University of Maryland

Prin Of Microeconomics Baltimore County

Carroll, Kathlee Fall 2009

Enrollment: 78 Ouestionnaires: 41

Title

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 442 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	4	9	6	21	4.02	1100/1509	4.03	4.21	4.31	4.18	4.02
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	6	9	15	11		1259/1509	3.98	4.21	4.26	4.25	3.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	11	8	18		1000/1287	4.15	4.28	4.30	4.24	3.93
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	2	4	8	7	10		1265/1459	4.00	4.07		4.11	3.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	1	2	9	14	10	3.83	986/1406	3.88	4.05	4.09	4.02	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	26	3	0	3	5	4	3.47	1209/1384	3.85	3.99	4.11	3.98	3.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	8	7	22	4.12	896/1489	4.14	4.31	4.17	4.20	4.12
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	2	6	31	4.74	858/1506	4.63	4.54	4.67	4.66	4.74
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	3	2	11	15	5	3.47	1257/1463	3.67	3.99	4.09	4.02	3.47
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	3	2	9	24	4.42	904/1438	4.44	4.53	4.46	4.44	4.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	3	6	29	4.68	991/1421	4.68	4.70	4.73	4.66	4.68
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	2	7	12	15		1107/1411	3.98	4.20	4.31	4.27	3.95
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	3	4	8	21	4.13	980/1405	4.19	4.29			4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	22	0	1	4	4	5	3.93	752/1236	3.78	3.77	4.00	3.87	3.93
Discussion						_								
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	2	4	3	7	8		1001/1260	3.49	3.77	4.14	3.95	3.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	2	4	6	4	8		1127/1255	3.37	3.89	4.33	4.15	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	2	2	5	7	8		1087/1258	3.69	4.05	4.38	4.18	3.71
4. Were special techniques successful	17	15	2	1	2	0	4	3.33	****/ 873	3.11	3.69	4.03	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	38	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	2.90	2.90	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	40	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	40	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.15	***
Seminar			•			•							4 0.1	
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	39	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	40	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.21	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 49	****	4.00	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	39	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 41	****	5.00		4.13	***
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	39	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	39	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	39	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Title Prin Of Microeconomics

Instructor: Carroll, Kathlee

Enrollment: 78
Questionnaires: 41

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2009

Page 442 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	2	 А	11	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	С	13	General	14	Under-grad	41	Non-major	40
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	1	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	-			
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 101 11 University of Maryland Page 443 Title Prin Of Microeconomics Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Instructor: Thomas,Mark

Enrollment: 42 Questionnaires: 20

# Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	Λ	Λ	Ο	3	7	10	4.35	778/1509	4.03	4.21	4.31	4.18	4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	6	11	4.30	807/1509	3.98	4.21	4.26	4.25	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	8	11	4.45	590/1287	4.15	4.28	4.30	4.24	4.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	346/1459	4.00	4.07	4.22	4.11	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	1	3	3	7	3.75	1045/1406	3.88	4.05	4.09	4.02	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	531/1384	3.85	3.99	4.11	3.98	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	399/1489	4.14	4.31	4.17	4.20	4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	19	0	3.95	1415/1506	4.63	4.54	4.67	4.66	3.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	4	6	7	4.18	714/1463	3.67	3.99	4.09	4.02	4.18
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	675/1438	4.44	4.53	4.46	4.44	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	665/1421	4.68	4.70	4.73	4.66	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	7	10	4.30	841/1411	3.98	4.20	4.31	4.27	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	7	10	4.32	848/1405	4.19	4.29	4.32	4.27	4.32
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	421/1236	3.78	3.77	4.00	3.87	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	621/1260	3.49	3.77	4.14	3.95	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	1	4	1	2	3.22	1184/1255	3.37	3.89	4.33	4.15	3.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	2	0	1	1	5	3.78	1063/1258	3.69	4.05	4.38	4.18	3.78
4. Were special techniques successful	11	7	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 873	3.11	3.69	4.03	3.89	****

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	5	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	-			
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 101 13 University of Maryland Page 444 Title Prin Of Microeconomics Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Instructor: Mutter,Ryan

Enrollment: 39 Questionnaires: 21

Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Job IRBR3029

				F	reque	ncies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions	NR	NA		_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	
	General														
1. Did you gain	new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	4	7	9	4.10	1051/1509	4.03	4.21	4.31	4.18	4.10
	ructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	3	13	4.24	880/1509	3.98	4.21	4.26	4.25	4.24
	questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	3	14	4.33	708/1287	4.15	4.28	4.30	4.24	4.33
	aluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	2	1	4	7	3.93	1055/1459	4.00	4.07	4.22	4.11	3.93
	readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	2	4	2	1	7	3.44	1219/1406	3.88	4.05	4.09	4.02	3.44
_	assignments contribute to what you learned	. 0	6	1	1	2	4	7	4.00	807/1384	3.85	3.99	4.11	3.98	4.00
	ing system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	0	6	13	4.43	569/1489	4.14	4.31	4.17	4.20	4.43
_	es was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1506	4.63	4.54	4.67	4.66	5.00
-	grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	1	1	7	4	3.86	1021/1463	3.67	3.99	4.09	4.02	3.86
	Lecture														
1 Were the inst	cructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	٥	Ο	1	3	15	4.74	480/1438	4.44	4.53	4.46	4.44	4.74
	ructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	-	0	2	0	17	4.79	828/1421	4.68	4.70	4.73	4.66	4.79
	naterial presented and explained clearly	2	0		1	1	4	12	4.32	830/1411	3.98	4.20	4.31	4.27	4.32
	ares contribute to what you learned	2	0			2	3	13	4.47	671/1405		4.29	4.32	4.27	4.47
	al techniques enhance your understanding	3	8	1	4	2	1	2		1164/1236		3.77	4.00	3.87	
	Discussion						_								
	scussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	_		0	Τ	3		1045/1260	3.49	3.77	4.14	3.95	3.50
	dents actively encouraged to participate	15	0			0	2			1167/1255		3.89	4.33	4.15	3.33
	ructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0			0	0	4		1041/1258		4.05	4.38	4.18	3.83
4. Were special	techniques successful	15	4	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 873	3.11	3.69	4.03	3.89	****
	Freq	uency	/ Di	stri	butio	n									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA Expected Grades	}			Re	asons	;			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27 0	0.00-0.99 0 A 6		R	 equi	red f	or Ma	jor	:	9	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	0

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	 6	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	5	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 101 2 University of Maryland Page 445 Title Prin Of Microeconomics Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Instructor: Mitch,David F

Enrollment: 41 Questionnaires: 29

# Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

ACCOUNTAINED BY COURSE DIVIDED DIVIDE DIVIDED DIVIDE DIVIDI DIV														
			Fr	eque	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	3	10	10	6		1345/1509			4.31		3.66
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	9	7	8		1339/1509	3.98	4.21	4.26	4.25	3.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	3	12	11	4.07	898/1287	4.15	4.28	4.30	4.24	4.07
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	4	7	9	8	3.75	1192/1459	4.00	4.07	4.22	4.11	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	1	7	9	8	3.74	1052/1406	3.88	4.05	4.09	4.02	3.74
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	4	5	7	9	3.73	1063/1384	3.85	3.99	4.11	3.98	3.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	2	5	6	12	3.69	1227/1489	4.14	4.31	4.17	4.20	3.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	27	4.96	233/1506	4.63	4.54	4.67	4.66	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	1	4	9	5	1	3.05	1386/1463	3.67	3.99	4.09	4.02	3.05
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	2	4	13	Q	3 89	1270/1438	4 44	4.53	4 46	4.44	3.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	7			1107/1421		4.70	4.73	4.66	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	6	10	9			1344/1411	3.98	4.20	4.31	4.27	3.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	4	6	5			1257/1405	4.19	4.29	4.32	4.27	3.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	_	14	2	0	6	4			1072/1236		3.77			3.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	3	3	4	4	3	3.06	1155/1260	3.49	3.77	4.14	3.95	3.06
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	7	4	3	3	3.12	1199/1255	3.37	3.89	4.33	4.15	3.12
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	3	2	6	4	3.56	1132/1258	3.69	4.05	4.38	4.18	3.56
4. Were special techniques successful	14	3	2	1	1	4	4	3.58	677/ 873	3.11	3.69	4.03	3.89	3.58
Freq	iencv	Dis	trib	utio	n									
11040		220												

Credits I	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	 А	7	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	13						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	4	General	9	Under-grad	29	Non-major	29
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	_			
				?	0						

