603/1635	4.35	4.58	4.65	4.56	3.49
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	3	0	1	10	15	6	3.81	1125/1579	3.59	3.89	4.08	3.95	3.81
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	3	11	34	4.65	629/1518	4.22	4.42	4.43	4.38	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2		40	4.76	872/1520	4.55	4.65	4.70	4.61	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	2	11	18	16		1071/1517	3.88		4.27	4.20	4.02
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	7	16	25	4.33	841/1550	4.03	4.25	4.22	4.17	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	1	4	7	16	17	3.98	655/1295	3.47	3.71	3.94	3.84	3.98
1,									,					
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	5	3	9	10	13		1083/1398	3.67	3.87	4.07	3.85	3.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	3	3	8	9	18		1082/1391	3.89	4.15	4.30	4.07	3.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	2	0	5	13	21	4.24	841/1388	4.06	4.19	4.28	4.01	4.24
4. Were special techniques successful	11	31	1	1	4	0	4	3.50	****/ 958	3.01	3.63	3.93	3.71	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	40	11	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 224	****	5.00	4.10	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	42	0	3	1	5	0	1	2.50	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.11	4.01	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	41	9	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 219	****	5.00	4.44	4.44	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	41	9	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 215	****	5.00	4.35	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	42	8	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 198	***	5.00	4.18	4.25	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	41	6	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/ 85	****	4.75	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	41	8	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	41	10	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	41	7	0	0	2	2	0		****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	41	9	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 82	****	5.00	4.16	3.90	****
7. 11 1														
Field Work	4.0	0	_	-	_	_	-	0 50	****	als als als als	F 00	4 0 4	2 61	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	46	0	2	1	2	0	1		****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	3.61	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	45	0	2	1	1	2	1	2.86	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.05	3.51	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	45	1	0	0	1	1	4		****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.79	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	45	6	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	45	6	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.56	4.60	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	44	0	1	1	3	2	1	3.13	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	44	4	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	44	3	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	4.69	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	44	7	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	44	6	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 21	***	5.00	4.52	5.00	***

Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

Instructor: CARPENTER, ROBE

Enrollment: 79
Questionnaires: 52

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 492 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	3	А	6	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	18						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	5	C	12	General	1	Under-grad	52	Non-major	49
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	27				
				?	1						

Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

Instructor: KAIKAI, ALPHA

Enrollment: 41 Questionnaires: 40

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 493 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Frequencies			Tng	tructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean		Mean	_	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	1	6	17	13	3.90	1252/1639	3.93	4.12	4.27	4.08	3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	3	6	18	11		1313/1639		4.09	4.22	4.17	3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	5	18	13		1029/1397		4.17	4.28	4.18	3.95
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	16	1	1	7	6	9	3.88	1178/1583	3.68	3.94	4.19	4.01	3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	4	4	13		4.11	,		3.95	4.01	3.88	4.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	19	0	2	6	9	4	3.71	1083/1504	3.42	3.74	4.05	3.78	3.71
 Was the grading system clearly explained 	0	0	1	1	6	13		4.20	,		4.25	4.16	4.10	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	34			1466/1635		4.58	4.65	4.56	4.08
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	2	1	3	5	16	4	3.66	1239/1579	3.59	3.89	4.08	3.95	3.66
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	4	18	16	4.26	1094/1518	4.22	4.42	4.43	4.38	4.26
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	2	4	12	21		1318/1520		4.65	4.70	4.61	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	2	6	16	14		1071/1517		4.14	4.27	4.20	4.03
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	5	14	17		1010/1550		4.25	4.22	4.17	4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	27	3	2	1	3	3		1150/1295		3.71	3.94	3.84	3.08
	_		_	_	_	_	_							
Discussion			_		_				0.40.44.000					
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	2	7	10	8	3.79	943/1398		3.87	4.07	3.85	3.79
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	0	6	10	11	4.07	,		4.15	4.30	4.07	4.07
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	4	9	15	4.39	746/1388	4.06	4.19	4.28	4.01	4.39
4. Were special techniques successful	12	18	1	2	3	2	2	3.20	818/ 958	3.01	3.63	3.93	3.71	3.20
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	36	2	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 224	****	5.00	4.10	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.11	4.01	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/ 219	****	5.00	4.44	4.44	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	37	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/ 215	****	5.00	4.35	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	37	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/ 198	****	5.00	4.18	4.25	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	36	1	0	0	1	0	2	4 33	****/ 85	****	4.75	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	36	1	0	1	0	0	2		,	****	5.00	4.52	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	1	0	0	2		****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	1	0	2		****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	38	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00			5.00	4.16	3.90	****
- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		•		-		-	_		,					
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	1	0	2		****/ 52		5.00	4.04	3.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	37	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.05	3.51	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	37	0	0	1	0	0	2		,	****	5.00	4.75	4.79	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	37	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 37		5.00	4.58	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	37	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.56	4.60	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	37	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00			5.00	4.51	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	37	0	1	0	0	0	2		****/ 43		5.00	4.69	4.69	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	37	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	, -		5.00	4.37	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	37	0	1	0	0	0	_		****/ 21		5.00	4.52	5.00	****

Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

Instructor: KAIKAI, ALPHA

Enrollment: 41
Questionnaires: 40

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 493 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits 1	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	3	A	11	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	12						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	8	General	3	Under-grad	40	Non-major	40
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
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	20				
				?	0						

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

I 0

?

0

Instructor: KAIKAI, ALPHA

Enrollment: 41 Questionnaires: 8

		Fall		-
St.udent.	Course	Evalua	ation	Ouestionnaire

Page 494

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

							Fr	eque:	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	1042/1639	3.93	4.12	4.27	4.08	4.13
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1281/1639	3.85	4.09	4.22	4.17	3.88
3. Did th	ne exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	795/1397	3.96	4.17	4.28	4.18	4.25
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	1	0	0	4	0	3	3.86	1192/1583	3.68	3.94	4.19	4.01	3.86
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	553/1532	3.78	3.95	4.01	3.88	4.29
6. Did wr	ritten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	1171/1504	3.42	3.74	4.05	3.78	3.57
7. Was th	ne gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	364/1612	3.99	4.25	4.16	4.10	4.63
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	1	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	1428/1635	4.35	4.58	4.65	4.56	4.14
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll tead	hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	889/1579	3.59	3.89	4.08	3.95	4.00
		Lectur																
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	919/1518	4.22	4.42	4.43	4.38	4.43	
2. Did th	ne instru	n the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	1188/1520	4.55	4.65	4.70	4.61	4.50		
3. Was le	cture ma	explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	2	2	3.75	1260/1517	3.88	4.14	4.27	4.20	3.75		
4. Did th	ne lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	0	1	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1077/1550	4.03	4.25	4.22	4.17	4.00
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	3	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	806/1295	3.47	3.71	3.94	3.84	3.80
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	965/1398	3.67	3.87	4.07	3.85	3.75
2. Were a	all stude	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	616/1391	3.89	4.15	4.30	4.07	4.50
3. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	d open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	387/1388	4.06	4.19	4.28	4.01	4.75
4. Were s	special t	echniques succe	ssful		4	1	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	904/ 958	3.01	3.63	3.93	3.71	2.67
				Frequ	ency	7 Dist	trib	utio:	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27															0			
00-27 28-55						ked	quir	ea I	or Ma	ijori	5	3	Graduat	E	0	Majo)T	0
28-55 56-83						Cos	nera	1				0	Under-q	rad.	8	Non	major	8
84-150							nera	1				U	onder-g	Lau	O	11011-	·iiia JOI	0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	Б 0 F 0		רם.	ecti [.]					1	#### - :	Maana +	hara n	re not	- anous	rh
Grau.	U	P 0		ĿΙt	ECLI	ves				_	respons				_	111		

Other

Course-Section: ECON 101 1101 University of Maryland Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

Baltimore County Fall 2007

Instructor: DICKSON, LISA

Enrollment: 39 Questionnaires: 30

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 495

FEB 13, 2008

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	4	0	0	2	4	5	15	4.27	880/1639	3.93	4.12	4.27	4.08	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	1	3	7	15	4.38	709/1639	3.85	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	1	1	1	9	14	4.31	749/1397	3.96	4.17	4.28	4.18	4.31
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	5	0	4	2	7	8	3.90	1158/1583	3.68	3.94	4.19	4.01	3.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	3	1	2	6	5	8	3.77	1023/1532	3.78	3.95	4.01	3.88	3.77
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	5	4	2	4	7	4	3.24	1347/1504	3.42	3.74	4.05	3.78	3.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	1	2	1	3	19	4.42	603/1612	3.99	4.25	4.16	4.10	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	22	3	4.12	1441/1635	4.35	4.58	4.65	4.56	4.12
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	4	11	9	4.08	841/1579	3.59	3.89	4.08	3.95	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	3	4	19	4.62	670/1518	4.22	4.42	4.43	4.38	4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	5	20	4.80	802/1520	4.55	4.65	4.70	4.61	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	4	7	13	4.28	854/1517	3.88	4.14	4.27	4.20	4.28
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	7	18	4.65	468/1550	4.03	4.25	4.22	4.17	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	17	1	0	3	1	3	3.63	917/1295	3.47	3.71	3.94	3.84	3.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	1	4	2	6	3.79	943/1398	3.67	3.87	4.07	3.85	3.79
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	5	2	8	4.20	863/1391	3.89	4.15	4.30	4.07	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	624/1388	4.06	4.19	4.28	4.01	4.53
4. Were special techniques successful	15	10	1	0	3	0	1	3.00	****/ 958	3.01	3.63	3.93	3.71	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	7	General	2	Under-grad	30	Non-major	29
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13	_			
				?	0						

Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

Instructor: COBB, VINCENT

Enrollment: 39
Questionnaires: 18

Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 496 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	5	Λ	5	6	2	2 00	1599/1639	2 02	4.12	4.27	4.08	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	6	2	7	1	2		1628/1639	3.85	4.09	4.22	4.17	2.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	5	1	6	5	1		1389/1397	3.96	4.17	4.28	4.17	2.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	٥	3	4	1	4	3	3		1532/1583	3.68	3.94	4.19	4.01	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	5	2	3	4	3		1463/1532		3.95	4.01	3.88	2.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	6	2	3	4	3		1452/1504		3.74	4.05	3.78	2.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	5	1	4	4	4		1515/1612		4.25	4.16	4.10	3.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	12		958/1635	4.35	4.58	4.65	4.56	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	4	3	5	2	0		1564/1579		3.89	4.08	3.95	
J. now would fou grade one overdir bodoning circoonveness	-	Ü	-	5		_	Ü	2.50	1301/13/3	3.33	3.03	1.00	5.75	2.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	6	2	1	5	4	2.94	1488/1518	4.22	4.42	4.43	4.38	2.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	2	3	1	5	7	3.67	1478/1520	4.55	4.65	4.70	4.61	3.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	4	3	4	4	2	2.82	1480/1517	3.88	4.14	4.27	4.20	2.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	4	1	5	4	3	3.06	1436/1550	4.03	4.25	4.22	4.17	3.06
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	9	2	2	1	2	2	3.00	1158/1295	3.47	3.71	3.94	3.84	3.00
_,														
Discussion			_			_	_							
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	3	0	1	3	Τ		1316/1398		3.87	4.07	3.85	2.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	3	4		719/1391	3.89	4.15	4.30	4.07	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	3	2	2		1185/1388	4.06	4.19	4.28	4.01	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	10	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 958	3.01	3.63	3.93	3.71	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.75	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 82	****	5.00	4.16	3.90	****
5. Here offeria for grading made offder	- '	J	3	3	3	_	Ü	2.00	, 02		3.00	1.10	3.30	

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

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

Instructor: APPIAH, ELIZABE

Enrollment: 40 Questionnaires: 20

Fall 2007 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 497 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	quer	ncies			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	3	0	0	0	4	7	6		1055/1639	3.93	4.12	4.27	4.08	4.12
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	2	7	3	5		1421/1639	3.85	4.09	4.22	4.17	3.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	3	7	7			3.96	4.17	4.28	4.18	4.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	2	2	3	6	4		1418/1583	3.68		4.19	4.01	3.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	1	5	4	5		1120/1532	3.78	3.95	4.01	3.88	3.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	2	1	0	5	8	1		1194/1504	3.42	3.74	4.05	3.78	3.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	1	2	4	5	4		1375/1612	3.99	4.25	4.16	4.10	3.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	3	15		766/1635	4.35	4.58	4.65	4.56	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	2	6	5	1	3.36	1383/1579	3.59	3.89	4.08	3.95	3.36
Lecture	2	0	0	_	4	4	-	2 04	1005/1510	4 00	4 40	4 42	4 20	2 04
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	2	4	4 7	/		1285/1518	4.22	4.42	4.43	4.38	3.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2		8		1305/1520	4.55	4.65	4.70	4.61	4.35
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	2	3	8	3		1317/1517	3.88	4.14	4.27	4.20	3.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	1	5	2	7		1281/1550	4.03	4.25	4.22	4.17	3.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	1	4	2	3	3	3.23	1109/1295	3.47	3.71	3.94	3.84	3.23
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	0	0	4	2	3 50	1106/1398	3.67	3.87	4.07	3.85	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	2	1	2	2	1		1351/1391	3.89	4.15	4.30	4.07	2.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	2	1	4	1		1185/1388	4.06	4.19	4.28	4.01	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	1	1	3	3	0	3.00	841/ 958	3.01				3.00
4. Were special techniques successial	12	U	_	_	3	3	U	3.00	041/ 950	3.01	3.03	3.93	3.71	3.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	1	0	1	0	3 00	****/ 224	****	5.00	4.10	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.11	4.01	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 219	****	5.00	4.44	4.44	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	0	1	0			****	5.00	4.35	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 198	****	5.00	4.18	4.25	****
		-		-	_	_	-		,					
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.75	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.25	***
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.16	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	3.61	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.05	3.51	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.79	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	5.00	***
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.56	4.60	****
Self Paced			_	_		_		_						
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	4.69	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	1	1	0		, -	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****

Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

Instructor: AP

APPIAH, ELIZABE

Enrollment: 40
Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 497 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS

Title Instructor: APPIAH, ELIZABE

Enrollment: 40 Questionnaires: 19

Fall 2007

Page 498 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

			Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	2	2	4	2	7	3 59	1462/1639	3.93	4.12	4.27	4.08	3.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	3	6	2	5		1517/1639	3.85	4.09	4.22	4.17	3.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	3	3	2	2	7		1296/1397	3.96	4.17	4.28	4.18	3.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	2	3	3	3	4	3.27	1482/1583	3.68	3.94	4.19	4.01	3.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	3	5	2	5		1282/1532	3.78	3.95	4.01	3.88	3.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	5	1	5	3	3.27	1337/1504	3.42	3.74	4.05	3.78	3.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	5	3	2	5	3.18	1494/1612	3.99	4.25	4.16	4.10	3.18
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	0	1	15	4.76	869/1635	4.35	4.58	4.65	4.56	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	2	1	3	5	1	3.17	1448/1579	3.59	3.89	4.08	3.95	3.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	2	4	4	6	3.71	1385/1518	4.22	4.42	4.43	4.38	3.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	2	3	10	4.38	1292/1520	4.55	4.65	4.70	4.61	4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	3	4	1	6	3.38	1393/1517	3.88	4.14	4.27	4.20	3.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	6	1	7	3.65	1281/1550	4.03	4.25	4.22	4.17	3.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	2	1	3	3	5	3.57	943/1295	3.47	3.71	3.94	3.84	3.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	4	5	2	3.46	1128/1398	3.67	3.87	4.07	3.85	3.46
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	4	2	2	3	3.00	1321/1391	3.89	4.15	4.30	4.07	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	3	3	1	5	3.46	1201/1388	4.06	4.19	4.28	4.01	3.46
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	2	0	4	2	1	3.00	841/ 958	3.01	3.63	3.93	3.71	3.00
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.11	4.01	***
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.16	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	3.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	,	****	5.00	4.05	3.51	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.79	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.56	4.60	****
Self Paced				_		_								
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	4.69	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	4	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	e are not enough	ı

P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 10 ? 1

Course-Section: ECON 101H 0101 University of Maryland Title PRIN OF MICROECON-HONO Baltimore County Fall 2007

MCCONNELL, VIRG

Instructor: 9

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 7

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 499

FEB 13, 2008

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	1	6	4.86	214/1639	4.86	4.12	4.27	4.08	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	650/1639	4.43	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	196/1397	4.86	4.17	4.28	4.18	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	281/1583	4.71	3.94	4.19	4.01	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	293/1532	4.57	3.95	4.01	3.88	4.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	466/1504	4.43	3.74	4.05	3.78	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	418/1612	4.57	4.25	4.16	4.10	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.58	4.65	4.56	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	783/1579	4.14	3.89	4.08	3.95	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	529/1518	4.71	4.42	4.43	4.38	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.65	4.70	4.61	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	800/1517	4.33	4.14	4.27	4.20	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	401/1550	4.71	4.25	4.22	4.17	4.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	511/1398	4.40	3.87	4.07	3.85	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	863/1391	4.20	4.15	4.30	4.07	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	872/1388	4.20	4.19	4.28	4.01	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	725/ 958	3.50	3.63	3.93	3.71	3.50

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

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

Title

Instructor: THOMAS, MARK S

Enrollment: 38 Ouestionnaires: 20

Fall 2007 Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire Page 500

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 2 7 4 7 3.80 1326/1639 3.77 4.12 4.27 4.08 3.80 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 1 7 3 9 4.00 1090/1639 3.79 4.09 4.22 4.17 4.00 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 1 3 4 3 9 3.80 1151/1397 3.88 4.17 4.28 4.18 3.80 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 1 0 5 5 8 4.00 1010/1583 3.73 3.94 4.19 4.01 4.00 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 5 1 1 3 3 6 3.86 950/1532 3.75 3.95 4.01 3.88 3.86 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 7 2 1 3 1 5 3.50 1212/1504 3.42 3.74 4.05 3.78 3.50 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 1 1 2 3 12 4.26 802/1612 3.82 4.25 4.16 4.10 4.26 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 1 15 3 4.11 1454/1635 4.33 4.58 4.65 4.56 4.11 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 7 5 3 3.73 1185/1579 3.56 3.89 4.08 3.95 3.73 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 1 1 5 13 4.50 807/1518 4.21 4.42 4.43 4.38 4.50 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 1 4 4 10 4.21 1371/1520 4.50 4.65 4.70 4.61 4.21 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 1 5 6 8 4.05 1054/1517 3.91 4.14 4.27 4.20 4.05 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 2 0 5 4 9 3.90 1161/1550 4.00 4.25 4.22 4.17 3.90 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1 1 0 6 3 9 4.00 623/1295 3.65 3.71 3.94 3.84 4.00 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10 0 2 1 2 0 5 3.50 1106/1398 3.61 3.87 4.07 3.85 3.50 5 3.80 1124/1391 3.65 4.15 4.30 4.07 3.80 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10 0 1 2 1 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10 0 1 1 3 0 5 3.70 1112/1388 3.65 4.19 4.28 4.01 3.70 4. Were special techniques successful 11 4 0 1 0 2 3.00 841/958 3.00 3.63 3.93 3.71 3.00

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	1						
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	10	-			
				?	1						

ECON 102 0201 University of Maryland PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS Baltimore County

Title PRIN OF MACROECO
Instructor: THOMAS, MARK S

Enrollment: 36
Questionnaires: 13

OMAS, MARK S Fall 2007

Page 501 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Stude	nt Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	3	3	4	3	3 54	1484/1639	3.77	4.12	4.27	4.08	3.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	3	5		1300/1639		4.09	4.22	4.17	3.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	3	4		1204/1397		4.17	4.28	4.18	3.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	0	6	4		1010/1583		3.94	4.19	4.01	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	4	5	2		1264/1532		3.95	4.01	3.88	3.46
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	1	0	5	1		1212/1504		3.74	4.05	3.78	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31			4.25	4.16	4.10	4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	10	2	4.08	1466/1635	4.33	4.58	4.65	4.56	4.08
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	4	2	1	3.57	1284/1579	3.56	3.89	4.08	3.95	3.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	670/1518	4.21	4.42	4.43	4.38	4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	1	4	6	4.17	1383/1520	4.50	4.65	4.70	4.61	4.17
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	2	4	6	4.08	1042/1517	3.91	4.14	4.27	4.20	4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	1	5	5	3.85	1193/1550	4.00	4.25	4.22	4.17	3.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	2	2	6	4.09	581/1295	3.65	3.71	3.94	3.84	4.09
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	1207/1398	3.61	3.87	4.07	3.85	3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	1	0	2	0	2.75	1364/1391	3.65	4.15	4.30	4.07	2.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	1185/1388	3.65	4.19	4.28	4.01	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 958	3.00	3.63	3.93	3.71	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.11	4.01	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 219	****	5.00	4.44	4.44	***
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 215	****	5.00	4.35	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	5.00	4.18	4.25	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 85	****	4.75	4.58	4.50	***
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00		****	5.00	4.52	4.12	***
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.25	***
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 80		5.00	4.47	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.16	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 52		5.00	4.04	3.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 53	****	5.00	4.05	3.51	***
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.79	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.56	4.60	****
Self Paced		_	_			_	_							
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00		****	5.00	4.45	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	, -	****	5.00	4.51	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	, -	****	5.00	4.69	4.69	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	, -	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	***
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	***

Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS

Instructor: THOMAS, MARK S

Enrollment: 36
Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 501 FEB 13, 2008 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	2	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS

Title Instructor: COOMBER, WILLIA

Enrollment: 44

Fall 2007 Questionnaires: 28

Page 502 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

			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	1	0	0	0	_	1 4	_	2 01	1210/1620	2 77	4 10	4 07	4 00	2 01
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	2	6	14	5		1318/1639		4.12	4.27	4.08	3.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	10	10	5		1432/1639		4.09	4.22	4.17	3.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	4	5	10	7		1219/1397		4.17	4.28	4.18	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	1	2	3	11	5		1247/1583		3.94	4.19	4.01	3.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	9	1	2	6	4	5		1212/1532		3.95	4.01	3.88	3.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	10	2	2	4	6	3		1291/1504		3.74	4.05	3.78	3.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	2	3	6	9	6		1387/1612		4.25	4.16	4.10	3.54
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	7	19	1		1587/1635		4.58	4.65	4.56	3.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	0	9	6	3	3.67	1232/1579	3.56	3.89	4.08	3.95	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	4	11	10	4.24	1110/1518	4.21	4.42	4.43	4.38	4.24
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	7	16		1144/1520		4.65	4.70	4.61	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	5	10	9		1036/1517		4.14	4.27	4.20	4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	3	9	12	4.28	875/1550		4.25	4.22	4.17	4.28
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	2	5	12		3.78						3.78
5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	U	2	5	12	4	3.76	019/1293	3.05	3.71	3.94	3.04	3.70
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	770/1398		3.87	4.07	3.85	4.00
 Were all students actively encouraged to participate 	21	0	0	2	1	3	1	3.43	1241/1391	3.65	4.15	4.30	4.07	3.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	1	0	1	4	1	3.57	1165/1388	3.65	4.19	4.28	4.01	3.57
4. Were special techniques successful	21	3	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	****/ 958	3.00	3.63	3.93	3.71	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3 00	****/ 224	****	5.00	4.10	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 240	****	5.00	4.11	4.01	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	27	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 219	****	5.00	4.44	4.44	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	27	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 215	****	5.00	4.35	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 198	****	5.00	4.18	4.25	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	۷/	U	U	U	1	U	U	3.00	"""/ 190		5.00	4.10	4.25	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 85	****	4.75	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.16	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	3.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53		5.00	4.05	3.51	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42		5.00	4.75	4.79	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 32		5.00	4.56	4.60	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out fred accrivities	۱ ک	U	U	U	Т	U	U	3.00	/ 32		5.00	4.50	4.00	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 43		5.00	4.69	4.69	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS

Instructor:

Enrollment: 44 Questionnaires: 28

Baltimore County COOMBER, WILLIA

Fall 2007

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Frequency Distribution

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

Page 502

FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029 Course-Section: ECON 102 0401 University of Maryland
Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS Baltimore County

Instructor: COOMBER, WILLIA

Enrollment: 43
Ouestionnaires: 22

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Fall 2007

Page 503

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 5 0 3 8 4 2 3.29 1346/1532 3.75 3.95 4.01 3.88 3.29 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 3 1 2 10 2 3 3.22 1351/1504 3.42 3.74 4.05 3.78 3.22 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 3 11 4 3 3.33 1455/1612 3.82 4.25 4.16 4.10 3.33 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 4 14 3 3.95 1533/1635 4.33 4.58 4.65 4.56 3.95 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 5 12 2 3.84 1102/1579 3.56 3.89 4.08 3.95 3.84

Lecture

1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 7 5 9 4.10 1206/1518 4.21 4.42 4.43 4.38 4.10 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 3 4 14 4.52 1173/1520 4.50 4.65 4.70 4.61 4.52 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 2 5 7 7 3.90 1182/1517 3.91 4.14 4.27 4.20 3.90 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 1 5 6 8 3.90 1161/1550 4.00 4.25 4.22 4.17 3.90 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 5 0 3 2 5 6 3.88 753/1295 3.65 3.71 3.94 3.84 3.88

Discussion

1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 0 5 2 1 3.50 1106/1398 3.61 3.87 4.07 3.85 3.50 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 14 0 1 0 3 2 2 3.50 1220/1391 3.65 4.15 4.30 4.07 3.50 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 14 0 0 1 5 0 2 3.38 1235/1388 3.65 4.19 4.28 4.01 3.38 4. Were special techniques successful 14 3 0 0 3 0 2 3.80 ****/ 958 3.00 3.63 3.93 3.71 ****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	3	Under-grad	22	Non-major	19
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	2						

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

Instructor: FALCON, JAIME

Enrollment: 40 Questionnaires: 30

		Fall		- 1
Student	Course	Evalua	tion	Ouestionnaire

Page 504

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

					Frequencies					Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Question	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 L															
1. Did yo	u gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	2	0	0	1	4	10	13	4.25	890/1639	3.77	4.12	4.27	4.08	4.25
2. Did th	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	2	0	0	0	4	8	16	4.43	650/1639	3.79	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.43
3. Did th	e exam q	uestions reflec	the e	expected goals	3	0	0	0	3	6	18	4.56	467/1397	3.88	4.17	4.28	4.18	4.56
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	2	0	0	3	3	6	16	4.25	792/1583	3.73	3.94	4.19	4.01	4.25
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contrib	ite to	what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	9	15	4.41	441/1532	3.75	3.95	4.01	3.88	4.41
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	2	0	0	3	6	6	13	4.04	807/1504	3.42	3.74	4.05	3.78	4.04
7. Was th	e gradin	g system clearly	y expla	ined	2	0	0	0	2	5	21	4.68	305/1612	3.82	4.25	4.16	4.10	4.68
8. How ma	ny times	was class cance	elled		2	0	0	0	0	13	15	4.54	1114/1635	4.33	4.58	4.65	4.56	4.54
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll tead	hing effectiveness	10	0	0	0	4	3	13	4.45	450/1579	3.56	3.89	4.08	3.95	4.45
1. Were t	he instr	prepared	3	0	0	0	3	5	19	4.59	696/1518	4.21	4.42	4.43	4.38	4.59		
2. Did th	e instru	n the subject	3	0	0	0	1	1	25	4.89	597/1520	4.50	4.65	4.70	4.61	4.89		
3. Was le	cture ma	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	3	0	0	0	3	5	19	4.59	486/1517	3.91	4.14	4.27	4.20	4.59
4. Did th	e lectur	es contribute to	what	you learned	3	0	0	2	1	6	18	4.48	664/1550	4.00	4.25	4.22	4.17	4.48
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	nance y	our understanding	4	14	0	1	3	2	6	4.08	586/1295	3.65	3.71	3.94	3.84	4.08
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ite to	what you learned	18	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	625/1398	3.61	3.87	4.07	3.85	4.25
2. Were a	ll stude	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	18	0	0	1	0	5	6	4.33	752/1391	3.65	4.15	4.30	4.07	4.33
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	d open discussion	18	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	647/1388	3.65	4.19	4.28	4.01	4.50
4. Were s	pecial to	echniques succe	ssful		18	7	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/ 958	3.00	3.63	3.93	3.71	****
				Frequ	iency	Dist	ribu	ution	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	.s			Ty	pe			Majors	;
														- 				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 12		Red	quire	ed fo	or M	ajor	s	4	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	в 4														
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 4		Ger	nera!	1				5	Under-g	rad 3	0	Non-	major	30
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0 P 0	Electives							0	#### - 1 respons				_	ιh

Other

I 0

?

0

11

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS GINDLING, THOMA

Instructor: Enrollment: 40 Questionnaires: 22 Fall 2007

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 505 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

	-			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect				
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	7	14	4.59	518/1639	3.77	4.12	4.27	4.08	4.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	8	11	4.36	735/1639	3.79	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	15	4.64	392/1397	3.88	4.17	4.28	4.18	4.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	3	5	7	4.27	781/1583	3.73	3.94	4.19	4.01	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	3	8	9	4.30	535/1532	3.75	3.95	4.01	3.88	4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	11	6	4.35	529/1504	3.42	3.74	4.05	3.78	4.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	4	15	4.55	449/1612	3.82	4.25	4.16	4.10	4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	17	5	4.23	1374/1635	4.33	4.58	4.65	4.56	4.23
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	4	9	7	4.15	772/1579	3.56	3.89	4.08	3.95	4.15
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	213/1518	4.21	4.42	4.43	4.38	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	546/1520	4.50	4.65	4.70	4.61	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	4	16	4.64	439/1517	3.91	4.14	4.27	4.20	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	325/1550	4.00	4.25	4.22	4.17	4.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	14	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	****/1295	3.65	3.71	3.94	3.84	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	2	3	7	4.15	702/1398	3.61		4.07	3.85	4.15
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	4	2	7	4.23	831/1391	3.65	4.15	4.30	4.07	4.23
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	752/1388	3.65	4.19	4.28	4.01	4.38
4. Were special techniques successful	9	10	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 958	3.00	3.63	3.93	3.71	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 224	****	5.00	4.10	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.11	4.01	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 219	****	5.00	4.44	4.44	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 215	****	5.00	4.35	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	5.00	4.18	4.25	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 85	****	4.75	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.16	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	3.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.05	3.51	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.79	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.56	4.60	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	4.69	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 21	***	5.00	4.52	5.00	****

Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS

Instructor: GINDLING, THOMA

Enrollment: 40
Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 505 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	10	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	2	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						

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

Instructor: APPIAH, ELIZABE

Enrollment: 65 Questionnaires: 28

Fall 2007 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 506

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies						Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	4	11	8	3	3.21	1575/1639	3.77	4.12	4.27	4.08	3.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	5	10	9	2	3.14	1570/1639	3.79	4.09	4.22	4.17	3.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	6	8	9	2	3.04	1360/1397	3.88	4.17	4.28	4.18	3.04
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	4	7	5	5	2	2.74	1569/1583	3.73	3.94	4.19	4.01	2.74
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	2	3	5	8	4	3.41	1300/1532	3.75	3.95	4.01	3.88	3.41
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	7	7	4	5	2	1	2.26	1490/1504	3.42	3.74	4.05	3.78	2.26
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	9	6	7	4	1	2.33	1586/1612	3.82	4.25	4.16	4.10	2.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	25	4.93	529/1635	4.33	4.58	4.65	4.56	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	1	4	10	4	0	2.89	1514/1579	3.56	3.89	4.08	3.95	2.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	7	10	4	4	3.04	1479/1518	4.21	4.42	4.43	4.38	3.04
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	6	8	12	4.15	1388/1520	4.50	4.65	4.70	4.61	4.15
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	7	5	10	4	1	2.52	1500/1517	3.91	4.14	4.27	4.20	2.52
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	6	8	5	3	2.88	1465/1550	4.00	4.25	4.22	4.17	2.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	11	4	4	5	2	1	2.50	1247/1295	3.65	3.71	3.94	3.84	2.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	3	1	7	2	1	2 79	1326/1398	3.61	3.87	4.07	3.85	2.79
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	3	3	5	3		1200/1391	3.65	4.15	4.30	4.07	3.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	3	1	3	5	2		1297/1388	3.65	4.19	4.28	4.01	3.14
4. Were special techniques successful	14	6	2	1	1	3	1	3.00	. ,		3.63	3.93	3.71	3.00
Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									

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

Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS

Instructor: COBB, VINCENT

Enrollment: 32
Questionnaires: 12

Fall 2

Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 507 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	2	3	0	5	3.33	1546/1639	3.77	4.12	4.27	4.08	3.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	3	1	4	3.25	1553/1639	3.79	4.09	4.22	4.17	3.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	2	6	3.83	1131/1397	3.88	4.17	4.28	4.18	3.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	3	0	1	2	4	3.40	1449/1583	3.73	3.94	4.19	4.01	3.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	2	1	2	3	3.75	1046/1532	3.75	3.95	4.01	3.88	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	2	1	4	3.17	1371/1504	3.42	3.74	4.05	3.78	3.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	2	3	3	3.55	1383/1612	3.82	4.25	4.16	4.10	3.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1635	4.33	4.58	4.65	4.56	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	2	1	1	1	0	2.20	1568/1579	3.56	3.89	4.08	3.95	2.20
T o whome														
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	2	1	_	2 72	1378/1518	4.21	4 40	4.43	4.38	3.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	Ţ	0	0	0	1	Τ.	7		1115/1520	4.21	4.42	4.43	4.38	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2 2	0	2	1	7	1	4		1384/1517	3.91	4.14	4.70	4.20	3.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	1	- 4		1161/1550	4.00	4.14	4.27	4.20	3.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	1	1	0	Τ	2		1101/1295			3.94		3.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	О	1	1	U	U	2	3.25	1101/1295	3.05	3./1	3.94	3.84	3.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	3	1	2	3.43	1150/1398	3.61	3.87	4.07	3.85	3.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	2	0	0	3	3	3.63	1187/1391	3.65	4.15	4.30	4.07	3.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	2	0	2	2	1	3.00	1320/1388	3.65	4.19	4.28	4.01	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 958	3.00	3.63	3.93	3.71	****
T. D. Control														
Laboratory	1.0	-1	0	0	0	0	1	F 00	**** / 004		г оо	4 10	2 00	****
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	T	0	0	0	U	T		****/ 224		5.00	4.10	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	Τ	U	0	U	U	1.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.11	4.01	***

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

Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I

Instructor: ST MARTIN, JEAN

Enrollment: 36
Questionnaires: 25

ST MARTIN, JEAN Fall 2007

Page 508 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

			Fre	eanei	ncies			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	3	6	14	4.48	656/1639	4.41	4.12	4.27	4.08	4.48
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	6	17	4.74	273/1639	4.52	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.74
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	5	17	4.70	342/1397	4.50	4.17	4.28	4.18	4.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	5	0	0	1	3		4.72	270/1583	4.20	3.94	4.19	4.01	4.72
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	2	0	2	4	3	11	4.15	663/1532	4.27	3.95	4.01	3.88	4.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	8	0	1	4	3	6	4.00	824/1504	3.90	3.74	4.05	3.78	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	2	4		4.64	352/1612	4.63	4.25	4.16	4.10	4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	1	9	11		1165/1635	4.78	4.58	4.65	4.56	4.48
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	2	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	352/1579	4.38	3.89	4.08	3.95	4.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	19	4.78	397/1518	4.67	4.42	4.43	4.38	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	273/1520	4.79	4.65	4.70	4.61	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	263/1517	4.53	4.14	4.27	4.20	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	276/1550	4.59	4.25	4.22	4.17	4.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	14	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	561/1295	3.84	3.71	3.94		4.13
1														
Discussion		_	_				_							
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	1	0	4	7	4.15	702/1398	4.14	3.87	4.07	3.85	4.15
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	594/1391	4.30	4.15	4.30	4.07	4.54
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	624/1388	4.26	4.19	4.28	4.01	4.54
4. Were special techniques successful	12	6	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	87/ 958	4.19	3.63	3.93	3.71	4.86
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 224	****	5.00	4.10	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.11	4.01	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 219	****	5.00	4.44	4.44	***
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 215	****	5.00	4.35	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 198	****	5.00	4.18	4.25	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 85	****	4.75	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.25	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 82	****	5.00	4.16	3.90	****
or nois offocial for grading made offoci		Ü	Ü	Ü	ŭ	Ū	_	3.00	, 02		3.00	1.10	3.30	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	3.61	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.05	3.51	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.79	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.56	4.60	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	4.69	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	0	1	0	0	1		****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****
1 onois onough proceed for all one beauciful	23	J	3	_	3	5	_	2.33	, 21		2.00	1.52	2.00	

Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I

Instructor: ST MARTIN, JEAN

Enrollment: 36
Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 508 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	5	General	2	Under-grad	25	Non-major	22
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	1						

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

Enrollment:

40

Baltimore County Fall 2007

University of Maryland Page 509 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Ouestionnaires: 27	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
--------------------	---------	--------	------------	---------------

						Frequencies In		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 -) i d	anin nor	Genera insights,ski	_	m this source	1	0	0	0	2	6	17	4.54	582/1639	4.41	4.12	4.27	4.08	4.54
	_	-	or make clear			1	0	0	0	2	6	18	4.62	404/1639	4.52	4.12	4.27	4.17	4.62
			estions reflec			1	0	0	0	2	10	14	4.46	574/1397	4.50	4.17	4.28	4.18	4.46
		_	ations reflect			1	6	0	1	2	7	10	4.30	741/1583	4.20	3.94	4.19	4.10	4.30
					what you learned	1	8	3	3	2	4	5		1353/1532	4.20	3.95	4.19	3.88	3.28
		_	_		what you learned o what you learne		9	0	1	4	3	8	4.13	,		3.74	4.01	3.78	4.13
			system clearly			u 2	0	0	1	0	2	22		166/1612		4.25	4.16	4.10	4.13
			as class canc		Illea	2	0	0	0	0	13	12		1155/1635	4.78	4.58	4.65	4.56	4.48
	_				hing offoatiwonoa		0	0	0	1	2	13		175/1579	4.38	3.89	4.08		4.75
э. п	9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiven						U	U	U	Τ	2	13	4.75	1/5/15/9	4.30	3.09	4.00	3.95	4.75
			Lectur	۵															
1. W	Were the	instruc	tor's lecture	_	prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	21	4.84	301/1518	4.67	4.42	4.43	4.38	4.84
			or seem inter			2	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	597/1520	4.79	4.65	4.70	4.61	4.88
					xplained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	4	20	4.76	287/1517	4.53	4.14	4.27	4.20	4.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					2	0	0	0	0	5	20	4.80	288/1550	4.59	4.25	4.22	4.17	4.80	
	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding						14	0	1	4	1	5	3.91	731/1295		3.71	3.94	3.84	
J. 2		0110441	occiminadach cir	ilalioc j	our unacrocunating	_		Ü	-	-	_		3.71	,01,12,0	3.01	3.71	3.71	3.01	3.71
			Discus	sion															
1. D	oid clas	s discus	sions contrib	ute to	what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	294/1398	4.14	3.87	4.07	3.85	4.71
2. W	Were all	student	s actively en	courage	d to participate	18	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	579/1391	4.30	4.15	4.30	4.07	4.56
3. D	Did the	instruct	or encourage	fair an	d open discussion	19	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	546/1388	4.26	4.19	4.28	4.01	4.63
4. W	Were spe	cial ted	hniques succe	ssful		18	5	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 958	4.19	3.63	3.93	3.71	****
					Fre	quency	/ Dis	trib	ution	n									
Cred	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad								Rea	ason	s			Туј	pe			Majors	\$
00-		2	0.00-0.99	0	A 8		Re	quir	ed fo	or M	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	2
28-		2	1.00-1.99	0	В 9				_	1									
56-		2	2.00-2.99	3	C 0	General 1			Τ	Under-g	rad 2	27	Non-	major	25				
	-150	3	3.00-3.49	7	D 0	=1				0			,			,			
Gra	aa.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Electives				2	#### - 1				_	ın		
					P 0					ıiican	ıt								
					I 0		Ot	her				1	.5						

1 ?

Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I

Instructor: COLE, RICHARD

Enrollment: 39
Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 510 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ouestions	NR	NA	Fre	-	ncies 3	4	5		ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	2	2	9	11	4.21	939/1639	4.41	4.12	4.27	4.08	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	7	14	4.46	600/1639	4.52	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	7	15	4.50	517/1397	4.50	4.17	4.28	4.18	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	3	5	14	4.50	476/1583	4.20	3.94	4.19	4.01	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	1	6	15	4.64	256/1532		3.95	4.01	3.88	4.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	1	3	6	8	4.17	701/1504	3.90	3.74	4.05	3.78	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	4	18	4.67	317/1612		4.25	4.16	4.10	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	0	23	4.92	595/1635		4.58	4.65		4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	461/1579	4.38	3.89	4.08	3.95	4.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	271/1518	4.67	4.42	4.43	4.38	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	961/1520	4.79	4.65	4.70		4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	0	4	17	4.64	439/1517	4.53	4.14	4.27	4.20	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	3	16	4.67			4.25	4.22		4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	5	3	2	3	3	5	3.31	1076/1295		3.71		3.84	3.31
1									,					
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	5	4	8	4.00	770/1398	4.14	3.87	4.07	3.85	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	1	5	4	7	3.83	1106/1391	4.30	4.15	4.30	4.07	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	6	3	8	3.94	998/1388	4.26	4.19	4.28	4.01	3.94
4. Were special techniques successful	7	12	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	****/ 958	4.19	3.63	3.93	3.71	***
T a la seca la seco														
Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	2 00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.11	4.01	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 219	****	5.00	4.11	4.01	***
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	U	U	U	U	1	U	1.00	/ 219		3.00	1.11	1.11	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	3.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.05	3.51	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.79	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 32		5.00	4.51	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	4.69	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****
Frequ	ency	Dist	rib	utio	n									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	 5	0.00-0.99	2	A	8	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	1	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	13						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	24	Non-major	24
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	18	_			
				2	0						

PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I

Title Instructor: COLE, RICHARD

Enrollment: 35

Questionnaires: 23

Baltimore County Fall 2007

University of Maryland

Page 511 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

						Fre	eque	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
		General															
1 Did vo	u gain n		s from this course	3	0	0	1	6	6	7	3 95	1195/1639	4 41	4.12	4.27	4.08	3.95
_	-	ctor make clear th		3	0	0	0	5	7	8	4.15	959/1639		4.09	4.22	4.17	4.15
			the expected goals	2	0	0	1	1	10	9				4.17		4.18	4.29
	_	uations reflect th		2	3	1	2	3	8	4		1324/1583		3.94	4.19		3.67
			e to what you learned	3	0	0	2	0	9	9	4.25	580/1532		3.95	4.01	3.88	4.25
			ute to what you learned	3	4	1	0	5	7			1104/1504		3.74	4.05	3.78	3.69
		g system clearly	-	3	0	0	0	1			4.70			4.25	4.16	4.10	4.70
		was class cancel		3	0	0	0	1	4		4.70			4.58	4.65		4.70
			teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	2	9			795/1579			4.08	3.95	
		Lecture															
1. Were th	he instr	uctor's lectures	well prepared	3	0	1	0	3	6	10	4.20	1141/1518	3 4.67	4.42	4.43	4.38	4.20
			ted in the subject	3	0	0	1	2	7	10		1338/1520		4.65	4.70	4.61	4.30
			and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	6	5		4.15			4.14	4.27	4.20	4.15
		es contribute to	-	3	0	1	0	4	5			982/1550		4.25		4.17	
			nce your understanding	4	7	4	1	1	4			1195/1295		3.71			
J. 214 44		_	-	-	•	-	_	_	-	_	2.,,2	1173, 127	. 5.01	3.71	3.71	3.01	2.,,2
1 Did cla	agg diga	Discussions contribute	on e to what you learned	8	0	3	3	3	4	2	2 93	1300/1398	3 4.14	3.87	4.07	3.85	2.93
			uraged to participate	8	0	2	1	2	8			1230/1393		4.15	4.30	4.07	3.47
		_	ir and open discussion	8	0	1	1	5	3	_		1130/1388		4.19	4.28		3.67
		echniques success		8	10	3	0	1	1	0		****/ 958			3.93		****
		Laborato:	ry														
2. Were ye	ou provi	ded with adequate	background information	21	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.11	4.01	****
		Seminar															
2. Was the	e instru	ctor available for	r individual attention	20	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	4.12	****
		Field Wo:															
1. Did fi	eld expe	rience contribute	to what you learned	21	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	3.61	****
2. Did you	u clearl	y understand your	evaluation criteria	21	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.05	3.51	****
		Self Pa															
			e to what you learned	22	0	1	0	0	0	0				5.00	4.45	4.54	****
		tions make clear		21	0	0	0	2	0	0		****/ 32		5.00	4.51	4.67	****
3. Were y	our cont	acts with the ins	tructor helpful	21	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	4.69	****
			Frequ	ıency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade							Re	ason	s			Ту	⁄pe			Majors	\$
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	 1 A 7	Required for Majors					1	 Graduat	 :e	 0	Majo	 or	0		
28-55	3		0 B 11											5 -			
56-83	3		3 C 1	General						0	Under-	rad :	23	Non-	-major	23	
84-150	1		3 D 0												3	-	
Grad.	0		3 F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				2	#### -	Means	there a	re not	enoue	1h
	-		P 0										ses to l			_	,
			- 0							-		1000011		91.			