Prin Of Microeconomics

Title Instructor: Mitch,David F

Enrollment: 47

Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 446 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	mie	ncie	c		Tnet	tructor	Course	Dent	UMBC	T.exre1	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NΑ	1	2 2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	4	11	10	3.96	1154/1509	4.03	4.21	4.31	4.18	3.96
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	0	7	8	10	3.79	1240/1509	3.98	4.21	4.26	4.25	3.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	0	6	7	11	3.85	1047/1287	4.15	4.28	4.30	4.24	3.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	3	1	5	10	8	3.70	1217/1459	4.00	4.07	4.22	4.11	3.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	2	5	6	12	3.89	949/1406	3.88	4.05	4.09	4.02	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	1	11	5	7	3.44	1217/1384	3.85	3.99	4.11	3.98	3.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	5	6	5	11	3.71	1214/1489	4.14	4.31	4.17	4.20	3.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/1506	4.63	4.54	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	2	1	9	8	2	3.32	1320/1463	3.67	3.99	4.09	4.02	3.32
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	2	4	4	13	4.08	1179/1438	4.44	4.53	4.46	4.44	4.08
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	2	8	13	4.38	1234/1421	4.68	4.70	4.73	4.66	4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	3	4	4	6	7	3.42	1305/1411	3.98	4.20	4.31	4.27	3.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	1	3	4	13		1089/1405	4.19	4.29	4.32	4.27	3.96
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	18	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	****/1236	3.78	3.77	4.00	3.87	****
Discussion						_								
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	2	4	4	1	3		1192/1260	3.49	3.77	4.14	3.95	2.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	2	1	6	3	2		1195/1255	3.37	3.89	4.33	4.15	3.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	2	5	4	2		1193/1258	3.69	4.05	4.38	4.18	3.29
4. Were special techniques successful	14	5	4	2	1	1	1	2.22	864/ 873	3.11	3.69	4.03	3.89	2.22
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	26	1	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
<u> </u>	26	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 198		2.90		4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	26 26	0	0	0	0	0	2			2.90 ****	∠.90 ****	4.22	4.14	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	26	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 177	****	****	4.46	4.40	***
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	26	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.29	****
J. Were requirements for tab reports creatry specified	20	U	U	U	U	U	2	3.00	/ 103			1.10	1.13	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	***
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	***
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced				_										
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 49	****	4.00	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Title Prin Of Microeconomics

Instructor: Mitch, David F

Enrollment: 47
Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 446 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland

Title Prin Of Microeconomics Baltimore County

Instructor: Bradley,Michael
Enrollment: 76

Fall 2009

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 447 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	7	8	12	10	3.54	1390/1509	4.03	4.21	4.31	4.18	3.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	8	10	11	8	3.38	1408/1509	3.98	4.21	4.26	4.25	3.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	8	6	10	12		1144/1287	4.15	4.28	4.30	4.24	3.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	4	4	8	7	10		1328/1459	4.00	4.07		4.11	3.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	5	8	8	13		1030/1406	3.88	4.05	4.09	4.02	3.77
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	20	3	0	6	4	4		1256/1384	3.85	3.99	4.11	3.98	3.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	2	1	8	10	14		1058/1489	4.14	4.31	4.17	4.20	3.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	1	36		175/1506	4.63	4.54	4.67	4.66	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	2	2	10	14	3	3.45	1268/1463	3.67	3.99	4.09	4.02	3.45
Tashuus														
Lecture	4	0	1	1	6	10	17	1 17	1100/1420	4.44	4.53	4.46	4.44	4.17
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	7	17 30	4.17	1128/1438		4.53	4.46	4.44	4.17
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	5	3	13	8	30 7		863/1421 1333/1411	4.68 3.98	4.70	4.73	4.00	3.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	4	6	5	5	15		1241/1405	4.19	4.29	4.31	4.27	3.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	18	2	2	5	3	5		1026/1236	3.78	3.77	4.00	3.87	3.41
5. Did addiovisual techniques emhance your understanding	4	10	2	4	5	3	5	3.41	1020/1230	3.70	3.11	4.00	3.07	3.41
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	6	8	6	4	7	2.94	1188/1260	3.49	3.77	4.14	3.95	2.94
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	7	6	6	5	6		1224/1255	3.37	3.89	4.33	4.15	2.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	3	3	8	5	11		1126/1258	3.69	4.05	4.38	4.18	3.60
4. Were special techniques successful	9	20	2	1	1	3	3	3.40	738/ 873	3.11	3.69	4.03	3.89	3.40
*														
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	8	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	1	2	5	1	1	2.90	196/ 198	2.90	2.90	4.22	4.14	2.90
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	30	5	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	5	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	6	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	32	3	0	1	1	1	1		****/ 89	***	****	4.49	4.31	***
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	31	5	0	0	2	0	1		****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	31	7	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	31	7	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	3.92	***
rd all divinue														
Field Work	2.1	0	4	-	1	^	_	0 00	****/ 40		****	4 20	2 75	***
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	4	1	1	0	2		****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	2	1	0	1	3		****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	32	4	0	0	0	0	3		****/ 47	****		4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	32	4	0	0	0	0	3		****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	32	4	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 44	^ ^ * *	* * * *	4.32	4.12	^ ^ ~ ~
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	30	0	2	2	2	1	2	2 00	****/ 49	****	4.00	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	30	2	2 1	0	0	2	4		****/ 41	****	5.00	4.26	4.28	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	4	0	0	0	1	3	4.75		****	5.00	4.14	4.13	***
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	4	1	0	0	0	3		****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.52	***
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	31	4	1	1	0	1	1		****/ 30	****	****		4.47	***
J. Were chere enough procedus for all the scudents	3 T	-	Τ.	Τ.	U	Τ	Τ	3.00	/ 30			4.4/	<del>1</del> .∠⊥	

Title Prin Of Microeconomics

Instructor: Bradley,Michael
Fnrollment: 76

Enrollment: 76
Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2009

Page 447 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	14						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	5	General	14	Under-grad	39	Non-major	38
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-		_	
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 101 5 University of Maryland Baltimore County

Title Prin Of Microeconomics

Instructor: Viauroux,Christ

Enrollment: 42 Questionnaires: 22

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Fall 2009

Page 448

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

					Frequencies					Inst	ructor	Course	Dept		Level	Sect		
		Question	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain n	ew insights,ski		m this course	2	0	0	0	2	10	8	4.30	833/1509	4.03	4.21	4.31	4.18	4.30
		ctor make clear			3	0	0	1	2	7	9	4.26	849/1509	3.98	4.21	4.26	4.25	4.26
3. Did th	e exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	3	0	0	1	1	3	14	4.58	453/1287	4.15	4.28	4.30	4.24	4.58
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	3	7	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	367/1459	4.00	4.07	4.22	4.11	4.58
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	4	12	4.50	332/1406	3.88	4.05	4.09	4.02	4.50
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	3	7	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	531/1384	3.85	3.99	4.11	3.98	4.33
7. Was th	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	3	0	1	0	2	4	12	4.37	641/1489	4.14	4.31	4.17	4.20	4.37
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		3	1	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	981/1506	4.63	4.54	4.67	4.66	4.61
9. How wo	. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivenes						0	2	0	9	4	4.00	853/1463	3.67	3.99	4.09	4.02	4.00
	Lecture																	
1. Were t	. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared							0	1	2	16	4.79	396/1438	4.44	4.53	4.46	4.44	4.79
	. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	3	3	13		1146/1421	4.68	4.70	4.73	4.66	4.53
				xplained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	592/1411			4.31	4.27	4.53
		es contribute t			3	0	0	0	3	4	12	4.47	671/1405	4.19	4.29	4.32	4.27	4.47
				our understanding	3	0	0	1	4	2	12	4.32	441/1236	3.78	3.77	4.00	3.87	4.32
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc			what you learned	17	0	2	0	0	0	3	3.40	****/1260	3.49	3.77	4.14	3.95	****
				d to participate	17		2	0	0	1	2		****/1255		3.89	4.33	4.15	****
		-	_	d open discussion	17	0	0	1		0	3		****/1258		4.05	4.38	4.18	****
		echniques succe		-	17	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 873	3.11	3.69	4.03	3.89	****
				Frequ	iency	, Dist	trib	utio	n									
				_	2													
Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad							Rea	ason	s 			Ту]	pe 			Majors	
00-27	00-27 2 0.00-0.99 2 A 3						quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s 1	.1	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	В 6														
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C 6		Ger	nera	1				4	Under-g	rad 2	22	Non-	major	22
84-150																		
Grad.	Grad. $0   3.50-4.00   2   F   0$					Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	h
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nifican	ıt	
		I 0 Other									0							

Prin Of Microeconomics

Title Instructor: Viauroux,Christ

Enrollment: 39 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 449 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect				
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	3	8	7	4.05	1079/1509	4.03	4.21	4.31	4.18	4.05
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	10	6		1049/1509	3.98	4.21	4.26	4.25	4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	7	9	4.21	811/1287	4.15	4.28	4.30	4.24	4.21
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	2	3	6	5	3.71	1217/1459	4.00	4.07	4.22	4.11	3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	4	5	8	4.00	813/1406	3.88	4.05	4.09	4.02	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	2	0	2	6	4	3.71	1076/1384	3.85	3.99	4.11	3.98	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	652/1489	4.14	4.31	4.17	4.20	4.35
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	820/1506	4.63	4.54	4.67	4.66	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	1	2	6	3	3.69	1148/1463	3.67	3.99	4.09	4.02	3.69
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	1	1	15	4.61	660/1438	4.44	4.53	4.46	4.44	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	0		4.78	846/1421	4.68	4.70	4.73	4.66	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2		13				4.20	4.31	4.27	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	3		12		615/1405			4.32	4.27	4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	1	2		11				3.77		3.87	
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	1	1	_	3	2 E O	1045/1260	2 40	3.77	4.14	3.95	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	2	1 0	3	2	3		1127/1255		3.77	4.14	4.15	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	1	3	4			1127/1255		4.05	4.38		3.58
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	1	1	<i>3</i>	1	2		776/ 873		3.69		3.89	
4. Were special techniques successful	,	3	_	_	4	1	4	3.22	770/ 873	3.11	3.09	4.03	3.09	3.22
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	***	****	4.39	3.75	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 49	****	4.00	4.26	4.28	****
Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ıtior	ı									
Credita Farmed Cum CDA Emported Credes				aan				т.				Majawa		

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	5	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
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	0	_			
				?	0						

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Prin Of Microeconomics Dickson,Lisa M Fall 2009

Enrollment: 79 Questionnaires: 51

Title

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 450 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
G1														
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	5	9	17	20	4 02	1107/1509	4.03	4.21	4.31	4.18	4.02
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	9	19	19		1027/1509		4.21	4.26	4.25	4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	4	7	14	23	3.98	943/1287		4.28	4.30	4.24	3.98
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	2	4	6	17	16	3.91	1077/1459	4.00	4.07	4.22	4.11	3.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	4	5	6	14	17	3.76	1038/1406	3.88	4.05	4.09	4.02	3.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	5	2	13	17	12	3.59	1149/1384	3.85	3.99	4.11	3.98	3.59
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	9	16	23	4.20	823/1489		4.31	4.17	4.20	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	3	40	7		1353/1506		4.54	4.67	4.66	4.08
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	1	1	2	9	15	5	3.66	1174/1463	3.67	3.99	4.09	4.02	3.66
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	3	17	28	4.47	852/1438	4.44	4.53	4.46	4.44	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	1	12	35	4.65	1026/1421	4.68	4.70	4.73	4.66	4.65
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	4	6	16	20	4.00	1051/1411	3.98	4.20	4.31	4.27	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	5	12	29	4.35	818/1405		4.29	4.32		4.35
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	23	2	7	6	9	2	3.08	1120/1236	3.78	3.77	4.00	3.87	3.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	3	3	1	5	15	3.96	795/1260	3.49	3.77	4.14	3.95	3.96
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	1	1	7	8	11	3.96	939/1255	3.37	3.89	4.33	4.15	3.96
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	2	0	3	6	17	4.29	802/1258	3.69	4.05	4.38	4.18	4.29
4. Were special techniques successful	23	16	0	1	6	4	1	3.42	****/ 873	3.11	3.69	4.03	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	48	1	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	48	0	0	1	2	0	0		****/ 198	2.90	2.90	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	48	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	48	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	48	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	48	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	48	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	48	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	48	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	48	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.33	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	48	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	48	0	0	0	2	1	0		,	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	49	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	48	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 49	****	4.00	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	48	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.14	4.20	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	49	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	48	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	48	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	***	****	4.27		***

Prin Of Microeconomics

Instructor: Dickson,Lisa M

Enrollment: 79
Questionnaires: 51

Title

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2009

Page 450 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	В	20						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C	8	General	12	Under-grad	51	Non-major	50
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	3						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	1	Electives	6	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4	_		_	
				?	2						

University of Maryland

Prin Of Microeconomics Baltimore County

Instructor: Thomas, Mark

Enrollment: 80
Questionnaires: 30

Title

rsity of Maryland Page 451 ltimore County MAR 22, 2010 Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	4	9	15	4.31	822/1509	4.03	4.21	4.31	4.18	4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	0	8	18	4.38	731/1509	3.98	4.21	4.26	4.25	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	4	5	19	4.54	491/1287	4.15	4.28	4.30	4.24	4.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	12	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	182/1459	4.00	4.07	4.22	4.11	4.76
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	1	5	5	12	4.08	753/1406	3.88	4.05	4.09	4.02	4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	13	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	306/1384	3.85	3.99	4.11	3.98	4.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	5	5	15	4.03	965/1489	4.14	4.31	4.17	4.20	4.03
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	20	8	4.24	1265/1506	4.63	4.54	4.67	4.66	4.24
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	5	13	5	4.00	853/1463	3.67	3.99	4.09	4.02	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	9	18	4.61	675/1438	4.44	4.53	4.46	4.44	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	6	22	4.79	828/1421	4.68	4.70	4.73	4.66	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	4	7	16	4.32	820/1411	3.98	4.20	4.31	4.27	4.32
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	2	6	18	4.52	624/1405	4.19	4.29	4.32	4.27	4.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	0	1	3	2	17	4.52	261/1236	3.78	3.77	4.00	3.87	4.52
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	2	4	3	4	3.69	968/1260	3.49	3.77	4.14	3.95	3.69
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	2	4	3	4		1074/1255	3.37	3.77	4.33	4.15	3.69
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	1	6	3	3		1122/1258	3.69	4.05	4.38	4.15	3.62
4. Were special techniques successful	18	7	0	0	2	1			****/ 873		3.69	4.03	3.89	3.0∠ ****
4. Were special techniques successiui	10	,	U	U	2	1	2	4.00	/ 6/3	3.11	3.09	4.03	3.09	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.06	***
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 198	2.90	2.90	4.22	4.14	***
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4 20	2 75	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	-	0	1	-	1		, 10	++++	++++	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28		0		1	0	1	4.00	,	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	28	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 47 ****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	28	1	-	-	-	•	1	5.00	,	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	28	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	^^^	****	4.32	4.12	* * * *
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 49	****	4.00	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	28	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	28	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	28	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****
	-					-								

Title Prin Of Microeconomics

Instructor: Thomas, Mark

Enrollment: 80
Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2009

Page 451 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	 А	14	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	10	Under-grad	30	Non-major	30
84-150	3	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 sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	-		_	
				?	3						

Prin Of Macroeconomics

Instructor: Cinyabuguma, Mat

Enrollment: 80
Ouestionnaires: 54

Title

56-83

Grad.

84-150

3

2

0

2.00-2.99

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

1

7

C

F 1

Ρ

Ι

D 0

0

0

2

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2009

Page 452 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Non-major 53

			Frequencies			Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Q1														
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	Λ	2	1	13	16	15	2 71	1321/1509	4.10	4.21	4.31	4.18	3.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	4	4	13	19	16		1252/1509	4.15	4.21	4.26	4.10	3.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	2	8	15	25	4.20		4.29	4.28	4.30	4.24	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	11	5	3	3	14	15		1182/1459	4.09	4.07	4.22	4.11	3.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	10	3	4	3	16	14		971/1406	4.05	4.05	4.09	4.02	3.85
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	19	2	2	7	13	8		1076/1384	3.94	3.99	4.11	3.98	3.72
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	2	1	9	6	17	16		1188/1489	4.18	4.31	4.17	4.20	3.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	1	1	38	10		1325/1506	4.28	4.54	4.67	4.66	4.14
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	1	5	12	15	10	3.65	1174/1463	3.96	3.99	4.09	4.02	3.65
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	1	2	9	18	18	4.04	1191/1438	4.43	4.53	4.46	4.44	4.04
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	4	11	33		1084/1421	4.71	4.70	4.73	4.66	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	6	8	20	13	3.79	1190/1411	4.20	4.20	4.31	4.27	3.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	5	7	17	19	4.04	1028/1405	4.26	4.29	4.32	4.27	4.04
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	27	2	1	5	5	7	3.70	883/1236	3.72	3.77	4.00	3.87	3.70
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	3	5	9	7	3.83	896/1260	3.93	3.77	4.14	3.95	3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	29	0	1	3	3	7	11	3.96	939/1255	4.15	3.89	4.33	4.15	3.96
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	30	0	1	1	4	7	11	4.08	907/1258	4.37	4.05	4.38	4.18	4.08
4. Were special techniques successful	31	13	1	1	2	0	6	3.90	****/ 873	****	3.69	4.03	3.89	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	53	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 198	****	2.90	4.22	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	52	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	52	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.16	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	52	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	3.92	****
Frequ	iency	Dist	tribu	utic	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	ason	ıs			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27 11 0.00-0.99 0 A 25		Red	quire	ed f	or M	lajor	s 1	.5	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	1
28-55 5 1.00-1.99 0 B 14		_	_					_	3	, -				

General

Other

Electives

16

9

1

Under-grad 54

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Course-Section: ECON 102 2 University of Maryland Page 453 Title Prin Of Macroeconomics Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Instructor: Dasgupta, Nandit

Enrollment: 40 Questionnaires: 17

	I	Fall	2009	
Student	Course	Evalua	ation	Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