Other

14

I 0

Course-Section: ECON 121 0701 University of Mary Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I Baltimore Count Instructor: MEDICUS, SUZANN Fall 2007

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 16

38

University of Maryland Page 512
Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008
Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

					Frequencies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect				
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	u gain n	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	257/1639	4.41	4.12	4.27	4.08	4.80
_	_	ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	349/1639	4.52	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.67
		uestions reflec			1	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	302/1397	4.50	4.17	4.28	4.18	4.73
	_	uations reflect		_	1	5	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	741/1583	4.20	3.94	4.19	4.01	4.30
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	203/1532	4.27	3.95	4.01	3.88	4.71
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	1	7	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	964/1504	3.90	3.74	4.05	3.78	3.88
7. Was th	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	1	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	317/1612	4.63	4.25	4.16	4.10	4.67
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1635	4.78	4.58	4.65	4.56	5.00
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	5	1	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	382/1579	4.38	3.89	4.08	3.95	4.50
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	_	prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	529/1518	4.67	4.42	4.43	4.38	4.71
		ctor seem inter			2	0	0	0	0			5.00	1/1520	4.79	4.65	4.70	4.61	5.00
	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly					0	0	0	2		- 8		700/1517	4.53	4.14	4.27	4.20	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					2	0	0	0	0	2	12		231/1550			4.22	4.17	4.86
	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding				2	4	0	0	0	3	7		167/1295		3.71			4.70
		Discus	gion															
1 Did cl	agg digo			what you learned	9	0	0	0	Ο	3	4	4.57	386/1398	4 14	3.87	4.07	3.85	4.57
				d to participate	9	0	0	0	0	1		4.86	279/1391		4.15	4.30	4.07	4.86
				d open discussion	9	0	0	0	2	1	4		815/1388	4.26	4.19	4.28	4.01	4.29
		echniques succe		a open arroadron	9	3	0	0	1	1	2		349/ 958	4.19	3.63	3.93	3.71	4.25
				Frequ	ong	. Dia	t wib	1+101	2									
				riequ	епсу	DIS	CLID	10101	.1									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r r	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	в 5	Required for Majors							3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 1	General				1	Under-g	rad 1	.6	Non-	major	16			
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0	General										-			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ιh
				P 0	responses to be			e sign	ificar	ıt								
				I 0		Otl	her				1	.0						

0

Baltimore County Fall 2007

Course-Section: ECON 121 0801 University of Maryland Page 513 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029 Instructor: MEDICUS, SUZANN

Enrollment:	39				
Questionnaires:	28	Student Co	ourse	Evaluation	Questionnaire

? 2

						Frequencies					Instructor		Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect	
Questions			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	0	4	10	14	4.36	797/1639	4.41	4.12	4.27	4.08	4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals					0	0	0	0	2	10	16	4.50	517/1639	4.52	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals					0	0	0	0	1	10	17	4.57	447/1397	4.50	4.17	4.28	4.18	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals					1	9	0	2	3	7	6	3.94	1098/1583	4.20	3.94	4.19	4.01	3.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned					1	0	0	0	1	15	11	4.37	469/1532	4.27	3.95	4.01	3.88	4.37
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned					2	11	1	2	3	6	3	3.53	1194/1504	3.90	3.74	4.05	3.78	3.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained					1	0	1	0	2	11	13	4.30	767/1612	4.63	4.25	4.16	4.10	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled					1	0	0	0	0	1	26	4.96	265/1635	4.78	4.58	4.65	4.56	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness				8	0	0	1	3	11	5	4.00	889/1579	4.38	3.89	4.08	3.95	4.00	
		Lectur	Α															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared					2	0	0	0	1	5	20	4.73	491/1518	4.67	4.42	4.43	4.38	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject					2	0	0	0	0	4	22	4.85	699/1520	4.79	4.65	4.70	4.61	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly					2	0	0	0	4	6	16	4.46	648/1517	4.53	4.14	4.27	4.20	4.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					2	0	0	1	1	5	19	4.62	511/1550	4.59	4.25	4.22	4.17	4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding			-	3	1	2	2	3	4	13	4.00	623/1295		3.71		3.84	4.00	
Discussion								_	_	_		=00/4000						
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned				17	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	539/1398	4.14	3.87	4.07	3.85	4.36	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate				17	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	516/1391	4.30	4.15	4.30	4.07	4.64	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion			17	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	693/1388	4.26	4.19	4.28	4.01	4.45		
4. Were special techniques successful			17	2	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	456/ 958	4.19	3.63	3.93	3.71	4.00		
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utior	ı									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Reasons							Type			Majors				
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	2	A 4		Red	quire	ed fo	or M	ajor	S	1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В 13		_					_				_			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 0		Gei	General				1		Under-g	rad 2	18	Non-	major	27
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D 0														
Grad.						Ele	Electives 0					U	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant					
				P 0		∩ +1	har				1	Ω	respons	es to E	e sign	ıııcan	I L	
	I 0 Other						Other 18											

PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I

Title Instructor: HARDY, TIMOTHY

Enrollment: 33 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 514 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Frequencies			Ins	tructor	Course Dept		UMBC	Level	Sect		
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	8	12	4.52	593/1639	4.41	4.12	4.27	4.08	4.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	12	4.48	567/1639	4.52	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	6	11	4.29	767/1397	4.50	4.17	4.28	4.18	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	1	4	6	6	4.00	1010/1583	4.20	3.94	4.19	4.01	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	7	12	4.48	366/1532	4.27	3.95	4.01	3.88	4.48
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	1	2	4	6	3.93	920/1504	3.90	3.74	4.05	3.78	3.93
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	1	17	4.62	376/1612	4.63	4.25	4.16	4.10	4.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	331/1635	4.78	4.58	4.65	4.56	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	0	1	7	9	4.28	634/1579	4.38	3.89	4.08	3.95	4.28
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	745/1518	4.67	4.42	4.43	4.38	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	802/1520	4.79	4.65	4.70	4.61	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	4	13	4.50	597/1517	4.53	4.14	4.27	4.20	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	5	10	4.20	944/1550	4.59	4.25	4.22	4.17	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	1	3	5	7	3.94	687/1295	3.84	3.71	3.94	3.84	3.94
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	3	3	9	4.25	625/1398	4.14	3.87	4.07	3.85	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	2	2	3	9	4.19	871/1391	4.30	4.15	4.30	4.07	4.19
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	2	4	-	4.31	795/1388	4.26	4.19	4.28	4.01	4.31
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	0	3	2	2	4		670/ 958		3.63			
	_	_	-	-	_	_	_		,					
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 224	****	5.00	4.10	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.11	4.01	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 219	****	5.00	4.44	4.44	****
		-	_	-		-	-		,					
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 85	****	4.75	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 82	****	5.00	4.16	3.90	****
or note official for grading made office		ŭ	Ü	_	Ū	Ü	Ū	2.00	, 02		3.00	1.10	3.70	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	3.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.05	3.51	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.79	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.56	4.60	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	4.69	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****
		-	-	-	-	-	-	3	,					

Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I

Instructor: HARDY, TIMOTHY

Enrollment: 33
Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 514 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

PRIN OF ACCOUNTING II

Title Instructor: MCBRIDE, CHUCK

Enrollment: 31 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 515 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	cies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	670/1639	3.69	4.12	4.27	4.08	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	774/1639	3.62	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	367/1397	3.58	4.17	4.28	4.18	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	654/1583	3.55	3.94	4.19	4.01	4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	535/1532	4.14	3.95	4.01	3.88	4.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	5	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	329/1504	3.67	3.74	4.05	3.78	4.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	418/1612	4.08	4.25	4.16	4.10	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	1273/1635	4.67	4.58	4.65	4.56	4.36
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	623/1579	3.37	3.89	4.08	3.95	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	770/1518	3.85	4.42	4.43	4.38	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	0	3	9		1166/1520	4.37	4.65	4.70	4.61	4.54
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	4		4.54	560/1517	3.54	4.14	4.27	4.20	4.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	545/1550	3.43	4.25	4.22	4.17	4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	8	1	0	3	0	1	3.00	1158/1295	2.88	3.71	3.94	3.84	3.00
Discussion						_			=== /4 = = =					
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	770/1398	3.48	3.87	4.07	3.85	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	543/1391	4.37	4.15	4.30	4.07	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11 11	0 2	0	0 1	2 1	1 0	2	4.00	944/1388	4.25	4.19	4.28	4.01	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	ΤŢ	2	U	Τ	1	U	1	3.33	****/ 958	2.40	3.63	3.93	3.71	* * * *
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	2	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 224	****	5.00	4.10	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	1	1	1		****/ 240	****	5.00	4.11	4.01	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	1	0	1	0	0	1		****/ 219	****	5.00	4.44	4.44	***
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	1	0	0	1		****/ 215	****	5.00	4.35	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 198	****	5.00	4.18	4.25	****
Seminar		0	0	0	-	0	-	4 00	****		4 55	4 50	4 50	***
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	1 1	0	1		****/ 85	****	4.75	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	1	-	0		0	0		****/ 82 ****/ 78	****	5.00	4.52	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14 14	1 0	0	0	1 1	0	0 1		****/ 78 ****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.25 4.39	****
 Did presentations contribute to what you learned Were criteria for grading made clear 	14	0	0	1	0	0	1		****/ 82	****	5.00	4.47	3.90	****
• •	11	U	U		U	U	1	3.30	/ 02		3.00	4.10	3.90	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	1.50	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	3.61	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 53	****	5.00	4.05	3.51	***
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.79	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.56	4.60	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	1.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	4.67	***
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	1	0	0	1		****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	4.69	***
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****

Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING II

Instructor: MCBRIDE, CHUCK

Enrollment: 31
Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 515 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	С	3	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	12
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

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

Title Baltimore County Instructor: COAKLEY, DONALD Fall 2007

Enrollment: 39 Questionnaires: 18

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 516

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies						Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	3	7	3	2	2.89	1619/1639	3.69	4.12	4.27	4.08	2.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	8	6	0	2	2.56	1625/1639	3.62	4.09	4.22	4.17	2.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	7	4	5	1	2.89	1380/1397	3.58	4.17	4.28	4.18	2.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	3	1	1	2	1	2.63	1574/1583	3.55	3.94	4.19	4.01	2.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	4	5	6	3.72	1081/1532	4.14	3.95	4.01	3.88	3.72
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	1	1	1	4	1	3.38	1278/1504	3.67	3.74	4.05	3.78	3.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	5	3	6	2	3.06	1515/1612	4.08	4.25	4.16	4.10	3.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	397/1635	4.67	4.58	4.65	4.56	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	2	7	5	1	0	2.33	1565/1579	3.37	3.89	4.08	3.95	2.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	4	4	4	6	0	2.67	1502/1518	3.85	4.42	4.43	4.38	2.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	3	2	9	4		1462/1520	4.37	4.65	4.70	4.61	3.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	8	5	3	0	2.50	1501/1517	3.54	4.14	4.27	4.20	2.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	8	3	4	2	1	2.17	1514/1550	3.43	4.25	4.22	4.17	2.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	6	1	6	1	2	2.50	1247/1295	2.88	3.71	3.94	3.84	2.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	4	0	2	2	1		1353/1398	3.48	3.87	4.07	3.85	2.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9 9	0	2	0	0	3	4		1137/1391	4.37	4.15	4.30	4.07	3.78
. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion		0	0	1	2	4	2		1088/1388	4.25	4.19	4.28	4.01	3.78
4. Were special techniques successful	9	7	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 958	2.40	3.63	3.93	3.71	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	5	C	7	General	1	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	4	D	4						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						

Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING II

HARDY, TIMOTHY

Instructor: Enrollment:

30 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 517 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies							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	5	4	3	3.50	1497/1639	3.69	4.12	4.27	4.08	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	2	3	6		1294/1639	3.62	4.09	4.22	4.17	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	2	1	3	4	3.07	1356/1397	3.58	4.17	4.28	4.18	3.07
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	1	6	4	3.85	1198/1583	3.55	3.94	4.19	4.01	3.85
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	553/1532	4.14	3.95	4.01	3.88	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	5	4	3.79	1026/1504	3.67	3.74	4.05	3.78	3.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	0	1	11	4.50	490/1612	4.08	4.25	4.16	4.10	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	529/1635	4.67	4.58	4.65	4.56	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	2	7	1	3.64	1251/1579	3.37	3.89	4.08	3.95	3.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	2	2	9	4.29	1069/1518	3.85	4.42	4.43	4.38	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	1060/1520	4.37	4.65	4.70	4.61	4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	2	5	6	4.07	1042/1517		4.14	4.27	4.20	4.07
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	4	3	4	3.50	1328/1550	3.43	4.25	4.22	4.17	3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	2	2	3	6	3.79	819/1295	2.88	3.71	3.94	3.84	3.79
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	3	5	2	3.64	1052/1398	3.48	3.87	4.07	3.85	3.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	4	2	5	4.09	940/1391	4.37	4.15	4.30	4.07	4.09
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	693/1388	4.25	4.19	4.28	4.01	4.45
4. Were special techniques successful	3	6	1	2	1	1	0	2.40	928/ 958	2.40	3.63	3.93	3.71	2.40
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 224	****	5.00	4.10	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.11	4.01	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.39	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	3.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.05	3.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	4.67	****
Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	ution	n									

Credits I	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 122 0601 University of Maryland

Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING II Baltimore County Instructor: COAKLEY, DONALD Fall 2007

Enrollment: 31 Questionnaires: 13

4. Were special techniques successful

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 518 FEB 13, 2008

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	1	0	1	1	6	3	1	3.17	1583/1639	3.69	4.12	4.27	4.08	3.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	2	5	1	2	2.92	1603/1639	3.62	4.09	4.22	4.17	2.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	3	3	3	1	2.83	1385/1397	3.58	4.17	4.28	4.18	2.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	3	1	1	2	0	2.29	1576/1583	3.55	3.94	4.19	4.01	2.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	1	5	4	4.00	774/1532	4.14	3.95	4.01	3.88	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	2	0	2	4	0	3.00	1415/1504	3.67	3.74	4.05	3.78	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	1	2	2	5	3.82	1245/1612	4.08	4.25	4.16	4.10	3.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1635	4.67	4.58	4.65	4.56	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	2	1	4	2	0	2.67	1541/1579	3.37	3.89	4.08	3.95	2.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	2	3	1	4	3.25	1459/1518	3.85	4.42	4.43	4.38	3.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	1400/1520	4.37	4.65	4.70	4.61	4.08
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	7	2	2	1	2.75	1488/1517	3.54	4.14	4.27	4.20	2.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	1	2	4	1	2.75	1476/1550	3.43	4.25	4.22	4.17	2.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	3	2	1	2	0	2.25	1265/1295	2.88	3.71	3.94	3.84	2.25
Discussion														
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned		0	Ο	3	2	Ο	0	2.40	1364/1398	3.48	3.87	4.07	3.85	2.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	332/1391	4.37	4.15	4.30	4.07	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	872/1388	4.25	4.19	4.28	4.01	4.20
J. Dia the instructor encourage rair and open discussion	0	U	9	9		O		1.20	0,2/1300	1.23	1.17	1.20	1.01	1.20

Frequency Distribution

1

0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 958 2.40 3.63 3.93 3.71 ****

8 4

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	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	10				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ECON 122 0801 University of Maryland PRIN OF ACCOUNTING II Baltimore County

Title FEB 13, 2008 Instructor: MCBRIDE, CHUCK Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 27

Ouest	ionnaires:	16	

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies

Instructor

Page 519

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

							т т.	-que	TCTC			1110	craccor	COULDC	DCPC	OFIDC	TC A C T	DCCC
	Questions				NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	712/1639	3.69	4.12	4.27	4.08	4.44
2. Did th	e instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	633/1639	3.62	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.44
		uestions reflec				0	0	0	0	9	7	4.44	617/1397	3.58	4.17	4.28	4.18	4.44
4. Did ot	her evalu	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	5	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	347/1583	3.55	3.94	4.19	4.01	4.64
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	441/1532	4.14	3.95	4.01	3.88	4.40
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	1	4	0	3	2	2	4	3.64	1135/1504	3.67	3.74	4.05	3.78	3.64
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearly	y expla	ined	1	0	0	1	0	5	9	4.47	546/1612	4.08	4.25	4.16	4.10	4.47
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	0	13	2	4.13	1434/1635	4.67	4.58	4.65	4.56	4.13
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	4	0	0	0	5	3	4	3.92	1039/1579	3.37	3.89	4.08	3.95	3.92
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instru	actor's lecture	s well	prepared	2	0	0	0	3	1	10	4.50	807/1518	3.85	4.42	4.43	4.38	4.50
		ctor seem inter			2	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	837/1520	4.37	4.65	4.70	4.61	4.79
3. Was le	cture mat	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	2	0	0	2	3	4	5	3.86	1211/1517	3.54	4.14	4.27	4.20	3.86
4. Did th	e lecture	es contribute to	o what	you learned	2	0	0	2	2	2	8	4.14	1211/1517 991/1550	3.43	4.25	4.22	4.17	4.14
5. Did au	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understan						0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/1295	2.88	3.71	3.94	3.84	****
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	217/1398	3.48	3.87	4.07	3.85	4.80
2. Were a	ıll studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	11	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	543/1391 328/1388	4.37	4.15	4.30	4.07	4.60
				d open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	328/1388	4.25	4.19	4.28	4.01	4.80
		echniques succe		-	11	3	0	1	0				****/ 958					
				Freq	uency	7 Dis	trib	utio	n									
				_														
Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gr							Rea	ason	.s 			Тур	pe 			Majors	
	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 6						quir	ed fo	or M	ajor	s	0	Graduate	9	0	Majc	or	1
28-55	28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 4 56-83 4 2.00-2.99 2 C 3 84-150 1 3.00-3.49 5 D 0																	
	56-83 4 2.00-2.99 2 C 3					Ge:	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.6	Non-	major	15
84-150	34-150 1 3.00-3.49 5 D 0																	
Grad.						El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1					h
	Р 0												response	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
	I 0					Ot:	her				1	2						
	? 0																	

INTERMED ACCOUNTING I

Title Instructor: CROTEAU, MARCIA

Enrollment: 28

Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 520 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eauer	ncies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean			
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	4	12	4.44	698/1639	4.46	4.12	4.27	4.28	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	5	10	4.28	840/1639	4.43	4.09	4.22	4.20	4.28
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	5	11	4.39	678/1397	4.40	4.17	4.28	4.26	4.39
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	1	7	7	4.19	862/1583	4.26	3.94	4.19	4.24	4.19
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	5	10	4.28	562/1532	4.22	3.95	4.01	4.05	4.28
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	5	8	4.00	824/1504	3.89	3.74	4.05	4.12	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	1	3	12	4.47	532/1612	4.55	4.25	4.16	4.12	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.58	4.65	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	1	9	4	4.07	853/1579	4.10	3.89	4.08	4.07	4.07
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	330/1518	4.77	4.42	4.43	4.39	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	750/1520	4.86	4.65	4.70	4.68	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2			4.53	572/1517	4.49	4.14	4.27	4.23	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	414/1550	4.49	4.25	4.22	4.20	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	2	2	5	6	3.81	798/1295		3.71	3.94		3.81
o, bid didiotibudi ocominguos cimanos your anacisodianising	_	_	_	_	-	J	ŭ	3.01	,,0,12,0	3.70	3.71	3.71	3.75	3.01
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	3	3	5	3.77	958/1398	3.93	3.87	4.07	4.13	3.77
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	2	0	3	2	6		1141/1391		4.15	4.30	4.35	3.77
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	2	0	3	3	5		1116/1388	4.01	4.19	4.28	4.34	3.69
4. Were special techniques successful	5	7	0	1	2	0	3	3.83	563/ 958	3.83	3.63	3.93	3.97	3.83
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	5.00	4.10	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.11	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	5.00	4.44	4.44	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	5.00	4.35	4.21	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	5.00	4.18	4.04	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.75	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	4.59	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.60	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.65	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 82	****	5.00	4.16	4.08	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	1	2 00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	4.78	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	1	0	0	0	_			****	5.00	4.05		****
							1			****			4.31	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	1 1	0	0	0	0	1 1		****/ 42 ****/ 37	****	5.00 5.00	4.75	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	1	0	0	0	0	_		, -	****		4.58	4.52	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	Τ	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.56	4.30	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	1	0	0	0	0	1			****	5.00	4.69	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	***

Title INTERMED ACCOUNTING I

Instructor: CROTEAU, MARCIA

Enrollment: 28
Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 520 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	 А	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	18	Non-major	17
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

INTERMED ACCOUNTING I

Title

Instructor: CROTEAU, MARCIA

Enrollment: 32 Questionnaires: 19 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 521 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncies	;		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	4		4.47	656/1639	4.46	4.12	4.27	4.28	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	8	11	4.58	445/1639	4.43	4.09	4.22	4.20	4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7		4.42	632/1397	4.40	4.17	4.28	4.26	4.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	6	9	4.33	697/1583	4.26	3.94	4.19	4.24	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	7	8	4.16	663/1532	4.22	3.95	4.01	4.05	4.16
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	7	4	6		1034/1504	3.89	3.74	4.05	4.12	3.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	352/1612	4.55	4.25		4.12	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.58	4.65	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	3	6	5	4.14	783/1579	4.10	3.89	4.08	4.07	4.14
Lecture	_		•		_	_			=======================================					
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3		4.72	510/1518	4.77	4.42	4.43	4.39	4.72
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	597/1520	4.86	4.65	4.70	4.68	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	3		4.44		4.49	4.14	4.27	4.23	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	5	9	4.28	882/1550	4.49	4.25	4.22	4.20	4.28
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	1	4	5	5	3.75	838/1295	3.78	3.71	3.94	3.95	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	742/1398	3.93	3.87	4.07	4.13	4.08
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	816/1391	4.01	4.15	4.30	4.35	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	0	5	6	4.33	783/1388	4.01	4.19	4.28	4.34	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	8	8	0	1	2	0	0		****/ 958	3.83	3.63	3.93	3.97	****
1. Note special deciminates successful	O	Ü	O	_	-	Ü	Ü	2.07	, , , , ,	3.03	3.03	3.75	3.37	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 224	****	5.00	4.10	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.11	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 219	****	5.00	4.44	4.44	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 215	****	5.00	4.35	4.21	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 198	****	5.00	4.18	4.04	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 85	****	4.75	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	4.59	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.60	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.65	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.16	4.08	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	4.78	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 53	****	5.00	4.04	4.76	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 42	****	5.00	4.05	4.63	***
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 37	****	5.00	4.75	4.52	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 32	****	5.00		4.32	***
J. Did conferences help you carry out freit activities	10	U	U	U	U	_	U	1.00	/ 32		3.00	1.50	1.30	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	5.00		5.00	***