				±					Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General															
1. Did you	gain new	insights, skills	from this course	0	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	434/1509	4.10	4.21	4.31	4.18	4.65
2. Did the	instructo	or make clear th	e expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	447/1509	4.15	4.21	4.26	4.25	4.59
3. Did the	exam ques	stions reflect t	he expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	261/1287	4.29	4.28	4.30	4.24	4.75
4. Did othe	r evaluat	cions reflect th	e expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	454/1459	4.09	4.07	4.22	4.11	4.50
5. Did assi	gned read	dings contribute	to what you learned	0	2	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	575/1406	4.05	4.05	4.09	4.02	4.27
6. Did writ	ten assi	nments contribu	te to what you learned	0	5	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	762/1384	3.94	3.99	4.11	3.98	4.08
7. Was the	grading s	system clearly e	xplained	1	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	696/1489	4.18	4.31	4.17	4.20	4.31
8. How many	times wa	as class cancell	ed	1	0	0	0	4	11	1	3.81	1463/1506	4.28	4.54	4.67	4.66	3.81
9. How woul	How would you grade the overall teaching effectivened						0	1	6	7	4.20	690/1463	3.96	3.99	4.09	4.02	4.20
1. Were the	instruct	Lecture cor's lectures w	ell prepared	3	0	1	0	0	2	11	4.57	712/1438	4.43	4.53	4.46	4.44	4.57
			ed in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	794/1421	4.71	4.70	4.73	4.66	4.80
			nd explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	6	9	4.44	701/1411	4.20	4.20	4.31	4.27	4.44
		_	hat you learned	1	0	0	1	0	7	8	4.38	788/1405	4.26	4.29	4.32	4.27	4.38
			ce your understanding	1	8	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	383/1236	3.72	3.77	4.00	3.87	4.38
		Discussio	'n														
1. Did clas	s discuss		to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	337/1260	3.93	3.77	4.14	3.95	4.63
			raged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	,		3.89	4.33	4.15	4.33
		_	r and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	1	6		-,		4.05	4.38	4.18	4.63
		niques successf	_	8	6	1	0	0	1	1		****/ 873			4.03	3.89	****
			Frequ	ıency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ear	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade							ason	.s			Ty	pe			Majors	\$
00-27 28-55	3	0.00-0.99			Red	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s	8	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	0

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

University of Maryland Prin Of Macroeconomics

Baltimore County

Coomber, William

I 0

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 18

Title

Instructor:

Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 454 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

	Questions					NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructo Ra	_	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General																	
1. Did vou	ı gain ne	ew insights,skil		m this course	1	0	2	4	5	4	2	3.00	1473/	1509	4.10	4.21	4.31	4.18	3.00
_	_	ctor make clear			1	0	3	4	3	5	2		1475/		4.15	4.21	4.26	4.25	2.94
		estions reflect			1	0	1	4	3	6	3	3.35	1200/	1287	4.29	4.28	4.30	4.24	3.35
4. Did oth	ner evalī	ations reflect	the exp	pected goals	1	7	0	2	2	5	1	3.50	1314/	1459	4.09	4.07	4.22	4.11	3.50
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contribu	ite to v	what you learned	1	3	2	0	4	5	3	3.50	1178/	1406	4.05	4.05	4.09	4.02	3.50
				what you learned	1	10	1	0	3	3	0	3.14	1306/	1384	3.94	3.99	4.11	3.98	3.14
		g system clearly		ined	1	0	4	1	4	5		3.12			4.18	4.31	4.17	4.20	3.12
	-	was class cance			1	1	0	0		12		4.25			4.28	4.54	4.67	4.66	4.25
9. How wou	ıld you g	grade the overal	l teach	ning effectiveness	3	0	4	0	7	2	2	2.87	1415/	1463	3.96	3.99	4.09	4.02	2.87
		Lecture	<u>:</u>																
1. Were th	ne instru	actor's lectures	well r	orepared	1	0	1	1	4	5	6	3.82	1291/	1438	4.43	4.53	4.46	4.44	3.82
		ctor seem intere	_	-	1	0	1	0	2	5	9	4.24			4.71	4.70	4.73	4.66	4.24
				xplained clearly	2	0	3	3	4	4		2.94			4.20	4.20	4.31	4.27	2.94
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute to	what y	you learned	1	0	3	2	4	6	2	3.12	1339/	1405	4.26	4.29	4.32	4.27	3.12
5. Did aud	diovisual	l techniques enh	ance yo	our understanding	1	1	4	0	4	3	5	3.31	1064/	1236	3.72	3.77	4.00	3.87	3.31
		Discuss	ion																
1 Did cla	ass discu			what you learned	3	0	4	2	2	4	3	3 00	1162/	1260	3.93	3.77	4.14	3.95	3.00
	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned were all students actively encouraged to participat					0	2	1	3	5		3.53			4.15	3.89	4.33	4.15	3.53
	Were all students actively encouraged to participat Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussi				3	0	2	0	5	4	4		1137/		4.37	4.05	4.38	4.18	3.53
		echniques succes			3	14	0	0	0	1	0		****/		****	3.69	4.03	3.89	****
2 Were vo	ou provid	Laborat Laborat	_	ground information	16	0	1	0	0	0	1	3 00	****/	198	****	2.90	4.22	4.14	****
Z. Wele ye	ou provid	aca with adequat	c backs	ground informacion	10	Ü	_	Ü	O	O	_	3.00	,	100		2.50	1.22	1.11	
		Seminar																	
				announced theme	16	1	1	0	0	0	0		,	89	****	****	4.49	4.31	****
4. Did pre	esentatio	ons contribute t	o what	you learned	16	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	92	****	****	4.38	4.21	****
		Field W	lork																
1. Did fie	eld exper	rience contribut	e to wh	nat you learned	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	48	****	****	4.39	3.75	***
2. Did you	ı clearly	y understand you	ır evalı	uation criteria	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
4. To what	degree	could you discu	ıss your	r evaluations	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	47	****	****	4.18	4.26	***
		Self F	2222																
1. Did sel	lf-paced			what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	49	****	4.00	4.26	4.28	****
	1			-															
Fr						Dist	trib	ution	ı										
Credits Ea	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade							Rea	asons					Туј	pe			Majors	5
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 1					Red	 guire	ed fo	or Ma	iors		5	 Gra	duat	 e	0	Majo	 or	1
28-55							-			-							J -		
56-83						Ger	nera:	1				2	Und	er-g	rad 1	.8	Non-	-major	17
84-150														_				-	
Grad.						Ele	ectiv	ves				3			Means t				gh
				P 0									res	pons	es to b	e sign	ificar	nt	
				т О		O+1	0.00					1							

Other

1

University of Maryland

Prin Of Macroeconomics Baltimore County

Falcon III, Haro

Enrollment: 40 Questionnaires: 31

Title

Instructor:

Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 455 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Conoval														
General  1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	6	5	18	4.23	911/1509	4.10	4.21	4.31	4.18	4.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	9	16	4.26	859/1509	4.15	4.21	4.26	4.25	4.26
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	8	17	4.23	803/1287	4.29	4.28	4.30	4.24	4.23
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	6	1	1	3	7	10	4.09	917/1459	4.09	4.07	4.22	4.11	4.09
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	8	19	4.45	389/1406	4.05	4.05	4.09	4.02	4.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	2	3	5	13	4.26	609/1384	3.94	3.99	4.11	3.98	4.26
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	5	22	4.55	411/1489	4.18	4.31	4.17	4.20	4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	29	4.94	408/1506	4.28	4.54	4.67	4.66	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	1	1	2	10	10	4.13	774/1463	3.96	3.99	4.09	4.02	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	3	1	5	21	4.47	852/1438	4.43	4.53	4.46	4.44	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	2	27	4.83	716/1421		4.70	4.73	4.66	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	1	2	7	18	4.27	876/1411	4.20	4.20	4.31	4.27	4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	0	4	23	4.53	605/1405	4.26	4.29	4.32	4.27	4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	12	2	0	3	6	7	3.89	784/1236	3.72	3.77	4.00	3.87	3.89
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	3	4	10	4.22	645/1260	3.93	3.77	4.14	3.95	4.22
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	681/1255	4.15	3.89	4.33	4.15	4.39
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	563/1258	4.37	4.05	4.38	4.18	4.59
4. Were special techniques successful	14	10	0	2	3	0	2	3.29	****/ 873	****	3.69	4.03	3.89	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 198	****	2.90	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	27	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.15	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.21	***
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	3.92	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	2	0	1	0	1	2.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	2	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	2	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 49	****	4.00	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	28	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	28	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	***

Prin Of Macroeconomics

Instructor: Falcon III, Haro

Enrollment: 40
Questionnaires: 31

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 455 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits 1	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	1	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	13						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	4	General	9	Under-grad	30	Non-major	30
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	2						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	-		-	
				?	1						

University of Maryland

Prin Of Macroeconomics Baltimore County Gindling JR, Tho

Fall 2009

Enrollment: 78 Questionnaires: 45

Title

Instructor:

Page 456 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

	Evaluation	

			Fre	equer	ncie	c		Tnet	ructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NΑ	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	0	4	15	22	4.44	686/1509	4.10	4.21	4.31	4.18	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	2	19	20	4.44	652/1509	4.15	4.21	4.26	4.25	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	3	12	26	4.56	463/1287	4.29	4.28	4.30	4.24	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	7	0	2	1	14	17	4.35	667/1459	4.09	4.07	4.22	4.11	4.35
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	2	8	11	19	4.18	674/1406	4.05	4.05	4.09	4.02	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	4	0	0	1	19	16	4.42	430/1384	3.94	3.99	4.11	3.98	4.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	1	0	6	9	23	4.36	652/1489	4.18	4.31	4.17	4.20	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	0	28	11	4.28	1236/1506	4.28	4.54	4.67	4.66	4.28
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	0	7	14	13	4.18	714/1463	3.96	3.99	4.09	4.02	4.18
Lecture														
<ol> <li>Were the instructor's lectures well prepared</li> </ol>	5	0	0	0	1	5	34	4.82	334/1438	4.43	4.53	4.46	4.44	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	5	34	4.82	742/1421	4.71	4.70	4.73	4.66	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	2	7		4.72	339/1411	4.20	4.20	4.31	4.27	4.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	11		4.57	568/1405	4.26	4.29	4.32	4.27	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	19	2	2	6	5	5	3.45	1007/1236	3.72	3.77	4.00	3.87	3.45
Discussion	26	0	0	1	5	5	8	4.05	720/1260	2 02	2 77	1 1 1	3.95	4.05
<ol> <li>Did class discussions contribute to what you learned</li> <li>Were all students actively encouraged to participate</li> </ol>	26 26	0	0	4	2	5 4	9		729/1260	3.93	3.77	4.14		3.95
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	26 27	0	0	0	1	5	12	3.95 4.61	956/1255 542/1258	4.15 4.37	3.89 4.05	4.33	4.15 4.18	3.95 4.61
4. Were special techniques successful	27	10	1	1	2	5 1	3		****/ 873	4.3/	3.69	4.38	3.89	4.01 ****
4. were special techniques successful	21	10	Τ	1	2	Т	3	3.50	***/ 8/3	***	3.69	4.03	3.89	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	41	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	42	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 198	****	2.90	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	41	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	42	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	42	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	42	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	43	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	43	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	44	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	43	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	3.92	****
Dield Meele														
Field Work	1.1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	++++/ 10	****	++++	4 20	2 75	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	44		-			1	-		****/ 48 ****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	44	0 0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48 ****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	44	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	, .,	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	44 43	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47 ****/ 44	****	****	4.18 4.32	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	43	Т	U	U	Т	U	U	3.00	44			4.32	4.12	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	44	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	4.00	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	44	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	44	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	44	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	43	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Title Prin Of Macroeconomics

Instructor: Gindling JR, Tho

Enrollment: 78
Questionnaires: 45

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 456 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	 7	0.00-0.99	2	A	4	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	17						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	6	C	7	General	8	Under-grad	45	Non-major	44
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	7	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_		_	
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 102 7 University of Maryland Page 457 MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Title Prin Of Macroeconomics Baltimore County Instructor: Kaikai,Alpha Fall 2009

Enrollment: 40

Questionnaires: 30 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fr	equei	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1															
1. Did voi	u gain ne	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	1	2	3	13	11	4.03	1093/1509	4.10	4.21	4.31	4.18	4.03
		ctor make clear			0	0	1	1	4	8	16	4.23	880/1509	4.15	4.21	4.26	4.25	4.23
		uestions reflec			0	0	1	2	3	11	13	4.10			4.28	4.30	4.24	4.10
		uations reflect			0	12	1	1	1	12	3		1143/1459	4.09	4.07	4.22	4.11	3.83
				what you learned	0	3	3	2	2	11	9	3.78	1030/1406	4.05	4.05	4.09	4.02	3.78
				o what you learned	0	17	0	1	4	5	3	3.77	1043/1384	3.94	3.99	4.11	3.98	3.77
		g system clearl			0	0	1	1	2	4	22	4.50	458/1489	4.18	4.31	4.17	4.20	4.50
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	8	22	4.73	870/1506	4.28	4.54	4.67	4.66	4.73
				hing effectiveness	5	1	1	0	3	11	9						4.02	4.13
		Lectur	e															
1 Were th	he instri	uctor's lecture	_	prepared	0	0	0	1	2	10	17	4.43	891/1438	4 43	4.53	4.46	4.44	4.43
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	1			4.77				4.73		4.7
				xplained clearly	0	0	1	-		8		4.40			4.20	4.31	4.27	4.40
					0	0	0	1	3			4.40			4.29	4.32		4.40
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand					22	1	0	1				****/1236				3.87	***
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass disc			what you learned	13	0	2	1	2	4	8	3.88	876/1260	3.93	3.77	4.14	3.95	3.88
				d to participate	13		1	0	1			4.47			3.89	4.33		4.47
				d open discussion	13	0	0	0	2		14		,	4.37	4.05	4.38	4.18	4.7
		echniques succe				13	1	0	0	1	2		****/ 873				3.89	***
		Labora	tory															
2. Were yo	ou provi		-	ground information	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 198	****	2.90	4.22	4.14	****
				Frequ	encs	n Dist	trib	ıt i oı	า									
		Cum. GPA		_	.01107	220	0112											
Credits Ea	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	.s			Ту:	pe 			Majors	,			
00-27	00-27 6 0.00-0.99 2 A 16					Red	quir	ed fo	or M	ajor	s 1	.7	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	0
28-55																		
56-83						Gei	nera	1				6	Under-g	rad 3	0	Non-	major	30
84-150	84-150 1 3.00-3.49 2 D 0																	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				2	#### - 1				_	jh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
			I 0									0						
? 0																		

Prin Of Macroeconomics

Title Instructor: Dasgupta, Nandit

Enrollment: 39 Questionnaires: 23

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 458 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	386/1509	4.10	4.21	4.31	4.18	4.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	19	4.82			4.21	4.26	4.25	4.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	_	19	4.86	. ,		4.28	4.30	4.24	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	1	0		12	4.59			4.07	4.22	4.11	4.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	1	2		13	4.32			4.05	4.09		4.32
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learn	ed 1	6	0	2	2	3	9	4.19	685/1384	3.94	3.99	4.11	3.98	4.19
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	1	18	4.68	254/1489	4.18	4.31	4.17	4.20	4.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	7	10	4	3.77	1467/1506	4.28	4.54	4.67	4.66	3.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivene	ss 5	1	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	263/1463	3.96	3.99	4.09	4.02	4.59
T														
Lecture	1	0	0	0	1	2	1.0	1 02	240/1420	1 12	4 E2	1 16	1 11	1 00
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1 1	0	19 21	4.82			4.53 4.70	4.46	4.44 4.66	4.82 4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly		0	0	0	1		19		232/1411		4.70		4.00	4.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1			4.77				4.32	4.27	4.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandin		10	2	0	4	1	5	3.58					3.87	
5. Did dadiovibadi ecomilyaco emanee jour anderbeandin	5 +		_	Ü	•	_	3	3.30	J13/1230	3.72	3.77	1.00	3.07	3.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned		0	0	2	1	1	4	3.88	880/1260	3.93	3.77	4.14	3.95	3.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate		0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	629/1255	4.15	3.89	4.33	4.15	4.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussio		0	0	1	0	2			680/1258			4.38	4.18	4.44
4. Were special techniques successful	14	7	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 873	****	3.69	4.03	3.89	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attentio	n 22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.21	***
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	3.92	****
-1.11														
Field Work	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1 00	****/ 48	****	****	1 11	4.29	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	U	1	U	U	U	U	1.00	^^^/ 48			4.41	4.29	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	4.00	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.14	4.13	***
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.31	4.52	***
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
Fr	equency	Dis	trib	ution	n									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	15	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	23	Non-major	21
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	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	0				
				2	^						

Prin Of Accounting I

Title Cole, Richard M. Instructor:

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 23 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 459 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionn	aire
---------	--------	------------	-----------	------

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	6	6	10	4.04	1086/1509	4.16	4.21	4.31	4.18	4.04
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	16	4.61	424/1509	4.39	4.21	4.26	4.25	4.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	6	13	4.26	771/1287	4.30	4.28	4.30	4.24	4.26
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	2	4	3	7	3.76	1187/1459	4.06	4.07	4.22	4.11	3.76
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	3	4	14	4.52	319/1406	4.33	4.05	4.09	4.02	4.52
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	3	1	9	4.46	385/1384	4.17	3.99	4.11	3.98	4.46
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	19	4.74	208/1489	4.47	4.31	4.17	4.20	4.74
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1506	4.49	4.54	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	2	11	2	4.00	853/1463	3.89	3.99	4.09	4.02	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	Ο	Ο	1	4	18	4 74	480/1438	4 52	4.53	4.46	4.44	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	1	3	18		1084/1421	4.63	4.70	4.73	4.66	4.61
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	4	15	4.43	701/1411	4.05	4.20	4.31	4.27	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	4		4.50	634/1405		4.29	4.32	4.27	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	12	1	1	4	1	4	3.55	964/1236		3.77	4.00		3.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	2	4	3	6	3.69	973/1260	3.81	3.77	4.14	3.95	3.69
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	1	5	3	6		1054/1255	3.97	3.89	4.33	4.15	3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	2	0	1	5	8		913/1258		4.05	4.38	4.18	4.06
4. Were special techniques successful	7	11	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/ 873	3.77	3.69	4.03	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.29	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	7	General	1	Under-grad	23	Non-major	23
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	1			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-		-	
				2	2						