Title INTERMED ACCOUNTING I

Instructor:

Enrollment: 32 Questionnaires: 19

Baltimore County CROTEAU, MARCIA Fall 2007

Page 521 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

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

Title INTERM MICROECON ANALY

Instructor: COATES, DENNIS

Enrollment: 76
Questionnaires: 34

Baltimore County Fall 2007

University of Maryland

Page 522 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Eval	uatic	on Ques	sti	onnai	ire
---------	--------	------	-------	---------	-----	-------	-----

			Fre	quer	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	0	0	0	5	11	17	4.36	788/1639	4.31	4.12	4.27	4.28	4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	15	15	4.36	735/1639	4.30	4.09	4.22	4.20	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	3	10	18	4.33	722/1397	4.45	4.17	4.28	4.26	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	18	2	1	2	5	5	3.67	1324/1583	3.95	3.94	4.19	4.24	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	18	2	1	4	2	5		1241/1532	3.81	3.95	4.01	4.05	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	20	1	1	2	4	4		1051/1504	4.01	3.74	4.05	4.12	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	5	9					4.25		4.12	4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1		4.97	,	4.74	4.58	4.65	4.66	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	1	6	11	9	3.93	1022/1579	4.01	3.89	4.08	4.07	3.93
Lecture	_				_	_								
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	5		4.72	529/1518	4.68	4.42	4.43	4.39	4.72
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	5	26	4.75	890/1520	4.65	4.65	4.70	4.68	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	8				1065/1517	4.22	4.14	4.27		4.03
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	10	20		603/1550	4.46	4.25	4.22		4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	20	4	2	1	1	3	2.73	1222/1295	3.85	3.71	3.94	3.95	2.73
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	3	2	1	3	5	2 26	1177/1398	3.67	3.87	4.07	4.13	3.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	1	1	5	3	5		1177/1398	3.07	4.15	4.30	4.35	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	1	2	6	1	5		1201/1388	3.96	4.19	4.28	4.34	3.47
4. Were special techniques successful	20	9	3	0	0	1	1		****/ 958	3.29	3.63	3.93	3.97	3.47 ****
4. Were special techniques successful	20	9	3	U	U			2.40	7 936	3.43	3.03	3.93	3.91	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	33	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 224	****	5.00	4.10	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	33	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 240	****	5.00	4.11	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	33	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 219	****	5.00	4.44	4.44	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	33	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 215	****	5.00	4.35	4.21	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	33	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 198	****	5.00	4.18	4.04	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 85	****	4.75	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	4.59	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.60	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.65	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.16	4.08	****
T 11 T 1														
Field Work	2.2	0	^	^	0	^	1	F 00	**** / FO	****	F 00	4 0 4	4 70	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 52		5.00	4.04	4.78	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	33	0	0	0	0	0	1		,	****	5.00	4.05	4.31	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	33	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	33	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	4.52	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	33	U	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	****/ 32	* * * * *	5.00	4.56	4.30	* * * * *
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	5.00	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	33	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	5.00	***
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	33	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 21	****	5.00		5.00	****

Title INTERM MICROECON ANALY

Instructor: COATES, DENNIS

Enrollment: 76
Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 522 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	5	C	15	General	1	Under-grad	34	Non-major	27
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	30				
				?	2						

Title INTERM MICROECON ANALY

Instructor: MA, BING

Enrollment: 34
Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 523 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

				_	ncies				ructor	Course	_			Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	1	5	11	4.26	880/1639	4.31	4.12	4.27	4.28	4.26
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	8	8	4.21	895/1639	4.30	4.09	4.22	4.20	4.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	13	4.53	497/1397	4.45	4.17	4.28	4.26	4.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	2	1	2	4		1171/1583	3.95	3.94	4.19	4.24	3.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	580/1532	3.81	3.95	4.01	4.05	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	13	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	701/1504	4.01	3.74	4.05	4.12	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	118/1612	4.59	4.25	4.16	4.12	4.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	0	4	13	4.56	1101/1635	4.74	4.58	4.65	4.66	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	8	4	4.14	783/1579	4.01	3.89	4.08	4.07	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	397/1518	4.68	4.42	4.43	4.39	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	14		1006/1520	4.65	4.65	4.70	4.68	4.68
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	7	10	4.37	768/1517	4.22	4.14	4.27	4.23	4.37
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	4	13	4.47	677/1550	4.46	4.25	4.22	4.20	4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	11	1	0	0	0	7	4.50	265/1295	3.85	3.71	3.94	3.95	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	3	0	2	3	6	3 64	1045/1398	3.67	3.87	4.07	4.13	3.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	2	0	2	3	8	4.00	983/1391	3.91	4.15	4.30	4.35	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	2	5	7	4.13	902/1388	3.96	4.19	4.28	4.34	4.13
4. Were special techniques successful	4	8	1	0	4	0	2	3.29	798/ 958	3.29	3.63	3.93		3.29
Field Work		_		_	_	_								
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	4.78	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 53	****	5.00	4.05	4.31	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	4.52	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	,	****	5.00	4.69	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	5.00	****
Frequ	iency	Dis	tribu	ution	n									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	19	Non-major	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	16	-		_	
				2	1						

Course-Section: ECON 311 0301 University of Maryland Title INTERM MICROECON ANALY

Baltimore County Fall 2007

Instructor: MA, BING

Enrollment: 36 Questionnaires: 29

Page 524 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	Student	Course	Evaluation	Question	naire
---	---------	--------	------------	----------	-------

	Questions					NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	4	5		ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			Genera	 1															
1 г	nov bic	gain ne	.Genera w insights,skil	=	this course	2	0	1	2	2	5	17	4.30	850/1639	4.31	4.12	4.27	4.28	4.30
			ctor make clear			2	0	1	1	4	3	18	4.33	774/1639	4.30	4.09	4.22	4.20	4.33
			uestions reflect			2	1	0	0	4	5	17	4.50	517/1397		4.17	4.28	4.26	4.50
		_	uations reflect		_	2	13	0	0	4	2	8	4.29	761/1583	3.95	3.94	4.19	4.24	4.29
5. I	Did ass	igned re	eadings contribu	ite to w	hat you learned	2	8	3	1	2	6	7	3.68	1120/1532	3.81	3.95	4.01	4.05	3.68
6. I	Did wri	tten ass	signments contr	ibute to	what you learned	2	18	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	758/1504	4.01	3.74	4.05	4.12	4.11
7. V	Was the	grading	g system clearly	y explai:	ned	2	0	1	0	1	6	19	4.56	439/1612	4.59	4.25	4.16	4.12	4.56
			was class cance			3	0	1	0	0	4	21	4.69	968/1635	4.74	4.58	4.65	4.66	4.69
9. I	How wou	ld you g	grade the overa	ll teach	ing effectiveness	7	2	1	0	4	9	6	3.95	972/1579	4.01	3.89	4.08	4.07	3.95
			Lecture																
			actor's lectures			2	0	1	1	2	2	21	4.52	794/1518	4.68	4.42	4.43	4.39	4.52
			ctor seem intere		3	2	0	1	0	3	3	20		1180/1520	4.65	4.65	4.70	4.68	4.52
			-		plained clearly	3	0	1	2	2	5	16	4.27	875/1517	4.22	4.14	4.27	4.23	4.27
			es contribute to			2	0	2	2	1	1	21	4.37	796/1550	4.46	4.25	4.22	4.20	4.37
5. I	. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi						17	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	398/1295	3.85	3.71	3.94	3.95	4.33
			Discus	sion															
1. I	oid cla	ss discu	ussions contribu	ate to w	hat you learned	14	0	1	1	3	2	8	4.00	770/1398	3.67	3.87	4.07	4.13	4.00
2. V	Were al	l studer	nts actively end	couraged	to participate	14	0	0	1	5	1	8	4.07	954/1391	3.91	4.15	4.30	4.35	4.07
3. I	Did the	instruc	ctor encourage i	fair and	open discussion	14	0	0	2	2	1	10	4.27	828/1388	3.96	4.19	4.28	4.34	4.27
4. V	Were sp	ecial te	echniques succes	ssful		15	9	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	****/ 958	3.29	3.63	3.93	3.97	***
			Laborat	cory															
2. V	Were yo	u provid	ded with adequat	te backg	round information	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.11	4.08	***
					Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Cred	dits Ea:	rned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	5			Ty	pe			Majors	
															- 				
00-		0	0.00-0.99	1	A 6		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ijor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	6
	-55 -02	4	1.00-1.99	0	В 10 С 6		Cos	nera	1				2	Under-g	rad 3	19	Mon	maion	23
	56-83 5 2.00-2.99 2 C 6 84-150 4 3.00-3.49 3 D 0						Gel	nera.	т				4	onder-g.	rau 2		MOI1-	major	43
Gra		0	3.50-3.49	3 7	D 0 F 0		וק .	ecti	e.c				1	#### - 1	Meane +	here a	re not	enoud	h
GIO		U	3.30- 1 .00	,	P 0		11.1	CCLI	v C B				_	respons				_	11
					I O		O+1	her				1	.8	I CSPOIIS		c bigi	ıııcaı		
					? 0							_	-						

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

Instructor: CINYABUGUMA, MA Enrollment: 36

Ouestionnaires: 11

Fall 2007 Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 525

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 1 0 1 1 1 2 5 3.90 1252/1639 4.01 4.12 4.27 4.28 3.90 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 1 2 1 2 4 3.60 1444/1639 4.03 4.09 4.22 4.20 3.60 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 0 1 1 1 3 4 3.80 1151/1397 4.05 4.17 4.28 4.26 3.80 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 3 0 0 1 3 3 4.29 761/1583 4.22 3.94 4.19 4.24 4.29 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 3 1 6 4.30 535/1532 4.30 3.95 4.01 4.05 4.30 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 2 1 0 3 1 3 3.63 1141/1504 3.73 3.74 4.05 4.12 3.63 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 2 0 2 0 6 3.80 1253/1612 4.02 4.25 4.16 4.12 3.80 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 1 9 4.90 662/1635 4.55 4.58 4.65 4.66 4.90 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 1 2 1 1 1 2.83 1521/1579 3.42 3.89 4.08 4.07 2.83 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 3 0 1 1 1 2 3 3.63 1400/1518 4.17 4.42 4.43 4.39 3.63 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 4 0 1 0 0 1 5 4.29 1345/1520 4.49 4.65 4.70 4.68 4.29 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4 0 1 0 0 4 3.57 1321/1517 3.81 4.14 4.27 4.23 3.57 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 4 0 1 1 1 0 4 3.71 1254/1550 3.93 4.25 4.22 4.20 3.71 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 3 1 0 1 0 2 3.50 978/1295 3.40 3.71 3.94 3.95 3.50 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1398 4.01 3.87 4.07 4.13 5.00 0 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1391 4.13 4.15 4.30 4.35 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1388 4.14 4.19 4.28 4.34 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 7 1 0 0 1 2 4.67 155/ 958 4.67 3.63 3.93 3.97 4.67 Λ

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

Course-Section: ECON 312 0301 University of Maryland Page 526
Title INTERM MACROECON ANALY Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008

Instructor: ROSE, MORGAN

Enrollment: 27

Questionnaires: 16

Fall 2007
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	712/1639	4.01	4.12	4.27	4.28	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	327/1639	4.03	4.09	4.22	4.20	4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	400/1397	4.05	4.17	4.28	4.26	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	625/1583	4.22	3.94	4.19	4.24	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	409/1532	4.30	3.95	4.01	4.05	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	0	0	5	4	4.10	770/1504	3.73	3.74	4.05	4.12	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	6	8	4.31	743/1612	4.02	4.25	4.16	4.12	4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	6	4.38	1257/1635	4.55	4.58	4.65	4.66	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	7	5	4.13	795/1579	3.42	3.89	4.08	4.07	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	149/1518	4.17	4.42	4.43	4.39	4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	1087/1520	4.49	4.65	4.70	4.68	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	758/1517	3.81	4.14	4.27	4.23	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	10	4.38	796/1550	3.93	4.25	4.22	4.20	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	436/1295	3.40	3.71	3.94	3.95	4.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	369/1398	4.01	3.87	4.07	4.13	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	543/1391	4.13	4.15	4.30	4.35	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	387/1388		4.19	4.28	4.34	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 958		3.63	3.93	3.97	****
1. Note Special commission bacoustial			Ū	ŭ	Ü	_	_	1.50	, , , , ,	1.07	3.03	3.75	J.,	
Frequ	iency	Dist	ribu	ıtioı	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	3	Under-grad	16	Non-major	13
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 312 0401 University of Maryland Page 527 Title Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008 INTERM MACROECON ANALY

ROSE, MORGAN

Instructor: Enrollment: 40

Questionnaires: 19

Fall 2007 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Job IRBR3029

					Fre	equei	ncie	S		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General															
1. Did you gain new i	nsights,skills fro	om this course	0	0	1	2	5	5	6	3.68	1403/1639	4.01	4.12	4.27	4.28	3.68
2. Did the instructor	make clear the ex	spected goals	0	0	1	1	5	6	6	3.79	1338/1639	4.03	4.09	4.22	4.20	3.79
3. Did the exam quest	ions reflect the e	expected goals	0	0	1	2	4	6	6	3.74	1185/1397	4.05	4.17	4.28	4.26	3.74
4. Did other evaluation	ons reflect the ex	spected goals	1	5	0	1	4	2	6	4.00	1010/1583	4.22	3.94	4.19	4.24	4.00
5. Did assigned readi	ngs contribute to	what you learned	0	2	1	1	1	5	9	4.18	648/1532	4.30	3.95	4.01	4.05	4.18
6. Did written assign	ments contribute t	to what you learned	0	4	2	1	4	4	4	3.47	1230/1504	3.73	3.74	4.05	4.12	3.47
7. Was the grading sy	stem clearly expla	ained	0	0	0	2	6	2	9	3.95	1122/1612	4.02	4.25	4.16	4.12	3.95
8. How many times was	class cancelled		0	1	0	0	0	11	7	4.39	1250/1635	4.55	4.58	4.65	4.66	4.39
9. How would you grade	e the overall tead	ching effectiveness	5	0	1	1	6	5	1	3.29	1409/1579	3.42	3.89	4.08	4.07	3.29
	Lecture															
1. Were the instructor	r's lectures well	prepared	1	0	0	2	3	7	6	3.94	1285/1518	4.17	4.42	4.43	4.39	3.94
2. Did the instructor			1	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	1151/1520	4.49	4.65	4.70	4.68	4.56
3. Was lecture materia	al presented and e	explained clearly	2	0	1	3	2	9	2	3.47	1358/1517	3.81	4.14	4.27	4.23	3.47
4. Did the lectures c	ontribute to what	you learned	1	1	1	3	3	3	7	3.71	1259/1550	3.93	4.25	4.22	4.20	3.71
5. Did audiovisual te	chniques enhance y	our understanding	3	11	2	1	0	2	0	2.40	1259/1295	3.40	3.71	3.94	3.95	2.40
	Discussion															
1. Did class discussion	ons contribute to	what you learned	10	0	3	2	1	3	0	2.44	1361/1398	4.01	3.87	4.07	4.13	2.44
2. Were all students		_	10	0	1	2	4	2	0	2.78	1363/1391	4.13	4.15	4.30	4.35	2.78
3. Did the instructor	1 3		10	0	3	0	4	1	1	2.67	1365/1388	4.14	4.19	4.28	4.34	2.67
4. Were special techn	•	10	6	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 958	4.67	3.63	3.93	3.97	****	
		Frequ	ıency	, Dist	rib	ution	n									
Goodila Barrai	G GD3	Down to J. Condon	-			ъ.					m				N	
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	.s 			Ту	pe 			Majors	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	6	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	13
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	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	16				
				?	0						

Title QUANT MTHDS: MANAGEMENT

Instructor: PALMATEER, JASO

Enrollment:

75 Questionnaires: 44

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland Page 528 Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008 Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	quer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	8	19	16		1055/1639	4.11	4.12	4.27	4.28	4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	14	25	4.45	600/1639	4.45	4.09	4.22	4.20	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	14	27	4.52	497/1397	4.52	4.17	4.28		4.52
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	2	3	15			712/1583	4.32	3.94	4.19	4.24	4.32
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	1	2	6	14		3.94	856/1532	3.94	3.95	4.01	4.05	3.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	1	8	10		4.17	690/1504	4.17	3.74	4.05	4.12	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	12			376/1612	4.61	4.25		4.12	4.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	2	9	15	17		1458/1635	4.09	4.58	4.65	4.66	4.09
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	3	0	0	1	19	8	4.25	657/1579	4.25	3.89	4.08	4.07	4.25
Lecture					_				500/4540					
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	12			720/1518	4.57	4.42	4.43	4.39	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	1	17	23		1230/1520	4.45	4.65	4.70	4.68	4.45
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	16		4.50	597/1517	4.50	4.14	4.27		4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	6	12		4.43	742/1550	4.43	4.25	4.22		4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	2	4	16	18	4.25	459/1295	4.25	3.71	3.94	3.95	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	2	0	1	9	12	4.21	669/1398	4.21	3.87	4.07	4.13	4.21
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	0	2	1	10	10	4.22	847/1391	4.21	4.15	4.30	4.13	4.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	1	1	1	9	12	4.25	834/1388	4.25	4.19	4.28		4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	20	1	2	0	1	12	8	4.25	448/ 958	4.25	3.63	3.93		4.25
4. Wele special techniques successful	20	1	۷	U		12	0	4.04	440/ 936	4.04	3.03	3.93	3.31	4.04
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	5.00	4.10	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	43	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 240	****	5.00	4.11	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	43	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 219	****	5.00	4.44	4.44	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	43	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 215	****	5.00	4.35	4.21	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	43	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 198	****	5.00	4.18	4.04	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	43	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.75	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	43	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	4.59	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.60	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.65	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.16	4.08	****
Field Work					_		_							
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	4.78	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	43	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 53	****	5.00	4.05	4.31	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	43	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	43	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	4.52	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.56	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	5.00	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	43	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	5.00	***
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	5.00	***
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	43	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52		****
1 seady process for all one seadenes		ŭ	·	J	Ü	_	J	1.00	, 21		3.00	1.02	3.00	

Title QUANT MTHDS:MANAGEMENT

Instructor:

QUANT MTHDS: MANAGEMENT PALMATEER, JASO

Enrollment: 75
Questionnaires: 44

75

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2007

Page 528 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	19	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	18						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	7	С	2	General	3	Under-grad	44	Non-major	35
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	34				
				?	0						

Title FUND FINANCIAL MGMT

Instructor: ANORUO, EMMANUE

Enrollment: 32 Ouestionnaires: 17

ANORUO, EMMANUE Fall 2

Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 529

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

University of Maryland

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 0 0 0 0 3 7 7 4.24 909/1639 3.99 4.12 4.27 4.28 4.24 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 1 2 4 10 4.35 748/1639 4.22 4.09 4.22 4.20 4.35 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 2 5 10 4.47 560/1397 4.40 4.17 4.28 4.26 4.47 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 7 0 2 2 3 3 3.70 1296/1583 3.45 3.94 4.19 4.24 3.70 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 4 0 1 3 4 5 4.00 774/1532 3.50 3.95 4.01 4.05 4.00 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 8 0 1 3 3 1 3.50 1212/1504 3.08 3.74 4.05 4.12 3.50 1 0 0 0 1 7 8 4.44 589/1612 4.39 4.25 4.16 4.12 4.44 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 4 12 4.75 884/1635 4.50 4.58 4.65 4.66 4.75 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9 0 0 0 1 6 1 4.00 889/1579 3.70 3.89 4.08 4.07 4.00 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 4 0 0 0 2 2 9 4.54 770/1518 4.13 4.42 4.43 4.39 4.54 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 4 0 0 0 0 1 12 4.92 437/1520 4.28 4.65 4.70 4.68 4.92 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4 0 0 1 1 4 7 4.31 833/1517 4.06 4.14 4.27 4.23 4.31 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 0 1 6 6 4.38 787/1550 3.97 4.25 4.22 4.20 4.38 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 1 0 0 1 2 9 4.67 185/1295 4.38 3.71 3.94 3.95 4.67 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 3 4 4 4.09 738/1398 3.88 3.87 4.07 4.13 4.09 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6 0 0 0 1 3 7 4.55 586/1391 4.11 4.15 4.30 4.35 4.55 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0 0 0 1 1 9 4.73 423/1388 4.36 4.19 4.28 4.34 4.73 4. Were special techniques successful 6 9 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/ 958 **** 3.63 3.93 3.97 **** Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 14 2 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 224 **** 5.00 4.10 4.06 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 15 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 **** 240 **** 5.00 4.11 4.08 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** 5.00 4.04 4.78 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 16 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 53 **** 5.00 4.05 4.31 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 **** 5.00 4.45 5.00 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 16 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 **** 32 **** 5.00 4.51 5.00 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 0.00-0.99 0 A 10 Required for Majors 0 00-27 0 Graduate Major в 4 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 C 0 56-83 2.00-2.99 4 General 1 Under-grad 17 Non-major 15 5 3.00-3.49 5 D 0 84-150 6 Grad. 3.50-4.00 2 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough Ω P 0 responses to be significant Ι 0 Other 14

Course-Section: ECON 374 0201 University of Maryland Title FUND FINANCIAL MGMT Baltimore County THOMAS, MARK S Instructor:

Page 530 FEB 13, 2008 Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 34 Questionnaires: 12