Course-Section: ECON 121 3 University of Maryland Title Prin Of Accounting I

Baltimore County

Page 460

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: Medicus, Suzann Fall 2009 Enrollment: Ouestionnaires: 31 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

4. Were special techniques successful

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 1 0 2 1 7 9 11 3.87 1243/1509 4.16 4.21 4.31 4.18 3.87 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 0 1 3 14 12 4.23 880/1509 4.39 4.21 4.26 4.25 4.23 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 0 0 1 2 12 15 4.37 678/1287 4.30 4.28 4.30 4.24 4.37 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 12 1 1 6 3 8 3.84 1135/1459 4.06 4.07 4.22 4.11 3.84 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 2 1 2 7 8 11 3.90 941/1406 4.33 4.05 4.09 4.02 3.90 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 16 0 1 2 5 7 4.20 677/1384 4.17 3.99 4.11 3.98 4.20 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 3 9 19 4.52 446/1489 4.47 4.31 4.17 4.20 4.52 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 1 0 1 0 21 8 4.20 1300/1506 4.49 4.54 4.67 4.66 4.20 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 0 0 0 13 5 5 3.65 1174/1463 3.89 3.99 4.09 4.02 3.65 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 1 3 8 18 4.43 891/1438 4.52 4.53 4.46 4.44 4.43 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 1 2 6 21 4.57 1115/1421 4.63 4.70 4.73 4.66 4.57 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 2 2 9 8 9 3.67 1235/1411 4.05 4.20 4.31 4.27 3.67 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 3 7 9 10 3.80 1177/1405 4.05 4.29 4.32 4.27 3.80 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 4 3 1 5 7 9 3.72 871/1236 3.85 3.77 4.00 3.87 3.72 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 17 0 1 2 6 5 4.00 746/1260 3.81 3.77 4.14 3.95 4.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 17 0 0 0 1 5 8 4.50 575/1255 3.97 3.89 4.33 4.15 4.50 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 17 0 0 0 2 4 8 4.43 700/1258 4.18 4.05 4.38 4.18 4.43

#### Frequency Distribution

17 0 1 2 1 4 6 3.86 560/873 3.77 3.69 4.03 3.89 3.86

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	23	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В	12						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	7	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	31	Non-major	29
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	-		_	
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 121 4 University of Maryland Title Prin Of Accounting I

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 461

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 46 Questionnaires: 23 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Instructor:

Medicus, Suzann

			Fr	eque	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5		Rank		_		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	6	14	4.48	635/1509	4.16	4.21	4.31	4.18	4.48
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	14	4.43	652/1509	4.39	4.21	4.26	4.25	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	14	4.48	554/1287	4.30	4.28	4.30	4.24	4.48
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	4	6	7	4.18	851/1459	4.06	4.07	4.22	4.11	4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	7	12	4.48	366/1406	4.33	4.05	4.09	4.02	4.48
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	4	5	8	4.11	742/1384	4.17	3.99	4.11	3.98	4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	4	14	4.35	663/1489	4.47	4.31	4.17	4.20	4.35
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	18	3	4.14	1325/1506	4.49	4.54	4.67	4.66	4.14
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	2	9	4	4.13	762/1463	3.89	3.99	4.09	4.02	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	2	19	4.74	480/1438	4.52	4.53	4.46	4.44	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	20	4.83	742/1421	4.63	4.70	4.73	4.66	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3	2	5	13	4.22	920/1411	4.05	4.20	4.31	4.27	4.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	3	3	14	4.13	980/1405	4.05	4.29	4.32	4.27	4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	5	8	8	4.14	580/1236	3.85	3.77	4.00	3.87	4.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	4	5	2	3.58	1017/1260	3.81	3.77	4.14	3.95	3.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	1	2	4			1054/1255		3.89			3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	3	4			867/1258		4.05			4.17
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	0	1	4	5		3.67	,					
Frequ	lency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credita Formed Com CDA Expected Credes	-								т.				Majara	

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	 7	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	В	9						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	23	Non-major	23
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_			
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Prin Of Accounting I Davis,Alexis C.

Instructor: Davi Enrollment: 40 Questionnaires: 27

Title

Fall 2009

Page 462 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque: 2	ncie	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	3	4	7	12	3.96	1154/1509	4.16	4.21	4.31	4.18	3.96
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	3	9	11		1148/1509		4.21	4.26	4.25	3.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	6	5	12		1047/1287		4.28	4.30	4.24	3.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	3	3	5	8		1167/1459		4.07	4.22	4.11	3.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	5	6	13	4.15	693/1406		4.05	4.09	4.02	4.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	1	2	2	5	5	3.73	1063/1384	4.17	3.99	4.11	3.98	3.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	2	5	7	12	4.12	906/1489	4.47	4.31	4.17	4.20	4.12
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	1	25	4.81	762/1506	4.49	4.54	4.67	4.66	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	3	1	6	6	6	3.50	1241/1463	3.89	3.99	4.09	4.02	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	4	2	5	13		1273/1438		4.53	4.46	4.44	3.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	2	0	2	9	13		1312/1421		4.70	4.73	4.66	4.19
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	4	1	6	6	9		1262/1411		4.20	4.31	4.27	3.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	5	4	3	10		1297/1405		4.29	4.32	4.27	3.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	17	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	799/1236	3.85	3.77	4.00	3.87	3.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	3	1	1	4	5		1045/1260		3.77	4.14	3.95	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	3	1	3	1	6		1148/1255		3.89	4.33	4.15	3.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	3	2	2	6		1110/1258		4.05	4.38	4.18	3.64
4. Were special techniques successful	13	3	1	1	1	2	6	4.00	442/ 873	3.77	3.69	4.03	3.89	4.00
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	****/ 198	****	2.90	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 184		****	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	1	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 177		****	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	1	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 165	****	***	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	1	1	1	0	0	1		****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	2	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 92		****	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	2	1	0	1	0	0		****/ 90		****	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	2	0	1	1	0	2.25	****/ 92		****	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	3	0	0	1	0	1.75	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	3.92	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/ 49	****	4.00	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	2	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 41	****	5.00	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 46		5.00	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	2	1	0	0	0	0		,	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Prin Of Accounting I

Instructor: Davis, Alexis C.

Enrollment: 40
Questionnaires: 27

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 462 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Course-Section: ECON 121 6 University of Maryland Title Prin Of Accounting I

Baltimore County

McBride,Charles Instructor:

Enrollment: 37 Questionnaires: 26

Page 463 MAR 22, 2010 Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029

	Evaluation	

				eque					ructor	Course	_			
Questions	NR	NA	. 1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	0	2	6	16	4.44	673/1509	4.16	4.21	4.31	4.18	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1		21		245/1509		4.21	4.26	4.25	4.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	4	19	4.54	491/1287			4.30	4.24	4.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	5	17				4.07	4.22	4.11	4.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learne	d 0	0	0	1	2	3	20	4.62	261/1406	4.33	4.05	4.09	4.02	4.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you lear	ned 0	6	1	1	2	2	14	4.35	505/1384	4.17	3.99	4.11	3.98	4.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	3	21	4.65	287/1489	4.47	4.31	4.17	4.20	4.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	16	9	4.31	1222/1506	4.49	4.54	4.67	4.66	4.31
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiven	ess 8	0	0	1	2	8	7	4.17	726/1463	3.89	3.99	4.09	4.02	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	396/1438	4.52	4.53	4.46	4.44	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	269/1421	4.63	4.70	4.73	4.66	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	y 3	0	0	1	4	4	14	4.35	799/1411	4.05	4.20	4.31	4.27	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	3	3	16	4.43	720/1405	4.05	4.29	4.32	4.27	4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi	ng 5	0	2	0	5	3	11	4.00	664/1236	3.85	3.77	4.00	3.87	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learne	d 11	0	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	613/1260	3.81	3.77	4.14	3.95	4.27
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participat	e 11	0	0	1	0	6	8	4.40	665/1255	3.97	3.89	4.33	4.15	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussi	on 11	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	549/1258	4.18	4.05	4.38	4.18	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	11	8	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	681/ 873	3.77	3.69	4.03	3.89	3.57
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background informat	ion 25	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 198	****	2.90	4.22	4.14	****
F	requenc	y Di	strib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra	des			Re	ason	s			Туј	pe			Majors	3
00-27 3 0.00-0.99 1 A 11 28-55 2 1.00-1.99 0 B 8		 R	equir	ed f	or M	 ajor	s 1	.6	Graduat	e	0	Majo	 r	0