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

	Questions						Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did	you gain r	new insights,ski	- lls fro	m this course	0	0	1	2	1	3	5	3.75	1358/1639	3.99	4.12	4.27	4.28	3.75
	_	actor make clear			0	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	1029/1639	4.22	4.09	4.22	4.20	4.08
3. Did	the exam o	questions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	722/1397	4.40	4.17	4.28	4.26	4.33
4. Did	other eval	luations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	7	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	1497/1583	3.45	3.94	4.19	4.24	3.20
5. Did	assigned r	readings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	5	2	1	1	1	2	3.00	1421/1532	3.50	3.95	4.01	4.05	3.00
6. Did	written as	ssignments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	9	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	1471/1504	3.08	3.74	4.05	4.12	2.67
7. Was	the gradir	ng system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	718/1612	4.39	4.25	4.16	4.12	4.33
8. How	many times	s was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	9	3	4.25	1350/1635	4.50	4.58	4.65	4.66	4.25
9. How	would you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	1	1	1	1	3	3	2	3.40	1364/1579	3.70	3.89	4.08	4.07	3.40
1. Were	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared					0	1	1	2	3	4	3.73	1378/1518	4.13	4.42	4.43	4.39	3.73
2. Did	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject				1	0	2	0	1	5	3	3.64	1481/1520	4.28	4.65	4.70	4.68	3.64
3. Was	lecture ma	aterial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	1	0	0	3	0	4	4	3.82	1235/1517	4.06	4.14	4.27	4.23	3.82
4. Did	the lectur	res contribute t	o what	you learned	1	0	2	1	1	3	4	3.55	1315/1550	3.97	4.25	4.22	4.20	3.55
5. Did	audiovisua	al techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	0	1	0	1	4	5	4.09	581/1295	4.38	3.71	3.94	3.95	4.09
		Discus	sion															
1. Did	class disc	cussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	9	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1030/1398	3.88	3.87	4.07	4.13	3.67
2. Were	all stude	ents actively en	courage	d to participate	9	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1177/1391	4.11	4.15	4.30	4.35	3.67
3. Did	the instru	actor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	9	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	944/1388	4.36	4.19	4.28	4.34	4.00
4. Were	special t	techniques succe	ssful		9	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 958	****	3.63	3.93	3.97	***
		Frequ	iency	Dist	rib	utio	n											
Credits	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade							Rea	asons	3			Ту	ne			Majors	
	Expected Glades																	
00-27						Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	3	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	2
28-55								_										
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 0		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	2	Non-	major	10

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	10
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	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	11				
				2	Λ						

ASIAN ECONOMIC HIST

Title MITCH, DAVID F

Instructor:

Enrollment: 47 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 531 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	1	0	5	13	4.40	754/1639	4.40	4.12	4.27	4.28	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	4	12	4.30	813/1639	4.30	4.09	4.22	4.20	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	5	13	4.38	678/1397	4.38	4.17	4.28	4.26	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	4	6	9	3.95	1084/1583	3.95	3.94	4.19	4.24	3.95
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	2	4	12	4.05	744/1532		3.95	4.01	4.05	4.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	5	11	4.14	724/1504	4.14	3.74	4.05	4.12	4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	3	5	11	4.30	756/1612	4.30	4.25	4.16	4.12	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	1	0	1	18		1056/1635			4.65	4.66	4.62
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	2	0	2	8	4	3.75	1170/1579	3.75	3.89	4.08	4.07	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	2	5	10	4.28	1077/1518	4.28	4.42	4.43	4.39	4.28
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	0	0	2	15	4.67	1033/1520	4.67	4.65	4.70	4.68	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	2	4	4	8	4.00	1083/1517	4.00	4.14	4.27	4.23	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	0	5	12	4.37	805/1550	4.37	4.25	4.22	4.20	4.37
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	4	0	2	3	9	3.72	858/1295	3.72	3.71	3.94	3.95	3.72
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	532/1398	4.38	3.87	4.07	4.13	4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	1	1	1	5	3.89	1076/1391	3.89	4.15	4.30	4.35	3.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	2	1	1	5	4.00	944/1388	4.00	4.19	4.28	4.34	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	12	4	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/ 958	****	3.63	3.93	3.97	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 224	****	5.00	4.10	4.06	***
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.11	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 219	****	5.00	4.44	4.44	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 215	****	5.00	4.35	4.21	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 198	****	5.00	4.18	4.04	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.75	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	4.59	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.60	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.65	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.16	4.08	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	4.78	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.05	4.31	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	4.52	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.56	4.30	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****

Title ASIAN ECONOMIC HIST

Instructor: MITCH, DAVID F

Enrollment: 47
Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 531 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	21	Non-major	12
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	3	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						

Course-Section: ECON 405 0101 University of Maryland Page 532 Title BENEFIT-COST EVALUATIO Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008

MUTTER, RYAN L

Instructor:

Enrollment: 39 Questionnaires: 23

Fall 2007 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Job IRBR3029

	Questions						Fr	eauei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	ıs		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 .l															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fr	om this course	0	0	0	0	1	8	14	4.57	550/1639	4.57	4.12	4.27	4.42	4.57
2. Did th	ne instruc	ctor make clear	the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	15	4.52	496/1639	4.52	4.09	4.22	4.29	4.52
3. Did th	ne exam qu	uestions reflec	t the	expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	18	4.70	342/1397	4.70	4.17	4.28	4.38	4.70
4. Did ot	ther evalu	uations reflect	the e	xpected goals	0	9	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	476/1583	4.50	3.94	4.19	4.31	4.50
5. Did as	ssigned re	eadings contrib	oute to	what you learned	0	0	0	3	6	8	6	3.74	1069/1532	3.74	3.95	4.01	4.07	3.74
6. Did wr	ritten ass	signments contr	ribute	to what you learned	0	11	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	544/1504	4.33	3.74	4.05	4.20	4.33
7. Was th	ne grading	g system clearl	y expl	ained	0	0	0	1	1	7	14	4.48	532/1612	4.48	4.25	4.16	4.18	4.48
8. How ma	any times	was class cand	elled		0	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	331/1635	4.96	4.58	4.65	4.72	4.96
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ill tea	ching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	7	11	4.53	362/1579	4.53	3.89	4.08	4.21	4.53
		Lectur	re															
1. Were t	the instru	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	20	4.86	271/1518	4.86	4.42	4.43	4.51	4.86
2. Did th	ne instruc	ctor seem inter	ested	in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	546/1520	4.91	4.65	4.70	4.75	4.91
3. Was le	ecture mat	terial presente	ed and	explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	7	13	4.50	597/1517	4.50	4.14	4.27	4.34	4.50
4. Did th	ne lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	325/1550	4.77	4.25	4.22	4.24	4.77
5. Did au	udiovisual	l techniques en	hance	your understanding	1	18	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/1295	***	3.71	3.94	4.01	****
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	lass discu	ussions contrib	oute to	what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	8	5	4.29	599/1398	4.29	3.87	4.07	4.23	4.29
				ed to participate	9	0	0	0	3	1	10	4.50	616/1391	4.50	4.15	4.30	4.48	4.50
		-	_	nd open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	521/1388	4.64	4.19	4.28	4.50	4.64
				Frequ	ıency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade							Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	 1	0.00-0.99	0	A 11		Re	guir	ed f	or Ma	 ajor	 S	2	Graduat	 e	7	Majo	 or	4
28-55							-			5								
EC 03								,				-	TT1		_	37		1.0

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GP	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	Α	11	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	7	Major	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	7	Under-grad	16	Non-major	19
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	13	_			
				2	2						

Course-Section: ECON 408 0101 University of Maryland
Title MANAGERIAL ECONOMICS Baltimore County
Instructor: DASGUPTA, NANDI Fall 2007

University of Maryland Page 533
Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008
Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	36				
Questionnaires:	15	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

? 0

							Fre	equei	ncie	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1 Did vo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	Ο	0	0	1	1	2	11	4.53	582/1639	4.53	4.12	4.27	4.42	4.53
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	199/1639	4.80	4.09	4.22	4.29	4.80
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	0	2	0	13	4.73	302/1397	4.73	4.17	4.28	4.38	4.73
	_	uations reflect		_	0	7	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	355/1583	4.63	3.94	4.19	4.31	4.63
				what you learned	0	3	1	0	4	0	7	4.00	774/1532	4.00	3.95	4.01	4.07	4.00
	_	_		o what you learned	0	10	2	0	0	0	3		1259/1504	3.40	3.74	4.05	4.20	3.40
		g system clearl		-	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	317/1612	4.67	4.25	4.16	4.18	4.67
	_	was class canc			0	0	0	0	1	11			1434/1635	4.13	4.58	4.65	4.72	4.13
	-			hing effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	342/1579	4.55	3.89	4.08	4.21	4.55
		J-44-1											,					
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	271/1518	4.87	4.42	4.43	4.51	4.87
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	382/1520	4.93	4.65	4.70	4.75	4.93
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearl				0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	239/1517	4.80	4.14	4.27	4.34	4.80
	was recture material presented and explained clearly Did the lectures contribute to what you learned				0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	219/1550	4.87	4.25	4.22	4.24	4.87
5. Did au	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding				0	8	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	545/1295	4.14	3.71	3.94	4.01	4.14
		1	_															
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	494/1398	4.43	3.87	4.07	4.23	4.43
2. Were a	all stude:	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	8	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	564/1391	4.57	4.15	4.30	4.48	4.57
3. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	593/1388	4.57	4.19	4.28	4.50	4.57
4. Were s	special t	echniques succe	ssful	_	8	2	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	380/ 958	4.20	3.63	3.93	4.24	4.20
				Frequ	ency	7 Dist	tribu	ution	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	S			Туј	pe			Majors	1
														 -				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 9		Red	quire	ea i	or Ma	ajor	S	1	Graduate	3	0	Majo	r	4
	28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 4					a		1				2	TT		_	Mari		11
	56-83 0 2.00-2.99 4 C 0					Gei	nera]	L				3	Under-g	rad 1	.5	Non-	major	11
	84-150 11 3.00-3.49 1 D 0					m 2						^		+	h			.la
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 6 F 0						EIL	ectiv	/es				0	#### - I				_	11
	P 0					0-1	ı <u>.</u>					0	response	es co n	e sign	ıııcar	1L	
		I 0		Oti	her					9								

Course-Section: ECON 410B 0101 University of Maryland

RISK MNGMT FINANCIAL I Baltimore County CARPENTER, ROBE Fall 2007

Instructor: CARP Enrollment: 20 Ouestionnaires: 17

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 534

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 1 5 11 4.59 529/1639 4.59 4.12 4.27 4.42 4.59 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 0 0 3 5 8 4.31 800/1639 4.31 4.09 4.22 4.29 4.31 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 5 11 4.59 437/1397 4.59 4.17 4.28 4.38 4.59 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 14 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 ****/1583 **** 3.94 4.19 4.31 **** 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 4 8 5 4.06 737/1532 4.06 3.95 4.01 4.07 4.06 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 2 4 11 4.53 469/1612 4.53 4.25 4.16 4.18 4.53 0 0 0 1 6 8 2 3.65 1597/1635 3.65 4.58 4.65 4.72 3.65 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 0 0 0 1 2 8 4.64 262/1579 4.64 3.89 4.08 4.21 4.64 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 0 5 11 4.69 575/1518 4.69 4.42 4.43 4.51 4.69 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 1 15 4.94 382/1520 4.94 4.65 4.70 4.75 4.943. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 1 5 10 4.56 523/1517 4.56 4.14 4.27 4.34 4.56 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 2 14 4.88 208/1550 4.88 4.25 4.22 4.24 4.88 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0 0 0 1 8 6 4.33 398/1295 4.33 3.71 3.94 4.01 4.33 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11 0 0 1 2 3 4.33 560/1398 4.33 3.87 4.07 4.23 4.33 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11 0 1 0 0 1 4 4.17 887/1391 4.17 4.15 4.30 4.48 4.17 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0 0 0 0 2 4 4.67 496/1388 4.67 4.19 4.28 4.50 4.67

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	8	С	3	General		Under-grad	17	Non-major	15
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	15	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 415 0101 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County PRPRTY RIGHTS, ORGAN, MG

Instructor: CARROLL, KATHLE 29

Enrollment: Ouestionnaires: 11

Fall 2007 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 535

FEB 13, 2008

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	1	0	0	1	2	1	6	4.20	951/1639	4.20	4.12	4.27	4.42	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	6	2	4.00	1090/1639	4.00	4.09	4.22	4.29	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	4	2	3	3.60	1248/1397	3.60	4.17	4.28	4.38	3.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	1010/1583	4.00	3.94	4.19	4.31	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	4	2	3.50	1241/1532	3.50	3.95	4.01	4.07	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	5	3	3.90	945/1504	3.90	3.74	4.05	4.20	3.90
 Was the grading system clearly explained 	1	0	1	0	0	5	4	4.10	976/1612	4.10	4.25	4.16	4.18	4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	968/1635	4.70	4.58	4.65	4.72	4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	1	3	2	3.71	1200/1579	3.71	3.89	4.08	4.21	3.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	1053/1518	4.30	4.42	4.43	4.51	4.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	992/1520	4.70	4.65	4.70	4.75	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	4	2	3.78	1252/1517	3.78	4.14	4.27	4.34	3.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	2	4	3.80	1215/1550	3.80	4.25	4.22	4.24	3.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	1158/1295	3.00	3.71	3.94	4.01	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	770/1398	4.00	3.87	4.07	4.23	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	0	3	3	4.00	983/1391	4.00	4.15	4.30	4.48	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	1	2	3		1056/1388	3.86	4.19	4.28	4.50	3.86
4. Were special techniques successful	4	6	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 958	****	3.63	3.93	4.24	****

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

Course-Section: ECON 417 0101 University of Maryland

Title ECON STRATEGIC INTERAC Baltimore County Instructor: DASGUPTA, NANDI Fall 2007

Enrollment: 28 Questionnaires: 18

C+11don+	00,,,,,,,	Errolination	Ouestionnaire
Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Page 536

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

	Overtions						Fre	equei		S		Inst	ructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did v	vou gain n	ew insights,ski		m this course	1	0	1	0	0	5	11	4.47	656/1639	4.47	4.12	4.27	4.42	4.47
_		ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82		4.82	4.09	4.22	4.29	4.82
		uestions reflec			1	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	271/1397	4.76	4.17	4.28	4.38	4.76
	_	uations reflect		_	1	1	0	0	1	9	6	4.31		4.31		4.19	4.31	4.31
				what you learned	1	2	1		1	4	9	4.33	.,		3.95	4.01	4.07	4.33
				what you learned	1		0	0		3			678/1504			4.05	4.20	4.18
		g system clearl			1	0	0	1		4			837/1612	4.24	4.25	4.16	4.18	4.24
		was class canc			1	0	0	0	0	16	1	4.06	1475/1635	4.06		4.65	4.72	4.06
	-			ning effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4			175/1579				4.21	4.75
		Lectur	۵															
1 Were	the instr	uctor's lecture		orepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4 94	128/1518	4.94	4 42	4.43	4 51	4.94
				-	1	0	0	0					328/1520		4.65	4.70		
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clearly				1	-	0	0					222/1517				4.34	
	was lecture material presented and explained clearly Did the lectures contribute to what you learned				1		0	1	-				338/1550				4.24	
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding				2		2	2	0				1206/1295					
		_	_															
		Discus																
				what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	2			369/1398	4.60				
				d to participate	13	0	0	0	1			4.60	,	4.60	4.15	4.30	4.48	4.60
				d open discussion	13	0	0	0		1		4.80	328/1388	4.80	4.19	4.28	4.50	4.80
4. Were	special to	echniques succe	ssful		13	1	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 958	****	3.63	3.93	4.24	****
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	S			Туј	pe			Majors	1
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	 0	 А 9								2	Graduat		0			7
00-27 28-55	1	1.00-0.99	0	A 9 B 6		ке	quire	eu I	الان تار	a Jor	5	۷	Graduat	=	U	Majo	Σ	/
28-55 56-83	1	2.00-2.99		в 6 С 1		Cor	nera:	1				3	Under-g	rad 1	0	Non	-major	11
						Gel	nera.	т				٥	onder-g.	Lau I	.0	NOII-	-ma Jor	ТТ
Grad.	84-150 7 3.00-3.49 4 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0					₽1.	ectiv	700				0	#### - 1	Meane +	here a	re not	enous	h
Grau.	Graα. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0					11.11.5	CCCI	vca				J	respons				_	11
				I O		O+1	her				1	.1	T CPFOILP	- L U L	c argi.	ııııcaı	10	
				2 1		ULI	IICT				1							
			; ±															

INTRO TO ECONOMETRICS

Title DASGUPTA, NANDI

Instructor:

Enrollment: 38 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 537 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Ouestions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	3	4	5	7		1296/1639		4.12	4.27		3.84
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	8	4	7		1326/1639	3.80	4.09	4.22	4.29	3.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	6	3	9 4		1086/1397		4.17	4.28	4.38	3.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6 7	0 1	3 1	4 4	3 2	5		1378/1583 1112/1532	3.57 3.69	3.94 3.95	4.19 4.01	4.31	3.57 3.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	3	3	6	1	-		1415/1504		3.74	4.01	4.07	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	3	5			1175/1612		4.25	4.16	4.18	3.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	3	15	2		1533/1635		4.58	4.65		3.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	0	5	4	6		1079/1579			4.08	4.21	
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	4	12	4.47	849/1518	4.47	4.42	4.43	4.51	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	17	4.84	699/1520	4.84	4.65	4.70	4.75	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	1	4	4	8		1248/1517		4.14	4.27	4.34	3.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	3	3		4.16	982/1550	4.16	4.25	4.22	4.24	4.16
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	14	2	0	1	0	1	2.50	****/1295	****	3.71	3.94	4.01	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	3		****/1398	****	3.87	4.07	4.23	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1391	****	4.15	4.30	4.48	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	0	4		****/1388	****	4.19	4.28	4.50	****
4. Were special techniques successful	16	1	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 958	****	3.63	3.93	4.24	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 224	****	5.00	4.10	4.49	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.11	4.26	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 219	****	5.00	4.44	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 215	****	5.00	4.35	4.28	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 198	****	5.00	4.18	4.21	****
Seminar							_							****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 85	****	4.75	4.58	4.83	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19 19	0	0	0	0	0	1 1	5.00	****/ 82 ****/ 78	****	5.00	4.52 4.47	4.49	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78 ****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.56 4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 82	****	5.00	4.16	4.02	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	4.84	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.05	4.58	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.71	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	4.73	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 32		5.00	4.56	4.64	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.85	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	4.85	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	0	_		****/ 21	****		4.52	4.50	****

Title INTRO TO ECONOMETRICS

Instructor: DASGUPTA, NANDI

Enrollment: 38
Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 537 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	1	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	19	Non-major	16
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	1						

THEORY OF PUBLIC FINAN

Title

Instructor: MORRIS, RUSSELL

Enrollment: 43 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 538 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	quer	ncie	S		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	4	11	6		1281/1639		4.12	4.27	4.42	3.87
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	6	9		1090/1639	4.00	4.09	4.22	4.29	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	6	12	4.26			4.17	4.28		4.26
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	1	3	5	2		1282/1583		3.94	4.19	4.31	3.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0 7	0	2 2	8 8	8	5		1112/1532		3.95	4.01	4.07	3.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	5	3 14	4.43	1244/1504 589/1612	3.44 4.43	3.74 4.25	4.05 4.16	4.20 4.18	3.44 4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	,		4.58	4.65	4.72	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	5	14	1		1200/1579		3.89	4.08		3.71
J. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	_	Ü	Ü	-	,		_	3.71	1200/13/3	3.71	3.03	1.00	1.21	3.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	3	9	9	4.18	1148/1518	4.18	4.42	4.43	4.51	4.18
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	5	14	4.50	1188/1520	4.50	4.65	4.70	4.75	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	6	8	6	3.82	1235/1517	3.82	4.14	4.27	4.34	3.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	4	4	12	4.14	1000/1550	4.14	4.25	4.22	4.24	4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	3	0	3	6	3	3.40	1035/1295	3.40	3.71	3.94	4.01	3.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	5	4	3		1066/1398	3.62	3.87	4.07	4.23	3.62
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	380/1391	4.77	4.15	4.30	4.48	4.77
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54		4.54	4.19	4.28	4.50	4.54
4. Were special techniques successful	10	9	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	****/ 958	****	3.63	3.93	4.24	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 224	****	5.00	4.10	4.49	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 240	****	5.00	4.11	4.26	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 219	****	5.00	4.44	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 215	****	5.00	4.35	4.28	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 198	****	5.00	4.18	4.21	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 85	****	4.75	4.58	4.83	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	4.49	***
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.56	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.16	4.02	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4 00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	4.84	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 53	****	5.00	4.05	4.58	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.71	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	4.73	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 32		5.00	4.56		****
The same and the s		-	-	-	-	J	-		, 32					
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.85	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	4.00	***
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	4.85	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	, -	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	4.50	***

Title THEORY OF PUBLIC FINAN

Instructor:

MORRIS, RUSSELL

Enrollment: 43

Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 538 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	larned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	11						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	23	Non-major	16
84-150	17	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	20				
				?	0						

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

Title HEALTH ECONOMICS Baltimore Count Instructor: GOLDFARB, MARSH Fall 2007

Enrollment: 46
Questionnaires: 38

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 539 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	1	1	4	10	19	4.29	860/1639	4.10	4.12	4.27	4.42	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	2	0	6	11	16		1003/1639	3.74	4.09	4.22	4.29	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	1	3	14	16	4.23	822/1397	3.98	4.17	4.28	4.38	4.23
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	10	2	1	4	6	12	4.00	1010/1583	4.00	3.94	4.19	4.31	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	2	4	15	12	4.03	759/1532	3.61	3.95	4.01	4.07	4.03
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	15	1	1	2	7	9	4.10	770/1504	4.05	3.74	4.05	4.20	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	1	0	1	3	12	17	4.36	681/1612	4.13	4.25	4.16	4.18	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	10	25	4.71	943/1635	4.86	4.58	4.65	4.72	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	2	0	1	7	11	3	3.73	1193/1579	3.74	3.89	4.08	4.21	3.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	2	1	4	6	22	4.29	1069/1518	4.23	4.42	4.43	4.51	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	3	6	26		1047/1520	4.60	4.65	4.70	4.75	4.66
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	3	8	23	4.49	622/1517	4.20	4.14	4.27	4.34	4.49
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	4	4	25	4.46	703/1550	4.09	4.25	4.22		4.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	16	0	1	2	2	13	4.50	265/1295	4.00	3.71	3.94	4.01	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	3	0	1	4	10	4.00	770/1398	3.63	3.87	4.07	4.23	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	2	0	1	1	14	4.39	710/1391	4.44	4.15	4.30	4.48	4.39
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	2	1	0	2	13	4.28	821/1388	3.89	4.19	4.28	4.50	4.28
4. Were special techniques successful	20	6	0	1	1	2	8	4.42	260/ 958	4.42	3.63	3.93	4.24	4.42
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	5.00	4.10	4.49	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.11	4.26	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	5.00	4.44	4.42	* * * *
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	37	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 215	****	5.00	4.35	4.28	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	5.00	4.18	4.21	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.75	4.58	4.83	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	4.49	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.56	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.16	4.02	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	4.84	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.05	4.58	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.71	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	37	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	4.73	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	***	5.00	4.56	4.64	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.85	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	37	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	37	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	4.85	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	37	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	***
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	37	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	4.50	****

Course-Section: ECON 467 0101 Title HEALTH ECONOMICS Instructor:

GOLDFARB, MARSH

Enrollment: 46 Questionnaires: 38 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 539 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Earned		ed Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	6		
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	13								
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	10	C	7	General	2	Under-grad	38	Non-major	32		
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	5	D	0								
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5		F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	s there are not enough				
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant			
				I	0	Other	25						
				?	0								

Baltimore County Fall 2007

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: ECON 467 0201 University of Maryland Page 540 Title FEB 13, 2008 HEALTH ECONOMICS Instructor: GOLDFARB, MARSH Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 13

13

						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 you gain new insights, skills from this course						0	1	1	2	1	6	3.91	1252/1639	4.10	4.12	4.27	4.42	3.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals						0	2	2	1	2	4	3.36	1530/1639	3.74	4.09	4.22		3.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals						0	2	1	1	1	6	3.73	1190/1397	3.98	4.17	4.28	4.38	3.73
4. Did	4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals						0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1583	4.00	3.94	4.19	4.31	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned						0	2	1	3	3	2	3.18	1384/1532	3.61	3.95	4.01	4.07	3.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned						7	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	824/1504	4.05	3.74	4.05	4.20	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained						1	1	1	1	2	5	3.90	1175/1612	4.13	4.25	4.16	4.18	3.90
8. How many times was class cancelled						0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1635	4.86	4.58	4.65	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness					4	1	1	1	1	1	4	3.75	1170/1579	3.74	3.89	4.08	4.21	3.75
		Lectur	e															
1. Were	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared					0	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	1148/1518	4.23	4.42	4.43	4.51	4.18
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject					2	0	0	0	1	3	7		1158/1520		4.65	4.70	4.75	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly					2	0	1	2	0	2	6		1182/1517		4.14	4.27	4.34	3.91
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					2	0	2	1	1	1	6	3.73	1250/1550	4.09	4.25	4.22	4.24	3.73
	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding				3	6	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	978/1295	4.00	3.71	3.94	4.01	3.50
		Discus	sion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned					9	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1207/1398	3.63	3.87	4.07	4.23	3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate					9	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	616/1391	4.44	4.15	4.30	4.48	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion					9	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	1185/1388	3.89	4.19	4.28	4.50	3.50
	4. Were special techniques successful					3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 958	4.42	3.63	3.93	4.24	***
				Frequ	iency	/ Dist	trib	utio:	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades						Reasons						Type					Majors	
	Barrea Cum. Of A Barrette Grades											 1						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors					s	0	Graduat	e 0 Major			2		
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2							0	1	, ,	2			1.1	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 1	General						0	Under-g	rad 1	.3	Non-	major	11	
84-150		3.00-3.49	3	D 0							0			1			1-	
Grad.	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0					Electives						<pre>0 #### - Means there are not enough</pre>						jh

Other

10

responses to be significant

Ρ

I

0

0

Course-Section: ECON 475 0101

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2007

Title FINANCIAL INVSTMNT ANA Instructor: COATES, DENNIS

Enrollment: 45
Questionnaires: 19

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 541 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 1 2 6 12 4.58 540/1639 4.58 4.12 4.27 4.42 4.51 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 1 2 3 13 4.47 567/1639 4.47 4.01 4.22 4.29 4.47 4. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 1 2 3 15 4.74 302/1397 4.74 4.17 4.28 4.38 4.77 4. Did the revaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 1 1 4 2 8 4.13 910/1583 4.13 3.94 4.19 4.21 4.27 4.4 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 1 1 4 13 4.53 323/1532 4.53 3.95 4.01 4.07 4.5 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 1 0 2 3 12 4.39 506/1504 4.39 3.74 4.05 4.20 4.37 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 8 4.89 676/1635 4.93 3.95 4.01 4.07 4.5 5. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 8 4.89 676/1635 4.93 3.74 4.05 4.20 4.39 5. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 8 4.89 676/1635 4.93 3.74 4.05 4.20 4.39 5. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 8 4.89 676/1635 4.99 4.58 4.65 4.72 4.89 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 1 0 1 2 4 8 4.27 646/1579 4.27 3.89 4.08 4.21 4.27 4.34 4.27 5. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5. Did addivisual techniques enhance your understanding 6. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0				Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 1 6 12 4.58 540/1639 4.58 4.12 4.27 4.42 4.51 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 1 2 3 13 4.47 567/1639 4.77 4.09 4.22 4.29 4.47 4. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 3 15 4.74 302/1397 4.74 4.17 4.28 4.38 4.74 5.01 dother evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 4 0 1 4 2 8 4.13 910/1583 4.13 3.94 4.19 4.31 4.15 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 1 4 13 4.53 323/1532 4.53 3.95 4.01 4.07 4.55 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 1 0 2 3 12 4.39 506/1504 4.39 3.74 4.05 4.20 4.39 7.00 was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 8 4.89 676/1635 4.89 4.58 4.05 4.72 4.88 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 1 0 1 2 4 8 4.27 646/1579 4.27 3.89 4.08 4.21 4.25 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 1 0 1 2 4 8 4.27 646/1579 4.27 3.89 4.08 4.21 4.25 9. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 1 1 3 14 4.58 1136/1522 4.58 4.65 4.70 4.75 4.51 3.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00	Questions	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 1 2 3 13 4.47 567/1639 4.47 4.09 4.22 4.29 4.47 4. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 3 15 4.74 302/1397 4.74 4.17 4.28 4.38 4.75 4. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 4 0 1 4 2 8 4.13 910/1583 4.13 3.94 4.19 4.31 4.15 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 1 4 13 4.53 323/1532 4.53 3.95 4.01 4.07 4.55 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 1 0 2 3 12 4.39 506/1504 4.39 3.74 4.05 4.20 4.33 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 15 4.79 186/1612 4.79 4.25 4.16 4.18 4.77 8. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 1 0 1 2 4 8 4.27 646/1579 4.27 3.89 4.08 4.21 4.22 4.22 4.24 4.24 4.25 4.26 4.26 4.26 4.26 4.26 4.26 4.26 4.26	General														
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 3 15 4.74 302/1397 4.74 4.17 4.28 4.38 4.74 4.01 of their evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 4 0 1 4 2 8 4.13 910/1583 4.13 3.94 4.19 4.31 4.15 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 1 4 13 4.53 323/1532 4.53 3.95 4.01 4.07 4.55 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 1 0 2 3 12 4.39 506/1504 4.39 3.74 4.05 4.20 4.31 7.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00	1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	540/1639	4.58	4.12	4.27	4.42	4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 4 0 1 4 2 8 4.13 910/1583 4.13 3.94 4.19 4.31 4.15 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 1 4 13 4.53 323/1532 4.53 3.95 4.01 4.07 4.55 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 1 0 2 3 12 4.39 506/1504 4.39 3.74 4.05 4.20 4.31 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 15 4.79 186/1612 4.79 4.25 4.16 4.18 4.79 9. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 18 4.89 676/1635 4.89 4.58 4.65 4.72 4.88 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 1 0 1 2 4 8 4.27 646/1579 4.27 3.89 4.08 4.21 4.27	2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	13	4.47	567/1639	4.47	4.09	4.22	4.29	4.47
5. Did assignmed readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 1 1 4 13 4.53 323/1532 4.53 3.95 4.01 4.07 4.55 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 1 0 2 3 12 4.39 506/1504 4.39 3.74 4.05 4.20 4.39 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 4 15 4.79 186/1612 4.79 4.25 4.16 4.18 4.79 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 18 4.89 676/1635 4.89 4.58 4.65 4.72 4.89 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 1 0 1 2 4 8 4.27 646/1579 4.27 3.89 4.08 4.21 4.27 4.29 1.20 1.20 1.20 1.20 1.20 1.20 1.20 1.20	3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	302/1397	4.74	4.17	4.28	4.38	4.74
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 1 0 2 3 12 4.39 506/1504 4.39 3.74 4.05 4.20 4.35 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 4 15 4.79 186/1612 4.79 4.25 4.16 4.18 4.79 9. How may times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 1 0 18 4.89 676/1635 4.89 4.58 4.65 4.72 4.81 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 1 0 1 2 4 8 4.27 646/1579 4.27 3.89 4.08 4.21 4.27 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 4 15 4.79 397/1518 4.79 4.42 4.43 4.51 4.75 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 1 1 3 14 4.58 1136/1520 4.58 4.65 4.70 4.75 4.55 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 3 4 12 4.47 635/1517 4.47 4.14 4.27 4.34 4.47 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 3 4 12 4.47 635/1517 4.47 4.12 4.27 4.34 4.47 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 12 0 0 1 2 4 4.43 329/1295 4.43 3.71 3.94 4.01 4.47 5. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 2 2 1 4 3.78 950/1398 3.78 3.87 4.07 4.23 3.77 5. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10 0 0 1 0 2 6 4.44 662/1391 4.44 4.15 4.30 4.48 4.49 6. Were special techniques successful 10 6 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 ****/ 958 **** 3.63 3.93 4.24 **** Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 18 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 224 **** 5.00 4.10 4.49 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors	4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	4	2	8	4.13	910/1583	4.13	3.94	4.19	4.31	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 4 15 4.79 186/1612 4.79 4.25 4.16 4.18 4.79 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 18 4.89 676/1635 4.89 4.58 4.65 4.72 4.88 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 1 0 1 2 4 8 4.27 646/1579 4.27 3.89 4.08 4.21 4.2 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 15 4.79 397/1518 4.79 4.42 4.43 4.51 4.79 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 1 1 3 14 4.58 1136/1520 4.58 4.65 4.70 4.75 4.58 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 3 4 12 4.47 635/1517 4.77 4.14 4.27 4.34 4.44 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 3 4 12 4.47 677/1550 4.47 4.14 4.27 4.25 4.22 4.24 4.45 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 12 0 0 1 2 4 4.43 329/1295 4.43 3.71 3.94 4.01 4.45 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 2 2 1 4 3.78 950/1398 3.78 3.87 4.07 4.23 3.71 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10 0 0 1 0 2 6 4.44 662/1391 4.44 4.15 4.30 4.48 4.43 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10 0 0 1 0 1 7 4.56 609/1388 4.56 4.19 4.28 4.50 4.54 4. Were special techniques successful 10 6 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 ****/ 958 **** 3.63 3.93 4.24 **** Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 18 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 958 **** 5.00 4.10 4.49 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors	5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	13	4.53	323/1532	4.53	3.95	4.01	4.07	4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 1 0 18 4.89 676/1635 4.89 4.58 4.05 4.72 4.89 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 1 0 1 2 4 8 4.27 646/1579 4.27 3.89 4.08 4.21 4.22 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 4 15 4.79 397/1518 4.79 4.42 4.43 4.51 4.75 3. Was lecture material presented in the subject 0 0 0 1 1 3 14 4.58 1136/1520 4.58 4.65 4.70 4.75 4.55 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 3 4 12 4.47 635/1517 4.47 4.14 4.27 4.34 4.47 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 3 4 12 4.47 677/1550 4.47 4.25 4.22 4.24 4.47 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 12 0 0 1 2 4 4.43 329/1295 4.43 3.71 3.94 4.01 4.47 5. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 2 2 1 4 3.78 950/1398 3.78 3.87 4.07 4.23 3.77 5. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10 0 0 1 0 2 6 4.44 662/1391 4.44 4.15 4.30 4.48 4.44 6. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10 0 0 1 0 1 7 4.56 609/1388 4.56 4.19 4.28 4.50 4.56 6. Were special techniques successful 10 6 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 958 **** 3.63 3.93 4.24 **** Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 18 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 958 **** 5.00 4.10 4.49 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors	6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	2	3	12	4.39	506/1504	4.39	3.74	4.05	4.20	4.39
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 3 14 4.58 1136/1520 4.58 4.65 4.70 4.75 4.51 4.79 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 1 1 3 14 4.58 1136/1520 4.58 4.65 4.70 4.75 4.51 4.79 2. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 3 4 12 4.47 635/1517 4.47 4.14 4.27 4.34 4.47 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 3 4 12 4.47 677/1550 4.47 4.25 4.22 4.24 4.47 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 12 0 0 1 2 4 4.43 329/1295 4.43 3.71 3.94 4.01 4.45 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 2 2 1 4 3.78 950/1398 3.78 3.87 4.07 4.23 3.71 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10 0 0 1 0 2 6 4.44 662/1391 4.44 4.15 4.30 4.48 4.43 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10 0 0 1 0 1 7 4.56 609/1388 4.56 4.19 4.28 4.50 4.56 4. Were special techniques successful 10 6 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 958 **** 3.63 3.93 4.24 **** Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 18 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 958 **** 5.00 4.10 4.49 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors	7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	186/1612	4.79	4.25	4.16	4.18	4.79
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 3 14 4.58 1136/1520 4.58 4.65 4.70 4.75 4.55 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 3 4 12 4.47 635/1517 4.47 4.14 4.27 4.34 4.47 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 3 4 12 4.47 677/1550 4.47 4.25 4.22 4.24 4.45 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 12 0 0 1 2 4 4.43 329/1295 4.43 3.71 3.94 4.01 4.45 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 2 2 1 4 3.78 950/1398 3.78 3.87 4.07 4.23 3.77 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10 0 0 1 0 2 6 4.44 662/1391 4.44 4.15 4.30 4.48 4.49 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10 0 0 1 0 1 7 4.56 609/1388 4.56 4.19 4.28 4.50 4.56 4. Were special techniques successful 10 6 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 958 **** 3.63 3.93 4.24 **** Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 18 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 958 **** 5.00 4.10 4.49 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors	8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	18	4.89	676/1635	4.89	4.58	4.65	4.72	4.89
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 4 15 4.79 397/1518 4.79 4.42 4.43 4.51 4.79 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 1 1 3 3 14 4.58 1136/1520 4.58 4.65 4.70 4.75 4.55 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.55 4.65 4.70 4.75 4.55 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.5	9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	646/1579	4.27	3.89	4.08	4.21	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 1 1 3 14 4.58 1136/1520 4.58 4.65 4.70 4.75 4.56 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 3 4 12 4.47 635/1517 4.47 4.14 4.27 4.34 4.47 4.10 the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 3 4 12 4.47 677/1550 4.47 4.25 4.22 4.24 4.47 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 12 0 0 1 2 4 4.43 329/1295 4.43 3.71 3.94 4.01 4.45 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 2 2 1 4 3.78 950/1398 3.78 3.87 4.07 4.23 3.77 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10 0 0 1 0 2 6 4.44 662/1391 4.44 4.15 4.30 4.48 4.43 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10 0 0 1 0 1 7 4.56 609/1388 4.56 4.19 4.28 4.50 4.56 4. Were special techniques successful 10 6 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 ****/ 958 **** 3.63 3.93 4.24 **** Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 18 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 224 **** 5.00 4.10 4.49 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors	Lecture														
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 3 4 12 4.47 635/1517 4.47 4.14 4.27 4.34 4.47 4.10 the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 3 4 12 4.47 677/1550 4.47 4.25 4.22 4.24 4.47 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 12 0 0 1 2 4 4.43 329/1295 4.43 3.71 3.94 4.01 4.45 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 12 0 0 1 2 4 4.43 329/1295 4.43 3.71 3.94 4.01 4.45 5. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 2 2 1 4 3.78 950/1398 3.78 3.87 4.07 4.23 3.74 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10 0 0 1 0 2 6 4.44 662/1391 4.44 4.15 4.30 4.48 4.45 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	397/1518	4.79	4.42	4.43	4.51	4.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 3 4 12 4.47 677/1550 4.47 4.25 4.22 4.24 4.47 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 12 0 0 1 2 4 4.43 329/1295 4.43 3.71 3.94 4.01 4.45 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 2 2 1 4 3.78 950/1398 3.78 3.87 4.07 4.23 3.77 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10 0 0 1 0 2 6 4.44 662/1391 4.44 4.15 4.30 4.48 4.43 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10 0 0 1 0 1 7 4.56 609/1388 4.56 4.19 4.28 4.50 4.56 4. Were special techniques successful 10 6 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 ****/ 958 **** 3.63 3.93 4.24 **** Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 18 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 224 **** 5.00 4.10 4.49 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors	2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	3	14	4.58	1136/1520	4.58	4.65	4.70	4.75	4.58
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 2 2 1 4 3.78 950/1398 3.78 3.87 4.07 4.23 3.74 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10 0 0 1 0 2 6 4.44 662/1391 4.44 4.15 4.30 4.48 4.45 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10 0 0 1 0 1 7 4.56 609/1388 4.56 4.19 4.28 4.50 4.54 4.54 4.55 4.55 4.55 4.55 4.55	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	4	12	4.47	635/1517	4.47	4.14	4.27	4.34	4.47
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 2 2 1 4 3.78 950/1398 3.78 3.87 4.07 4.23 3.76 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10 0 0 1 0 2 6 4.44 662/1391 4.44 4.15 4.30 4.48 4.44 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10 0 0 1 0 1 7 4.56 609/1388 4.56 4.19 4.28 4.50 4.55 4. Were special techniques successful 10 6 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 ****/ 958 **** 3.63 3.93 4.24 **** Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 18 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 224 **** 5.00 4.10 4.49 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	12	4.47	677/1550	4.47	4.25	4.22	4.24	4.47
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 2 2 1 4 3.78 950/1398 3.78 3.87 4.07 4.23 3.72 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10 0 0 1 0 2 6 4.44 662/1391 4.44 4.15 4.30 4.48 4.44 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10 0 0 1 0 1 7 4.56 609/1388 4.56 4.19 4.28 4.50 4.56 4. Were special techniques successful 10 6 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 ****/ 958 **** 3.63 3.93 4.24 **** Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 18 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 224 **** 5.00 4.10 4.49 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	12	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	329/1295	4.43	3.71	3.94	4.01	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10 0 0 1 0 2 6 4.44 662/1391 4.44 4.15 4.30 4.48 4.44 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10 0 0 1 0 1 7 4.56 609/1388 4.56 4.19 4.28 4.50 4.56 4. Were special techniques successful 10 6 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 ****/ 958 **** 3.63 3.93 4.24 **** Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 18 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 224 **** 5.00 4.10 4.49 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors	Discussion														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10 0 0 1 0 1 7 4.56 609/1388 4.56 4.19 4.28 4.50 4.50 4.50 4. Were special techniques successful 10 6 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 ****/ 958 **** 3.63 3.93 4.24 **** Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 18 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 224 **** 5.00 4.10 4.49 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors	1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	2	2	1	4	3.78	950/1398	3.78	3.87	4.07	4.23	3.78
4. Were special techniques successful 10 6 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 ****/ 958 **** 3.63 3.93 4.24 **** Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 18 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 224 **** 5.00 4.10 4.49 *** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors	2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	662/1391	4.44	4.15	4.30	4.48	4.44
Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 18 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 224 **** 5.00 4.10 4.49 *** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors	3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	609/1388	4.56	4.19	4.28	4.50	4.56
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 18 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 224 **** 5.00 4.10 4.49 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors	4. Were special techniques successful	10	6	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 958	****	3.63	3.93	4.24	****
Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors	Laboratory														
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors	1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 224	****	5.00	4.10	4.49	****
	Freq	uency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 10 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 1 Major 3	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	5
	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 10		Red		ed fo	or Ma			0	Graduat	 e	1	 Maic	 or	3

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	2	Under-grad	18	Non-major	16
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	16	_			
				2	2						

Course-Section: ECON 477 0101 University of Maryland Title DERIVATIVE SECURITIES Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008

Instructor: GETTER, DARYL

Enrollment: 41 Questionnaires: 31

	I	Fall	2007	
Student	Course	Evalua	ation	Ouestionnaire

Page 542

Job IRBR3029

					Frequencies NR NA 1 2 3 4					s		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 vo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski		m this course	1	0	1	1	6	6	16	4.17	990/1639	4.17	4.12	4.27	4.42	4.17
		ctor make clear			1	-	2	2	9	8	9		1410/1639		4.09	4.22	4.29	3.67
		uestions reflec			1		3	5	8	4	10		1290/1397		4.17	4.28		3.43
	_	uations reflect		_	1	4	2	2	7	7	- 8		1331/1583		3.94	4.19	4.31	3.65
				what you learned		13	3	2	5	2	5		1367/1532		3.95	4.01	4.07	3.24
	_	_		o what you learned	1	10	2	2	4		6		1154/1504		3.74	4.05	4.20	3.60
		g system clearl			1	0	1	3			17		837/1612		4.25	4.16	4.18	4.23
		was class canc			1	0	0	0	1	0	29	4.93	463/1635	4.93	4.58	4.65	4.72	4.93
	-			hing effectiveness	8	1	1	0	6	11	4		1155/1579			4.08	4.21	3.77
	_																	
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	the instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	5	0	1	0	2	10	13	4.31	1053/1518	4.31	4.42	4.43	4.51	4.31
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	5	0	0	1	1	9	15	4.46	1222/1520	4.46	4.65	4.70	4.75	4.46
3. Was le	ecture ma	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	5	0	1	1	7	7	10	3.92	1162/1517	3.92	4.14	4.27	4.34	3.92
4. Did th	ne lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	5	0	1	1	5	4	15	4.19	944/1550	4.19	4.25	4.22	4.24	4.19
5. Did au	udiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	6	14	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	731/1295	3.91	3.71	3.94	4.01	3.91
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	lass disc			what you learned	18	0	0	2	2	5	4	3.85	912/1398	3.85	3.87	4.07	4.23	3.85
				d to participate	18	0	1	1	1	6	4	3.85	1100/1391	3.85	4.15	4.30	4.48	3.85
				d open discussion	19	0	0	2	2	3	5	3.92	1025/1388	3.92	4.19	4.28	4.50	3.92
		echniques succe		-	20	6	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	****/ 958	***	3.63	3.93	4.24	****
				Frequ	encs	, Diet	trib	ut i oı	n									
				11040	ciicy	DIS	CIID	acro.										
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	S			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 6		Red	auir	ed f	or M	 aior		0	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 5								-	2_3.3.300	-	-) ~		-
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C 8	General							4	Under-q	rad 3	1	Non-	major	31
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	9	D 1									5				3	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives							0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enouc	h
				P 0									respons				_	
				I 0		Otl	her				1	9	-		5			
				? 4														