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	 А	11	Required for Majors	16	 Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	26	Non-major	26
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-		_	
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 122 1 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County Prin Of Accounting II Instructor:

I

0

1

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 17

38

Page 464 MAR 22, 2010 McBride,Charles Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Fralmation	Ouestionnaire

		Ouestion:	7		MD	NA	Fre	-	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Questions	j 			NA				<del>- 4</del>		Mean	Ralik	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did you	u gain ne	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	363/1509	4.24	4.21	4.31	4.18	4.71
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	245/1509	4.34	4.21	4.26	4.25	4.76
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflect	the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	76/1287	4.54	4.28	4.30	4.24	4.94
4. Did oth	her evalu	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	2	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	116/1459	4.42	4.07	4.22	4.11	4.87
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	ate to	what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	135/1406	4.65	4.05	4.09	4.02	4.80
6. Did wri	itten ass	signments contri	ibute t	o what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	225/1384	4.07	3.99	4.11	3.98	4.67
7. Was the	e grading	system clearly	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	233/1489	4.44	4.31	4.17	4.20	4.71
8. How mar	ny times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	622/1506	4.85	4.54	4.67	4.66	4.88
9. How wou	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	325/1463	4.28	3.99	4.09	4.02	4.50
		Lecture	9															
1. Were th	he instru	actor's lectures	s well	prepared	2	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	276/1438	4.48	4.53	4.46	4.44	4.87
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	376/1421	4.79	4.70	4.73	4.66	4.93
				xplained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	416/1411	4.14	4.20	4.31	4.27	4.67
		es contribute to		-	2	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	459/1405		4.29	4.32	4.27	4.67
5. Did aud	diovisual	l techniques enl	nance y	our understanding	2	2	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	306/1236	3.75	3.77	4.00	3.87	4.46
		Discus																
				what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	172/1260		3.77	4.14	3.95	4.86
				d to participate	10	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	647/1255	4.27	3.89	4.33	4.15	4.43
				d open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1258		4.05	4.38	4.18	5.00
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succes	ssful		10	3	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/ 873	4.25	3.69	4.03	3.89	****
				Frequ	lency	Dist	crib	ution	1									
a 1'	,	a ana						_					_					
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	sons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	<b>;</b>
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Rec	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s	7	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	2
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	в 4			-			-								
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 2		Ger	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad 1	.7	Non-	major	15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0									_				-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ſh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	it	
													_					

Other

1

Course-Section: ECON 122 2 University of Maryland Title

Baltimore County Prin Of Accounting II Instructor: McBride, Charles Fall 2009

Ρ

Ι

0

0 0

Enrollment: 38 Questionnaires: 12

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 465

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

		Questions	5		NR	NA	Fre 1	_	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
		 General	 1															
1 Did von	ı gain ne	w insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	3	4	3	2	3 33	1435/1509	4.24	4 21	4.31	4.18	3 33
		tor make clear			0	0	0	1	3	6			1259/1509		4.21	4.26	4.25	3.75
		estions reflect		_	0	0	0	1	2	5			924/1287	4.54	4.28	4.30	4.24	4.00
	_	ations reflect		_	0	6	1	0	1	2	2		1238/1459		4.07	4.22	4.11	3.67
				what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	2	6	4.56			4.05	4.09	4.02	4.56
	_	-		o what you learned	0	6	1	0	2	3	0	3.17	1302/1384		3.99	4.11	3.98	3.17
		system clearly		_	0	0	0	0	4	1	7	4.25	760/1489	4.44	4.31	4.17	4.20	4.25
8. How man	ny times v	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	941/1506	4.85	4.54	4.67	4.66	4.67
9. How wou	ıld you g	rade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	1006/1463	4.28	3.99	4.09	4.02	3.88
		Lecture	9															
1. Were th	ne instru	ctor's lecture:	s well	prepared	1	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	1055/1438	4.48	4.53	4.46	4.44	4.27
2. Did the	e instruc	tor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	1049/1421	4.79	4.70	4.73	4.66	4.64
3. Was led	cture mate	erial presented	d and e	xplained clearly	1	0	0	2			1	3.18	1343/1411	4.14	4.20	4.31	4.27	3.18
4. Did the	e lecture	s contribute to	what	you learned	1	1	0	1	5	3	1	3.40	1294/1405	4.11	4.29	4.32	4.27	3.40
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques enl	nance y	our understanding	1	5	0	2	3	0	1	3.00	1131/1236	3.75	3.77	4.00	3.87	3.00
		Discus	sion															
				what you learned	8	0			2	0			1251/1260		3.77	4.14	3.95	2.25
		_	_	d to participate	8	0	0	0	1	1		4.25	,	4.27	3.89	4.33	4.15	4.25
3. Did the	e instruc	tor encourage :	fair an	d open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	620/1258	4.42	4.05	4.38	4.18	4.50
				Frequ	enas	Diet	-rihi	1+ 1 01	2									
				rrequ	lency	DISC		10101	1									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А б		Rec	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	3	9	Graduat	 е	0	Majo	r	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В 3			_			-								
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 2		Ger	nera:	L				0	Under-g	rad 1	2	Non-	major	11
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D 0									_				-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h

Other

0

Course-Section: ECON 122 3 University of Maryland Title Prin Of Accounting II Baltimore County

Prin Of Accounting II Baltimore County Hardy, Timothy W Fall 2009

Instructor: Hard Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 16

20
res: 16 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland Page 466
Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010
Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029

								_	ncies	5		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 yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	386/1509	4.24	4.21	4.31	4.18	4.69
2. Did th	e instruc	ctor make clear	the exp	pected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	11	4.50	543/1509	4.34	4.21	4.26	4.25	4.50
3. Did th	e exam qı	uestions reflec	t the ex	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	337/1287	4.54	4.28	4.30	4.24	4.69
4. Did ot	her evalı	uations reflect	the exp	pected goals	0	5	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	218/1459	4.42	4.07	4.22	4.11	4.73
				what you learned	0	1	1	0	0	2	12	4.60	269/1406	4.65	4.05	4.09	4.02	4.60
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute to	what you learned	0	3	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	466/1384	4.07	3.99	4.11	3.98	4.38
		g system clearl		ined	0	0	1	1	1	1	12	4.38	630/1489	4.44	4.31	4.17	4.20	4.38
	-	was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1506		4.54	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	381/1463	4.28	3.99	4.09	4.02	4.46
		Lectur	е															
1. Were the	he instru	actor's lecture	s well p	prepared	0	0	0	1	2	4	9	4.31	1021/1438	4.48	4.53	4.46	4.44	4.31
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor seem inter	ested in	n the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	768/1421	4.79	4.70	4.73	4.66	4.81
3. Was le	cture mat	terial presente	d and ex	xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	544/1411	4.14	4.20	4.31	4.27	4.56
		es contribute t	-	•	0	0	0	0	4	4	8	4.25	896/1405	4.11	4.29	4.32	4.27	4.25
5. Did au	diovisual	l techniques en	hance yo	our understanding	0	6	1	1	2	1	5	3.80	824/1236	3.75	3.77	4.00	3.87	3.80
		Discus	sion															
				what you learned	8	0	1	2	1	1	3	3.38	1096/1260	3.49	3.77	4.14	3.95	3.38
				d to participate	8	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13			3.89	4.33	4.15	4.13
				d open discussion	8	0	0	2	2	0	4		1070/1258		4.05	4.38	4.18	3.75
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		8	4	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	333/ 873	4.25	3.69	4.03	3.89	4.25
		Labora	tory															
		crease understa			15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were y	ou provid	ded with adequa	te back	ground information	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	2.90	4.22	4.14	****
				Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00 07	0	0 00 0 00		 A 7														
00-27 28-55	1	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	1 0	A 7 B 1		ке	quir	eu I	or Ma	JOE	5 I	د.	Graduat	E	0	Majo	JΤ	0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C 6		Go.	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.6	Non-	-major	16
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	0	D 0		GC.	иста.	_				J	onder -9	Luu 1	. 0	INOII-	ilia JUI	10
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	Б 0 F 0		E1	ecti	ves				0	#### - :	Means t	here a	are not	enous	rh
Ji da.	0	3.30 1.00	3	P 0		11.11	CCCI	v CD				J	respons				_	111
				I O		O+	her					0	T CPPOILE		,c bigi	ııı.caı		
				? 1		00.						•						