Course-Section: ECON 481 0101

INTERNATIONAL TRADE TH

Title

Instructor: TAKACS, WENDY E

Enrollment: 42 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 543 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eauer	ncies			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean			
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	2	3	18	4.58	529/1639	4.58	4.12	4.27	4.42	4.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	17	4.67	349/1639	4.67	4.09	4.22	4.29	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	4	17	4.58	437/1397	4.58	4.17	4.28	4.38	4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	13	1	0	0	2	8	4.45	536/1583	4.45	3.94	4.19	4.31	4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	0	4	5	11	4.05	744/1532	4.05	3.95	4.01	4.07	4.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	11	1	0	1	1	10	4.46	416/1504	4.46	3.74	4.05	4.20	4.46
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	5	18	4.71	270/1612	4.71	4.25	4.16	4.18	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	331/1635	4.96	4.58	4.65	4.72	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	3	4	11	4.44	450/1579	4.44	3.89	4.08	4.21	4.44
Lecture	_	0	0	0	^	^	0.0	F 00	1 /1 510	F 00	4 40	4 42	4 51	F 00
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1518		4.42	4.43	4.51	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.65	4.70	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	263/1517	4.78	4.14	4.27	4.34	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1 0	0	0	2	20	4.74	376/1550	4.74	4.25	4.22		4.74 ****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	15	U	0	1	3	2	4.17	****/1295	***	3.71	3.94	4.01	***
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	3	3	2	6	3.60	1074/1398	3.60	3.87	4.07	4.23	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	489/1391	4.67	4.15	4.30	4.48	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	411/1388	4.73	4.19	4.28	4.50	4.73
4. Were special techniques successful	10	11	2	0	0	1	1		****/ 958	****	3.63	3.93	4.24	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 224	****	5.00	4.10	4.49	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 240	****	5.00	4.11	4.26	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 219	****	5.00	4.44	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 215	****	5.00	4.35	4.28	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	5.00	4.18	4.21	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.75	4.58	4.83	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	4.49	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.56	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 82		5.00	4.16	4.02	****
5. Wele criteria for grading made crear	2.	Ü	O	Ü	Ü	Ü	_	3.00	, 62		3.00	1.10	1.02	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	4.84	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.05	4.58	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.71	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	4.73	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.56	4.64	****
Self Paced	0.4	0	0	0	^	_	1	F 00	****/ - ^		F 00	4 45	4 05	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.85	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	4.85	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24 24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32 ****/ 21	****	5.00	4.37	4.67 4.50	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	U	U	U	U	U	Τ	5.00	/ 21		5.00	4.52	4.50	

Course-Section: ECON 481 0101

Title INTERNATIONAL TRADE TH

Instructor:

TAKACS, WENDY E

Enrollment: 42
Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 543 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	3	Under-grad	25	Non-major	22
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 482 0101

INTERNATIONAL FINANCE

Title Instructor: MCINTYRE, KEVIN

Enrollment: 46 Questionnaires: 26 Fall 2007

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 544

FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
			~

				-quei	ncies	,			tructor	COULDC	Dept	UMDC	Level	Sect
N	IR :	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	0	0	0	1	2	5	18	4.54	582/1639	4.54	4.12	4.27	4.42	4.54
	0	0	0	2	2	6							4.29	4.38
	0	0	2	1	3	5	15	4.15			4.17	4.28	4.38	4.15
	0	9	0	3	1	3	10	4.18	871/1583	4.18	3.94	4.19	4.31	4.18
d	1	2	2	2	1	10	8	3.87	942/1532	3.87	3.95	4.01	4.07	3.87
	1	5	2	1	5	4	8	3.75	1051/1504	3.75	3.74	4.05	4.20	3.75
	1	0	0	0	5	4	16	4.44	575/1612	4.44	4.25	4.16	4.18	4.44
	1	0	0	0	0	13	12	4.48	1155/1635	4.48	4.58	4.65	4.72	4.48
ess	5	0	0	0	3	9	9	4.29	623/1579	4.29	3.89	4.08	4.21	4.29
	2	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	315/1518	4.83	4.42	4.43	4.51	4.83
	2	0	0	0	0	3	21	4.88	622/1520	4.88	4.65	4.70	4.75	4.88
У	2	0	0	0	2	4	18	4.67	405/1517	4.67	4.14	4.27	4.34	4.67
	2	0	0	1	0	3	20	4.75	351/1550	4.75	4.25	4.22	4.24	4.75
ng	4	13	2	1	2	0	4	3.33	1067/1295	3.33	3.71	3.94	4.01	3.33
d 1	.5	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	468/1398	4.45	3.87	4.07	4.23	4.45
e 1	.5	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	429/1391	4.73	4.15	4.30	4.48	4.73
on 1	.5	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	533/1388	4.64	4.19	4.28	4.50	4.64
1	.5	7	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/ 958	***	3.63	3.93	4.24	***
		0	0	0	1	0	0		,	****	5.00			****
es 2	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 219	****	5.00	4.44	4.42	****
		0	0	0	1	0	0		,		5.00	4.04	4.84	****
. 2	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.05	4.58	****
d 2	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	***	5.00	4.45	4.85	***
requen	су	Dist	ribu	ıtior	n									
des				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	5
		 Rea	nuire		 or Ma		 s	 2	Graduat	 e	0	Maic	 or	 2
		2109	. ~ C		110		-	_	5144446	-	-	. 10.) (
		Gen	neral					1	Under-a	rad 2	:6	Non-	-maior	24
		0011		-				_	011401 9	2	-	1.011		
		Ele	ectiv	res				0	#### -	Means t	here a	ire not	enou¢	ah
									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
		Oth	ner				1	9		es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
	d ned ess Y ng d 1 e 1 on 1 ion 2 es 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	0 0 0 d 1 ned 1 1 1 1 ess 5 5 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	0 0 0 0 0 0 9 d 1 2 ned 1 5 1 0 ess 5 0 0 2 0 0 1 3 d 1 3 d 15 0 es 15 0 0 15 7 ion 25 0 es 25 0 d 25 0 cs 25	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 2 0 0 2 1 0 9 0 3 d 1 2 2 2 2 ned 1 5 2 1 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 ess 5 0 0 0 2 0 0 0 2 0 0 0 2 0 0 0 2 0 0 0 2 0 0 0 2 0 0 1 ng 4 13 2 1 d 15 0 0 0 e 15 0 0 0 e 15 0 0 0 on 15 0 0 0 es 25 0 0 0 c 25 0 0 0 25 0 0 0 c 25	0 0 0 2 2 2 0 0 0 2 1 3 0 9 0 3 1 1 1 1 2 2 2 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	0 0 0 2 2 6 6 0 0 0 2 1 3 5 0 9 0 3 1 3 3 d 1 2 2 2 2 1 10 med 1 5 2 1 5 4 1 0 0 0 0 5 4 1 0 0 0 0 0 13 ess 5 0 0 0 0 0 3 9 ess 5 0 0 0 0 0 3 9 ess 5 0 0 0 0 0 3 9 ess 5 0 0 0 0 0 2 4 2 0 0 0 0 0 3 ang 4 13 2 1 2 0 0 d 15 0 0 0 0 2 2 e 15 0 0 0 0 1 2 and 15 0 0 0 0 1 2 and 15 0 0 0 0 1 2 and 15 0 0 0 1 0 and 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 and 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 and 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 2 2 2 6 16 0 0 0 2 1 3 5 15 0 9 0 3 1 3 10 d 1 2 2 2 2 1 10 8 ned 1 5 2 1 5 4 8 1 0 0 0 0 5 4 16 1 0 0 0 0 5 4 16 1 0 0 0 0 3 9 9 2 0 0 0 0 4 20 2 0 0 0 0 3 21 y 2 0 0 0 0 2 4 18 2 0 0 0 1 0 3 20 ng 4 13 2 1 2 0 4 d 15 0 0 0 2 2 7 e 15 0 0 0 1 2 8 on 15 0 0 0 1 2 8 on 15 7 1 0 0 2 1 ion 25 0 0 0 1 0 0 es 25 0 0 0 1 0 0 25 0 0 0 1 0 0 25 0 0 0 1 0 0 25 0 0 0 1 0 0 25 0 0 0 1 0 0 25 0 0 0 1 0 0 25 0 0 0 1 0 0 27 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 28 0 0 0 1 0 0 29 0 0 0 1 0 0 20 0 0 0 1 0 0 20 0 0 0 1 0 0 21 0 0 0 22 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 23 0 0 0 1 0 0 24 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 25 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 26 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 27 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 28 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 28 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 29 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 20 0 0 0 0 0 0 20 0 0 0	0 0 0 2 2 6 16 4.38 0 0 2 1 3 5 15 4.15 0 9 0 3 1 3 10 4.18 d 1 2 2 2 2 1 10 8 3.87 ned 1 5 2 1 5 4 8 3.75 1 0 0 0 0 5 4 16 4.44 1 0 0 0 0 5 4 16 4.44 1 0 0 0 0 13 12 4.48 ess 5 0 0 0 0 3 9 9 4.29 2 0 0 0 0 4 20 4.83 2 0 0 0 3 21 4.88 y 2 0 0 0 2 4 18 4.67 2 0 0 0 1 0 3 20 4.75 ng 4 13 2 1 2 0 4 3.33 d 15 0 0 0 2 2 7 4.45 e 15 0 0 0 3 8 4.73 on 15 0 0 0 1 2 8 4.64 15 7 1 0 0 2 1 3.50 ion 25 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 es 25 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 25 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 25 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 arequency Distribution des Reasons Required for Majors 2	0 0 0 2 2 6 16 4.38 709/1639 0 0 2 1 3 5 15 4.15 888/1397 0 9 0 3 1 3 10 4.18 871/1583 d 1 2 2 2 1 10 8 3.87 942/1532 ned 1 5 2 1 5 4 8 3.75 1051/1504 1 0 0 0 5 4 16 4.44 575/1612 1 0 0 0 0 13 12 4.48 1155/1635 ess 5 0 0 0 0 3 9 9 4.29 623/1579 2 0 0 0 0 4 20 4.83 315/1518 2 0 0 0 0 3 21 4.88 622/1520 y 2 0 0 0 0 3 21 4.88 622/1520 y 2 0 0 0 2 4 18 4.67 405/1517 2 0 0 1 0 3 20 4.75 351/1550 ng 4 13 2 1 2 0 4 3.33 1067/1295 d 15 0 0 0 2 2 7 4.45 468/1398 e 15 0 0 0 0 3 8 4.73 429/1391 on 15 0 0 0 1 2 8 4.64 533/1388 15 7 1 0 0 2 1 3.50 ****/ 958 ion 25 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 958 ion 25 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 53 d 25 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 53 d 25 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 53 d 25 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 53 d 25 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 50 requency Distribution des Reasons Ty Required for Majors 2 Graduat	0 0 0 2 2 6 16 4.38 709/1639 4.38 0 0 2 1 3 5 15 4.15 888/1397 4.15 0 9 9 0 3 1 3 10 4.18 871/1583 4.18 d 1 2 2 2 2 1 10 8 3.87 942/1532 3.87 ned 1 5 2 1 5 4 8 3.75 1051/1504 3.75 1 0 0 0 0 5 4 16 4.44 575/1612 4.44 1 0 0 0 0 0 13 12 4.48 1155/1635 4.48 ess 5 0 0 0 0 3 9 9 4.29 623/1579 4.29 2 0 0 0 0 4 20 4.83 315/1518 4.83 2 0 0 0 0 3 21 4.88 622/1520 4.88 y 2 0 0 0 0 2 4 18 4.67 405/1517 4.67 2 0 0 0 1 0 3 20 4.75 351/1550 4.75 ng 4 13 2 1 2 0 4 3.33 1067/1295 3.33 d 15 0 0 0 2 2 7 4.45 468/1398 4.45 e 15 0 0 0 0 3 8 4.73 429/1391 4.73 on 15 0 0 0 1 2 8 4.64 533/1388 4.64 15 7 1 0 0 2 1 3.50 ****/ 958 **** ion 25 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 958 **** ion 25 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 958 **** d 25 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 53 **** d 25 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 53 **** d 25 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 53 **** d 25 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 53 **** d 25 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 53 **** d 25 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 53 **** d 25 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 50 **** requency Distribution des Reasons Type Required for Majors 2 Graduate	0 0 0 2 2 2 6 16 4.38 709/1639 4.38 4.09 0 0 2 1 3 5 15 4.15 888/1397 4.15 4.17 0 9 0 3 1 3 10 4.18 871/1583 4.18 3.94 d 1 2 2 2 2 1 10 8 3.87 942/1532 3.87 3.95 ned 1 5 2 1 5 4 8 3.75 1051/1504 3.75 3.74 1 0 0 0 0 5 4 16 4.44 575/1612 4.44 4.25 1 0 0 0 0 13 12 4.48 1155/1635 4.48 4.58 ess 5 0 0 0 0 3 9 9 4.29 623/1579 4.29 3.89 2 0 0 0 0 0 4 20 4.83 315/1518 4.83 4.42 2 0 0 0 0 0 3 21 4.88 622/1520 4.88 4.65 y 2 0 0 0 0 2 4 18 4.67 405/1517 4.67 4.14 2 0 0 1 0 3 20 4.75 351/1550 4.75 4.25 ng 4 13 2 1 2 0 4 3.33 1067/1295 3.33 3.71 d 15 0 0 0 2 2 7 4.45 468/1398 4.45 3.87 e 15 0 0 0 0 1 2 8 4.64 533/1388 4.64 4.19 15 7 1 0 0 2 1 3.50 ****/ 958 **** 3.63 ion 25 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 53 **** 5.00 25 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 53 **** 5.00 25 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 53 **** 5.00 26 Reasons Type Required for Majors 2 Graduate 0	0 0 0 2 2 6 16 4.38 709/1639 4.38 4.09 4.22 0 0 2 1 3 5 15 4.15 888/1397 4.15 4.17 4.28 0 9 0 3 1 3 5 10 4.18 871/1583 4.18 3.94 4.19 d 1 2 2 2 1 10 8 3.87 942/1532 3.87 3.95 4.01 ned 1 5 2 1 5 4 8 3.75 1051/1504 3.75 3.74 4.05 1 0 0 0 5 4 16 4.44 575/1612 4.44 4.25 4.16 1 0 0 0 0 5 4 16 4.44 575/1612 4.44 4.25 4.16 ess 5 0 0 0 0 3 9 9 4.29 623/1579 4.29 3.89 4.08 2 0 0 0 0 4 20 4.83 315/1518 4.83 4.42 4.43 2 0 0 0 0 3 21 4.88 622/1520 4.88 4.65 4.70 y 2 0 0 0 2 4 18 4.67 405/1517 4.67 4.14 4.27 2 0 0 0 1 0 3 20 4.75 351/1550 4.75 4.25 4.22 ng 4 13 2 1 2 0 4 3.33 1067/1295 3.33 3.71 3.94 d 15 0 0 0 2 2 7 4.45 468/1398 4.45 3.87 4.07 e 15 0 0 0 1 2 8 4.64 533/1388 4.64 4.19 4.28 no 15 0 0 0 1 2 8 4.64 533/1388 4.64 4.19 4.28 15 7 1 0 0 2 1 3.50 ****/ 958 **** 3.63 3.93 ion 25 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 958 **** 5.00 4.44 25 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 958 **** 5.00 4.44 25 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 958 **** 5.00 4.44 25 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 958 **** 5.00 4.44 25 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 958 **** 5.00 4.44 25 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 50 **** 5.00 4.45 requency Distribution des Reasons Type Required for Majors 2 Graduate 0 Major	0 0 0 2 2 2 6 16 4.38 709/1639 4.38 4.09 4.22 4.29 0 0 0 2 1 3 5 15 4.15 888/1397 4.15 4.17 4.28 4.38 0 9 9 0 3 1 3 10 4.18 871/1583 2.18 3.94 4.19 4.31 d 1 2 2 2 2 1 10 8 3.87 942/1532 3.87 3.95 4.01 4.07 ned 1 5 2 1 5 4 8 3.75 1051/1504 3.75 3.74 4.05 4.20 1 0 0 0 0 5 4 16 4.44 575/1612 4.44 4.25 4.16 4.18 1 0 0 0 0 0 13 12 4.48 1155/1635 4.48 4.58 4.65 4.72 ess 5 0 0 0 0 3 9 9 4.29 623/1579 4.29 3.89 4.08 4.21 2 0 0 0 0 0 3 21 4.88 622/1520 4.88 4.65 4.70 4.75 y 2 0 0 0 0 2 4 18 4.67 405/1517 4.67 4.14 4.27 4.34 2 0 0 1 0 3 20 4.75 351/1550 4.75 4.25 4.22 4.24 ng 4 13 2 1 2 0 4 3.33 1067/1295 3.33 3.71 3.94 4.01 d 15 0 0 0 0 2 2 7 4.45 468/1398 4.45 3.87 4.07 4.23 e 15 0 0 0 0 1 2 8 4.64 533/1388 4.64 4.19 4.28 4.50 15 7 1 0 0 2 2 1 3.50 ****/ 958 **** 3.63 3.93 4.24 e 15 0 0 0 1 2 2 8 4.64 533/1388 4.64 4.19 4.28 4.50 15 7 1 0 0 2 2 1 3.50 ****/ 958 **** 3.63 3.93 4.24 e 15 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 958 **** 5.00 4.04 4.84 4.42 4.43 4.51 4.25 4.26 4.26 es 25 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 50 **** 5.00 4.44 4.42 4.25 4.26 4.26 4.26 4.26 4.26 4.26 4.26 4.26

Course-Section: ECON 490 0101 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County ANALYTIC METHODS IN EC Fall 2007

Instructor: CINYABUGUMA, MA

Enrollment: 29 Questionnaires: 16

Grad.

0

3.50-4.00

Ρ

I

?

0

0

1

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 545

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

						Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
		Question	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	1	0	0	0	7	2	6	3.93	1217/1639	3.73	4.12	4.27	4.42	3.93
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor make clear	the ex	spected goals	1	0	1	0	3	3	8	4.13	981/1639	4.07	4.09	4.22	4.29	4.13
3. Did th	ne exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	expected goals	1	0	1	1	1	3	9	4.20	850/1397	4.07	4.17	4.28	4.38	4.20
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	xpected goals	1	6	0	0	3	0	6	4.33	697/1583	3.78	3.94	4.19	4.31	4.33
5. Did as	ssigned r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	2	2	0	0	5	3	4	3.92	897/1532	3.71	3.95	4.01	4.07	3.92
6. Did wr	ritten as	signments contr	ibute 1	to what you learned	2	6	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	747/1504	3.46	3.74	4.05	4.20	4.13
7. Was th	ne gradin	g system clearly	y expla	ained	2	0	0	1	2	5	6	4.14	934/1612	4.19	4.25	4.16	4.18	4.14
8. How ma	any times	was class cance	elled		2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1635	4.56	4.58	4.65	4.72	5.00
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	7	0	0	1	3	3	2	3.67	1232/1579	3.76	3.89	4.08	4.21	3.67
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	the instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	1	0	1	0	0	5	9	4.40	947/1518	4.48	4.42	4.43	4.51	4.40
2. Did th	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject				1	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	925/1520	4.40	4.65	4.70	4.75	4.73
3. Was le	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clear				1	0	1	0	5	3	6	3.87	1205/1517	4.15	4.14	4.27	4.34	3.87
4. Did th	ne lectur	es contribute to	o what	you learned	1	0	1	0	4	2	8	4.07	1048/1550	4.06	4.25	4.22	4.24	4.07
5. Did au	udiovisua	l techniques en	nance y	your understanding	3	9	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1295	4.50	3.71	3.94	4.01	5.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	8	0	2	0	1	2	3	3.50	1106/1398	3.50	3.87	4.07	4.23	3.50
2. Were a	all stude	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	8	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	816/1391	4.25	4.15	4.30	4.48	4.25
3. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage :	fair a	nd open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	758/1388	4.38	4.19	4.28	4.50	4.38
4. Were s	special t	echniques succe	ssful		8	5	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 958	****	3.63	3.93	4.24	****
				Frequ	iency	, Dist	rib	ution	n									
G		G GD3		Demonstrad Occades				Da		_			m				M	
Credits E	.arnea	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Kea	asons	3 			Ту:	pe 			Majors 	;
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 7		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 5														
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera.	1				1	Under-g	rad 1	.6	Non-	-major	16
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D 0														

Electives

12

Other

Course-Section: ECON 490 0201 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County ANALYTIC METHODS IN EC Fall 2007

Instructor: THOMAS, MARK S

Enrollment: 28

Questionnaires: 17

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 546

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

	Freque					S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	0	E	7	2	2 52	1488/1639	2 72	4.12	4.27	4.42	3.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	a	5		1090/1639		4.12	4.22	4.29	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	7	6		1040/1397		4.17	4.28	4.38	3.94
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	2	2	4	2		1489/1583		3.94	4.19	4.31	3.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	0	2	4	1		1241/1532		3.95	4.01	4.07	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned		2	1	6	4	3.	1		1445/1504		3.74	4.01	4.20	2.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	4	۵		837/1612		4.25	4.16	4.18	4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	13	3		1447/1635		4.58	4.65	4.72	4.12
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness		0	0	0	4	8	2		1094/1579		3.89	4.08		3.86
7. now would you grade the overall teaching critectiveness	, ,	O	O	O	1	U	2	3.00	1001/1010	3.70	3.05	1.00	1.21	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	733/1518	4.48	4.42	4.43	4.51	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	3	5	7	4.06	1403/1520	4.40	4.65	4.70	4.75	4.06
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	6	9	4.44	687/1517	4.15	4.14	4.27	4.34	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	4	8	4.06	1048/1550	4.06	4.25	4.22	4.24	4.06
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	1	0	2	4	5	4.00	623/1295	4.50	3.71	3.94	4.01	4.00
Discussion				_										
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	Τ	0		****/1398		3.87	4.07	4.23	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/1391		4.15	4.30	4.48	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	Τ	0	0	3.00	****/1388	4.38	4.19	4.28	4.50	****
Fred	quency	/ Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	ason	g			Ту	ne			Majors	

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	 7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	12
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 600 0101

Title POLICY CONSQ:ECON ANAL

BRENNAN, TIMOTH

Instructor: Enrollment:

26 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 547 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	3	8	10	4.13	1029/1639	4.13	4.12	4.27	4.42	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	11	7		1090/1639	4.00	4.09	4.22	4.26	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	3	1	11	6	3.82	1144/1397	3.82	4.17	4.28	4.37	3.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	2	1	2	8	5	3.72	1282/1583	3.72	3.94	4.19	4.31	3.72
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	4	10	5	3.86	950/1532	3.86	3.95	4.01	4.10	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	8	0	0	1	8	4	4.23	629/1504		3.74	4.05	4.29	4.23
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	6	12	4.36	681/1612	4.36	4.25	4.16	4.27	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.58	4.65	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	4	10	4	3.89	1063/1579	3.89	3.89	4.08	4.17	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	5	17	4.65	616/1518	4.65	4.42	4.43	4.49	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	491/1520	4.91	4.65	4.70	4.79	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	4	7	11	4.17	964/1517	4.17	4.14	4.27	4.32	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	6	13	4.41	769/1550	4.41	4.25	4.22	4.23	4.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	17	0	0	2	4	0	3.67	894/1295	3.67	3.71	3.94	3.95	3.67
Diamondon														
Discussion	3	0	5	1	7	2	4	2 00	1071/1200	2 00	2 07	4 07	4 22	2 00
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	2	3	3 4	4 10		1271/1398 983/1391	3.00 4.00	3.87 4.15	4.07 4.30	4.22 4.47	3.00 4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	3	2	5	10	4.10		4.10	4.19	4.28	4.49	4.10
4. Were special techniques successful	3	19	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 958		3.63	3.93	4.01	****
1									,					
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.75	4.58	4.58	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	4.74	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	3.64	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 53	****	5.00	4.05	4.03	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.78	****
Frequ	iency	Dist	cribu	ıtior	1									

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	4	 А	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	18	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	5	Non-major	23
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	18	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	20				
				2	2						

Course-Section: ECON 601 0101 University of Maryland Title MICROECONOMIC ANALYSIS Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008 Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: FARROW, ROBERT

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 15

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 548

			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	2	3	5	5	3.87	1281/1639	3.87	4.12	4.27	4.42	3.87
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	6	2	3.53	1469/1639	3.53	4.09	4.22	4.26	3.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	2	3	5	2	3.21	1336/1397	3.21	4.17	4.28	4.37	3.21
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	6	4	4.00	1010/1583	4.00	3.94	4.19	4.31	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	3	5	5	3.73	1069/1532	3.73	3.95	4.01	4.10	3.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	8	3	3.73	1067/1504	3.73	3.74	4.05	4.29	3.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	6	5	4.00	1044/1612	4.00	4.25	4.16	4.27	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	811/1635	4.80	4.58	4.65	4.81	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	2	0	0	6	2	2	3.60	1270/1579	3.60	3.89	4.08	4.17	3.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	10	5	4.33	1021/1518	4.33	4.42	4.43	4.49	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	802/1520	4.80	4.65	4.70	4.79	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	6	6	3	3.80	1241/1517	3.80	4.14	4.27	4.32	3.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	7	5	4.13	1000/1550	4.13	4.25	4.22	4.23	4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	2	0	4	2	1	3.00	1158/1295	3.00	3.71	3.94	3.95	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	4	5	2	3.67	1030/1398	3.67	3.87	4.07	4.22	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	752/1391	4.33	4.15	4.30	4.47	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	783/1388	4.33	4.19	4.28	4.49	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	4	6	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	818/ 958	3.20	3.63	3.93	4.01	3.20

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	6	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	9	Non-major	9
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	mificant	
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 605 0101 University of Maryland Title BENEFIT-COST EVALUATIO Baltimore County

Instructor: MUTTER, R.

Enrollment: 39

Questionnaires: 8

Fall 2007 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 549

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

							Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	;		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1 Did voi	u dain ne	ew insights,skil		m this course	0	0	Λ	Ω	2	5	1	3 88	1274/1639	3.88	4.12	4.27	4.42	3.88
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	517/1639	4.50	4.09	4.22	4.26	4.50
		uestions reflect			0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	282/1397	4.75	4.17	4.28	4.37	4.75
	_	uations reflect		_	0	5	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	697/1583	4.33	3.94	4.19	4.31	4.33
				what you learned	0	1	1	0	2	1	3		1092/1532	3.71	3.95	4.01	4.10	3.71
				o what you learned	0	2	1	0	2	3	0		1371/1504	3.17	3.74	4.05	4.29	3.17
		g system clearly		_	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	955/1612	4.13	4.25	4.16	4.27	4.13
		was class cance	_		0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.58	4.65	4.81	5.00
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overal	l teac	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	889/1579	4.00	3.89	4.08	4.17	4.00
		Lecture																
1 Were th	he instri	nrenared	0	0	0	0	1	Λ	7	4.75	454/1518	4.75	4.42	4.43	4.49	4.75		
	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	1	7	4.88	622/1520	4.88	4.65	4.70	4.79	4.88
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clearl						0	0	2	0	6	4.50	597/1517	4.50	4.14	4.27	4.32	4.50
		es contribute to			0	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	796/1550	4.38	4.25	4.22	4.23	4.38
				our understanding	0	6	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	978/1295	3.50	3.71	3.94		3.50
1 541		Discuss			_	0	_	0	0	1	_	4 60	200/1200	4 60	2 07	4 07	4 00	4 60
				what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	Ţ	2	4.67 5.00	329/1398 1/1391	4.67 5.00	3.87 4.15	4.07	4.22	4.67
				d to participate d open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.15	4.30	4.47 4.49	5.00
		echniques succes		d open discussion	5 5	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	725/ 958	3.50	3.63	3.93	4.49	3.50
4. were sp	рестат с	ecuniques succes	SIUI		5	Τ	U	U	1	T	U	3.50	125/ 958	3.50	3.03	3.93	4.01	3.50
				Frequ	ency	/ Dist	crib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	;
														 -				
00-27 28-55	0	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0	A 5 B 3		кес	quire	ea i	or Ma	ijors	5	0	Graduat	9	1	Majo	or	2
28-55 56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Gor	nera:	1				2	Under-g	rad	7	Non	-major	6
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	0	D 0		Gei	лета.	L				4	onder-g.	Lau	,	NOII-	iia jui	U
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ıh

Other

6

Ρ

I

?

0

0

0

Baltimore County Fall 2007

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 550

Course-Section: ECON 611 0101 University of Maryland Title FEB 13, 2008 ECONOMETRICS I Instructor: GINDLING, THOMA Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:

84-150

Grad.

3

3

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

0

D

F

Ρ

I

?

0

0

0

2

Questionnaires: 19

21

							Fr	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	ıs		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera																
1. Did vo	nı gain ne	ew insights,ski		om this course	0	0	0	1	3	4	11	4.32	832/1639	4.32	4.12	4.27	4.42	4.32
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	3	10	6	4.16	959/1639	4.16	4.09	4.22	4.26	4.16
		estions reflec		_	0	0	0	0	1	10	8	4.37	696/1397	4.37	4.17	4.28	4.37	4.37
	_	ations reflect			1	0	0	0	3	7	8	4.28	771/1583	4.28	3.94	4.19	4.31	4.28
				what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	7	7	3.95	856/1532	3.95	3.95	4.01	4.10	3.95
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ribute t	to what you learned	0	0	0	1	6	6	6	3.89	951/1504	3.89	3.74	4.05	4.29	3.89
		g system clearl			0	0	0	0	3	4	12	4.47	532/1612	4.47	4.25	4.16	4.27	4.47
8. How ma	ny times	was class cano	elled		0	0	0	0	0	16	3	4.16	1422/1635	4.16	4.58	4.65	4.81	4.16
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the overa	all tead	ching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	4	6	4	4.00	889/1579	4.00	3.89	4.08	4.17	4.00
		Lectur	·e															
1. Were t	he instr	actor's lecture	_	prepared	0	0	0	0	2	6	11	4.47	849/1518	4.47	4.42	4.43	4.49	4.47
			0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	837/1520	4.79	4.65	4.70	4.79	4.79		
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clear						0	1	4	6	7		1054/1517	4.06	4.14	4.27	4.32	4.06
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearl Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	0	4	5	9	4.28	882/1550	4.28	4.25	4.22	4.23	4.28
				your understanding	0	1	2	0	2	6	8	4.00	623/1295	4.00	3.71	3.94	3.95	4.00
		Discus	ssion															
1. Did cl	ass discu			what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	660/1398	4.21	3.87	4.07	4.22	4.21
				ed to participate	5	0	0	0	1	7	6				4.15	4.30	4.47	4.36
				nd open discussion	5	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	647/1388	4.50	4.19	4.28	4.49	4.50
		echniques succe			5	7	0	2	2	3	0	3.14	827/ 958	3.14	3.63	3.93	4.01	3.14
		Labora	tory															
1. Did th	e lab ind		-	of the material	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 224	****	5.00	4.10	4.43	****
				ground information	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	***		4.11	3.96	***
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
				11040	сттоу	210			-									
Credits E	edits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad							Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 6		Red	quir	ed f	or M	 ajor	 s	0	Graduat	 e	3	Majo	 or	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	в 10			_			-						-		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad 1	6	Non-	-major	17

Electives

Other

2

15

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Course-Section: ECON 615 0101 University of Maryland Page 551 Title PROP RGHTS ORGAN & MGM Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008

TITLE PROP RGHTS ORGAN &

Instructor: CARROLL, K.

Enrollment: 26
Ouestionnaires: 4

Fall 2007

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 0 3 1 4.25 890/1639 4.25 4.12 4.27 4.42 4.25 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 2 1 4.00 1090/1639 4.20 4.17 4.28 4.37 4.50 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 0 1 1 1 4.00 1010/1583 4.00 3.94 4.19 4.31 4.00 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 2 0 2 4.00 774/1532 4.00 3.95 4.01 4.10 4.00 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 1 1 1 4.00 824/1504 4.00 3.74 4.05 4.29 4.00 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 1 1 2 4.25 814/1612 4.25 4.25 4.16 4.27 4.25 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 884/1635 4.75 4.58 4.65 4.81 4.75 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 1 1 1 4.00 889/1579 4.00 3.89 4.08 4.17 4.00 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 Ω 0 1 3 4.75 454/1518 4.75 4.42 4.43 4.49 4.75 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1520 5.00 4.65 4.70 4.79 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 3 1 4.25 886/1517 4.25 4.14 4.27 4.32 4.25 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 351/1550 4.75 4.25 4.22 4.23 4.75 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 1 2 0 3.67 1030/1398 3.67 3.87 4.07 4.22 3.67 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 489/1391 4.67 4.15 4.30 4.47 4.67 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 496/1388 4.67 4.19 4.28 4.49 4.67

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

Course-Section: ECON 652 0101
Title ECONOMICS OF HEALTH

University of Maryland Baltimore County

ECONOMICS OF HEALTH Baltimore Count GOLDFARB, MARSH Fall 2007

Enrollment: 12
Questionnaires: 12

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 552 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

									Fr	equei	ncies	\$		Inst	ructor	-	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
			Questions	5			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Ran	ık	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
			General	 I																	
1.	Did voi	ı gain n	ew insights,skil		this course	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	318/1	639	4.75	4.12	4.27	4.42	4.75
			ctor make clear			•	0	0	0	1	0	4	7	4.42	667/1		4.42	4.09	4.22	4.26	4.42
			uestions reflect			\$	1	0	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	477/1			4.17	4.28	4.37	4.55
			uations reflect				0	6	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	697/1		4.33	3.94	4.19	4.31	4.33
			eadings contribu			ned	1	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	256/1	.532	4.64	3.95	4.01	4.10	4.64
6.	Did wri	itten as	signments contri	ibute to	what you le	arned	0	7	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	150/1	.504	4.80	3.74	4.05	4.29	4.80
7.	Was the	e gradin	g system clearly	explair	ned		0	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	718/1	612	4.33	4.25	4.16	4.27	4.33
8.	How mar	ny times	was class cance	elled			0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1	635	5.00	4.58	4.65	4.81	5.00
9.	How wou	ıld you	grade the overal	ll teachi	ing effectiv	reness	0	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	484/1	.579	4.42	3.89	4.08	4.17	4.42
			Lecture	2																	
1.	Were th	ne instr	uctor's lectures	s well pr	repared		0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	315/1	.518	4.83	4.42	4.43	4.49	4.83
2.	Did the	e instru	ctor seem intere	ested in	the subject	;	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1	.520	5.00	4.65	4.70	4.79	5.00
3.	Was led	cture ma	terial presented	d and exp	plained clea	rly	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1	.517	5.00	4.14	4.27	4.32	5.00
4.	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding					0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1	.550	5.00	4.25	4.22	4.23	5.00	
5.	Did aud	diovisua	l techniques enh	nance you	ır understan	nding	0	10	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1	.295	****	3.71	3.94	3.95	****
	Discussion Pid along discussions generalisate to what you leaves																				
1.	Discussion Did class discussions contribute to what you learne						3	0	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	770/1	.398	4.00	3.87	4.07	4.22	4.00
2.	Were al	ll stude	nts actively end	couraged	to particip	ate	3	0	2	0	0	1	6	4.00	983/1	.391	4.00	4.15	4.30	4.47	4.00
			ctor encourage f		open discus	sion	3	0	1	1	0	2	5	4.00	944/1	.388	4.00	4.19	4.28	4.49	4.00
4.	Were sp	pecial t	echniques succes	ssful			3	7	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/	958	****	3.63	3.93	4.01	****
			Laborat																		
2.	Were yo	ou provi	ded with adequat	te backgr	round inform	nation	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	240	****	5.00	4.11	3.96	****
			Semina																		
		_	topics relevant				11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	85	****	4.75	4.58	4.58	****
			ctor available f			ntion	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	82	****	5.00	4.52	4.74	****
4.	Did pre	esentati	ons contribute t	to what y	you learned		11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	80	****	5.00	4.47	4.50	****
						Frequ	ency.	Dis	trib	utio	n										
Cre	dits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected G	rades				Rea	asons	5				Тур	oe .			Majors	}
	 -27		0 00-0 99	 1	 2 7	. – – – – – 1					or Ma	ior		1	 Grad	 Niata		 7	 Majo		2
	00-27 3 0.00-0.99 1 A 7 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 3					1		r.e.	4urr,	cu I	J⊥ 1*1C	יייני	D	_	Grad	uatt	-	,	Ma JC	, <u>.</u>	4
	28-55							Ger	nera	1				4	Unde	er-qı	rad	5	Non-	major	10
								ری	c. a	-				-	51146	91		_	14011	±0 ر م	10
	1-150 0 3.00-3.49 3 D 0 rad. 7 3.50-4.00 3 F 0							E1	ecti [.]	ves				1	####	t - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	rh
01		•	3.33 1.00	3	P 0									_			es to b			_	,
					I 0			Ot.1	her					5		31100					
					? 1									-							
					-																

Course-Section: ECON 661 0101 University of Maryland Title MICROECON: PUBLIC FINAN Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008 Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: MORRIS, RUSSELL

Enrollment: 1 Questionnaires: 1

Ctudant	('OIITCA	Evaluation	Ollegtion	n n n n n

Page 553

			Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1138/1639	4.00	4.12	4.27	4.42	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1579/1639	3.00	4.09	4.22	4.26	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	973/1397	4.00	4.17	4.28	4.37	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1010/1583	4.00	3.94	4.19	4.31	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	889/1579	4.00	3.89	4.08	4.17	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1237/1518	4.00	4.42	4.43	4.49	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.65	4.70	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1083/1517	4.00	4.14	4.27	4.32	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.25	4.22	4.23	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	623/1295	4.00	3.71	3.94	3.95	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1398	5.00	3.87	4.07	4.22	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.15	4.30	4.47	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.19	4.28	4.49	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	456/ 958	4.00	3.63	3.93	4.01	4.00

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

Course-Section: ECON 675 0101

ECON OF FINACIAL ANALY

Title Instructor: COATES, D.

Enrollment: 44 Questionnaires: 4 Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 554 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

			Fre	ימוופי	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_	Mean	Mean	Mean
General				_	_		_							
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	318/1639	4.75	4.12	4.27	4.42	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	252/1639	4.75	4.09	4.22	4.26	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.17	4.28	4.37	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	476/1583	4.50	3.94	4.19	4.31	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	236/1532	4.67	3.95	4.01	4.10 4.29	4.67 4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	3 4	4.75 5.00	182/1504 1/1612	4.75 5.00	3.74 4.25	4.05 4.16	4.29	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1612	5.00	4.25	4.16	4.27	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	241/1579	4.67		4.08	4.17	4.67
7. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	U		U	U	U		4	4.07	241/15/9	4.07	3.09	4.00	4.1/	4.07
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.42	4.43	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	890/1520	4.75	4.65	4.70	4.79	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	299/1517	4.75	4.14	4.27	4.32	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.25	4.22	4.23	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1295	5.00	3.71	3.94	3.95	5.00
Discussion					_				405/4000	4 = 0				
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	426/1398	4.50	3.87	4.07	4.22	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	393/1391	4.75	4.15	4.30	4.47	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	387/1388	4.75	4.19	4.28	4.49	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 958	5.00	3.63	3.93	4.01	5.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 224	5.00	5.00	4.10	4.43	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 240	5.00	5.00	4.11	3.96	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 219	5.00	5.00	4.44	4.23	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 215	5.00	5.00	4.35	4.72	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 198	5.00	5.00	4.18	4.74	5.00
or note requirements for tax reports orearry specifical		ŭ	Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	_	3.00	1, 1,0	3.00	3.00	1.10		3.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	4.75	4.58	4.58	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 82	5.00	5.00	4.52	4.74	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 78	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.52	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.50	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 82	5.00	5.00	4.16	4.37	5.00
7' 11 " 1														
Field Work	2	0	0	_	•	•	-	F 00	1 / 50	F 00	F 00	4 0 4	2 64	F 00
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	5.00	4.04	3.64	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 53	5.00	5.00	4.05	4.03	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 42	5.00	5.00	4.75	4.78	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 37	5.00	5.00	4.58	4.33	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 32	5.00	5.00	4.56	4.59	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 50	5.00	5.00	4.45	4.39	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 32	5.00	5.00	4.51	4.50	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 43	5.00	5.00	4.69	4.61	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 32	5.00	5.00	4.37	4.31	5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 21	5.00	5.00	4.52	4.42	5.00
	-	-	-	-	-	-	_		, 22					

Course-Section: ECON 675 0101

Title ECON OF FINACIAL ANALY

Instructor: COATES, D.

Enrollment: 44

Questionnaires: 4

Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 554 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

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

Course-Section: ECON 681 0101

ECON OF INTL COMM POLI

Instructor: TAKACS, W.

Title

Enrollment: 42 Questionnaires: 4 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 555 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				Frequencies			Instructor		Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect		
Oues	tions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
Ge	eneral														
1. Did you gain new insights	s,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.12	4.27	4.42	5.00
2. Did the instructor make o	lear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	252/1639	4.75	4.09	4.22	4.26	4.75
3. Did the exam questions re	eflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	282/1397	4.75	4.17	4.28	4.37	4.75
4. Did other evaluations ref	ions reflect the expected goals			1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1261/1583	3.75	3.94	4.19	4.31	3.75
5. Did assigned readings con	gned readings contribute to what you learned				0	0	2	2	4.50	335/1532	4.50	3.95	4.01	4.10	4.50
6. Did written assignments o	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned				0	0	1	2	3.75	1051/1504	3.75	3.74	4.05	4.29	3.75
7. Was the grading system cl	Was the grading system clearly explained				0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1612	5.00	4.25	4.16	4.27	5.00
8. How many times was class	any times was class cancelled				0	0	1	3	4.75	884/1635	4.75	4.58	4.65	4.81	4.75
9. How would you grade the o	overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	241/1579	4.67	3.89	4.08	4.17	4.67
Le	ecture														
1. Were the instructor's led		0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.42	4.43	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem i		0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.65	4.70	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material pres		0	0	0	0	0	1	3		299/1517	4.75		4.27	4.32	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribu		0	0	0	0	0	1		4.75	351/1550	4.75	4.25	4.22	4.23	4.75
	es enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	185/1295	4.67	3.71	3.94	3.95	4.67
	scussion					•	_	_		0.55 / 4.000					
1. Did class discussions con		0	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	965/1398	3.75	3.87	4.07	4.22	3.75
2. Were all students activel		0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	983/1391	4.00	4.15	4.30	4.47	4.00
	rage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.19	4.28	4.49	5.00
4. Were special techniques s	successful	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 958	5.00	3.63	3.93	4.01	5.00
La	boratory														
1. Did the lab increase unde	erstanding of the material	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 224	5.00	5.00	4.10	4.43	5.00
2. Were you provided with ad	lequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 240	5.00	5.00	4.11	3.96	5.00
3. Were necessary materials	available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 219	5.00	5.00	4.44	4.23	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor pr	covide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 215	5.00	5.00	4.35	4.72	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab	reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 198	5.00	5.00	4.18	4.74	5.00
Se															
1. Were assigned topics rele		2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	52/ 85	4.50	4.75	4.58	4.58	4.50
	ble for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 82	5.00	5.00	4.52	4.74	5.00
3. Did research projects con		2	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 78	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.52	5.00
4. Did presentations contrib		2	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 80	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.50	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading		2	1	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 82	5.00	5.00	4.16	4.37	5.00
	11 1														
	eld Work	_	0	_	_	0	0	-	F 00	1 / 50	F 00	F 00	4 0 4	2 64	F 00
1. Did field experience cont		3	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 52	5.00	5.00	4.04	3.64	5.00
2. Did you clearly understan		3	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 53	5.00	5.00	4.05	4.03	5.00
3. Was the instructor availa		3	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 42	5.00	5.00	4.75	4.78	5.00
4. To what degree could you	-	3	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 37	5.00	5.00		4.33	5.00
5. Did conferences help you	carry out field activities	2	1	0	0	0	0	Τ	5.00	1/ 32	5.00	5.00	4.56	4.59	5.00
	elf Paced														
 Did self-paced system cor 	_	3	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 50	5.00	5.00	4.45	4.39	5.00
2. Did study questions make	2	1	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 32	5.00	5.00	4.51	4.50	5.00	
Were your contacts with t		2	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/ 43	5.00	5.00	4.69	4.61	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring		2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 32	5.00	5.00	4.37	4.31	5.00
5. Were there enough proctor	s for all the students	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 21	5.00	5.00	4.52	4.42	5.00

Course-Section: ECON 681 0101

Title ECON OF INTL COMM POLI

Instructor: TAKACS, W.

Enrollment: 42
Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 555 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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