CON 301 1 Univers

Intermed Accounting I

Instructor: Stmartin, Jeanne

Enrollment: 32
Questionnaires: 22

Title

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 467 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	anier	ncies			Tnst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	0	9	11	4.43	698/1509	4.49	4.21	4.31	4.32	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	7	13	4.52	519/1509	4.50	4.21	4.26	4.25	4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	0	6	14	4.52	500/1287	4.47	4.28	4.30	4.33	4.52
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	0	3	3	13	4.19	834/1459	4.22	4.07	4.22	4.26	4.19
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	1	3	5	9	4.05	776/1406	4.14	4.05	4.09	4.12	4.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	1	5	4	8	3.89	946/1384	4.01	3.99	4.11	4.15	3.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	0	3	16	4.57	376/1489	4.59	4.31	4.17	4.14	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	7	13	4.65	949/1506	4.63	4.54	4.67	4.67	4.65
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	0	0	6	9	4.38	500/1463	4.45	3.99	4.09	4.08	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	5	14	4.52	775/1438	4.57	4.53	4.46	4.43	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	19	4.86	665/1421	4.82	4.70	4.73	4.73	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	2	5	12	4.35	789/1411	4.52	4.20	4.31	4.29	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	4	15	4.52	615/1405	4.55	4.29	4.32	4.32	4.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	10	1	0	1	2	6	4.20	536/1236	3.90	3.77	4.00	4.07	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	645/1260	4.22	3.77	4.14	4.22	4.22
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	0	2	3	3		1047/1255	3.78	3.89	4.33	4.37	3.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	1	2	3	2		1070/1258	3.75	4.05	4.38	4.42	3.75
4. Were special techniques successful	14	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 873	****	3.69	4.03	4.08	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 198	****	2.90	4.22	4.07	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.52	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.11	****
Combiner														
Seminar	0.1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 89	****	****	4 40	1 00	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21 21	0	0	0	0	1 1	0	4.00	****/ 89 ****/ 92	****	****	4.49 4.54	4.86	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 90	****	****	4.54	4.67 4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.03	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made crear	21	U	U	U	U	1	U	4.00	/ 93			4.00	3.34	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 44	***	****	4.32	4.40	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	4.00	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****

Intermed Accounting I

Instructor: Stmartin, Jeanne

Enrollment: 32
Questionnaires: 22

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 467 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 A	2	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	8	C	11	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-		_	
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 301 2 University of Maryland Title Intermed Accounting I

Baltimore County

Instructor: Stmartin,Jeanne

Enrollment: 35 Questionnaires: 27

Page 468 MAR 22, 2010 Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions			NR	NA	Fre	-	encies		5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean			
		Genera						_	_	_				-40/4-00		4 04	4 0 4		
		ew insights,ski				0	0	1 0	0 3	2	4	20 21	4.56	,		4.21	4.31		4.56
	<ol> <li>Did the instructor make clear the expected goals</li> <li>Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals</li> </ol>						0	0	3	1	1 5	18	4.48			4.21	4.26	4.25	4.48
							2	1	1	4	4	15	4.24	,		4.20	4.22	4.33	4.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned						0	4	0	1	3	9	10	4.22	. ,		4.05	4.09	4.12	4.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned						0	1	0	3	3	8	12		742/1384		3.99	4.11	4.15	4.12
7. Was the grading system clearly explained						1	0	1	1	1	1	22		330/1489		4.31	4.17	4.14	4.62
		was class canc		IIICU		1	0	0	0	0	10	16		981/1506		4.54	4.67	4.67	
	-	grade the overa		hing effective	eness	6	2	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	,		3.99	4.09	4.08	4.53
		Lectur	e																
1. Were th	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared		3	0	0	1	1	4	18	4.63	646/1438	4.57	4.53	4.46	4.43	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						3	0	0	0	2	1	21	4.79	811/1421	4.82	4.70	4.73	4.73	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly				rly	4	0	0	1	1	2	19	4.70	376/1411	4.52	4.20	4.31	4.29	4.70	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					3	0	1	0	2	2	19	4.58	558/1405	4.55	4.29	4.32	4.32	4.58	
5. Did aud	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understand	ding	3	14	2	0	2	2	4	3.60	936/1236	3.90	3.77	4.00	4.07	3.60
		Discus																	
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned					22	0	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	****/1260		3.77	4.14	4.22	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate					22	0	0	3	1	0	1		****/1255		3.89	4.33	4.37	****	
		ctor encourage		d open discuss	sion	22	0	0	2	1	0	2		****/1258		4.05	4.38	4.42	****
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful			22	2	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/ 873	****	3.69	4.03	4.08	****
		Labora																	
2. Were yo	ou provid	ded with adequa	te back	ground informa	ation	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	2.90	4.22	4.17	****
					Freque	ency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Gr	rades		Reasons							Ту	<i>r</i> pe		Majors		}
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A 4			Red	quir	ed fo	or M	 Iajor	s 1	.6	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r r	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 11				-			-						3 -		
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	4	C 4			Gei	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad 2	27	Non-	major	23
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	1	D 0															
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0 P 0			Ele	ecti	ves				2		Means there are not enough				
							01						0	respons	es to D	e sign	ııııcan	l L	
				I 0 ? 1		Other							U						
				; I															

ECON 311 1 University of Maryland

Interm Microecon Analy Baltimore County

Lord, William A Fall 20

Enrollment: 29
Questionnaires: 17

Title

Instructor:

Fall 2009

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 469 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General						_	_							
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	1	7	7		1032/1509	4.01		4.31		4.12
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	6	7		1049/1509	4.01	4.21	4.26	4.25	4.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	4	11		626/1287	4.23	4.28	4.30	4.33	4.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	1	2	1	2	3		1330/1459	3.83	4.07	4.22	4.26	3.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	5	4			956/1406	3.83	4.05	4.09	4.12	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	13	2	0	0	0	2		****/1384		3.99	4.11	4.15	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	109/1489	4.51	4.31	4.17	4.14	4.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7			1006/1506	4.47	4.54	4.67	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	2	8	3	3.93	957/1463	3.88	3.99	4.09	4.08	3.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	131/1438	4.53	4.53	4.46	4.43	4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3		4.82	742/1421	4.59	4.70	4.73		4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5		4.71	,	4.24	4.20	4.31	4.29	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5		4.71		4.25	4.29	4.32	4.32	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	1	0	0	4	5	4.20	536/1236		3.77	4.00	4.07	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	0	1	1	7	4.00	746/1260	3.83	3.77	4.14	4.22	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	3	2	5	3.91	992/1255	4.01	3.89	4.33	4.37	3.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	932/1258	4.13	4.05	4.38	4.42	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	9	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 873	4.00	3.69	4.03	4.08	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	1	0	Ο	3 00	****/ 198	****	2 90	4 22	4.17	***
z. were you provided with adequate background information	10	U	U	O	_	O	O	3.00	/ 100		2.50	1.22	1.17	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	1	0	2 E0	****/ 49	****	4.00	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 41	****	5.00	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 46	****	5.00	4.14	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	1.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
	15	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 30	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	тэ	Т	U	U	U	Т	U	4.00	/ 30			4.2/	5.00	
Frequ	encv	Dist	ribu	ıtior	ı									
11040	1													

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	15	 Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	В	13						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5	С	2	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	14
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	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	1				
				2	0						

University of Maryland

Baltimore County Fall 2009 Interm Microecon Analy

Instructor: Ma,Bing Enrollment: 39 Questionnaires: 25

Title

Page 470 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Eva.	luation	Question	naire
---------	--------	------	---------	----------	-------

			Fre	equer	ncie	2		Tnat	ructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NΑ	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
׫«»«»»														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	1	6	16	4.54	551/1509	4.01	4.21	4.31	4.32	4.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	1	3	18	4.50	543/1509	4.01	4.21	4.26	4.25	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	19	4.75	261/1287	4.23	4.28	4.30	4.33	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	569/1459	3.83	4.07	4.22	4.26	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	2	3	1	4	9	3.79	1023/1406	3.83	4.05	4.09	4.12	3.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	10	0	1	3	2	7	4.15	710/1384	4.08	3.99	4.11	4.15	4.15
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	3	3	17	4.61	341/1489	4.51	4.31	4.17	4.14	4.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	16	7	4.30	1222/1506	4.47	4.54	4.67	4.67	4.30
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	2	9	6	4.24	648/1463	3.88	3.99	4.09	4.08	4.24
Lecture														
<ol> <li>Were the instructor's lectures well prepared</li> </ol>	1	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	319/1438	4.53	4.53	4.46	4.43	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	21	4.88	614/1421	4.59	4.70	4.73	4.73	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	5	17	4.63	469/1411	4.24	4.20	4.31	4.29	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	20	4.79	297/1405	4.25	4.29	4.32	4.32	4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	8	1	0	0	4	10	4.47	306/1236	3.79	3.77	4.00	4.07	4.47
5.														
Discussion	1 /	0	0	0	2	4	5	4 07	COF /10CO	2 02	2 77	1 11	4.22	4.27
<ol> <li>Did class discussions contribute to what you learned</li> <li>Were all students actively encouraged to participate</li> </ol>	14	0	0	0	0	4	5 7	4.27	605/1260	3.83	3.77	4.14		4.27
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14 14	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.64	474/1255 670/1258	4.01 4.13	3.89 4.05	4.33	4.37 4.42	4.45
4. Were special techniques successful	14	1	0	1	2	3	4	4.45	442/ 873	4.13		4.38	4.42	4.45
4. were special techniques successful	14	T	U	T	2	3	4	4.00	442/ 8/3	4.00	3.09	4.03	4.08	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 198	****	2.90	4.22	4.17	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.52	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.11	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	3.94	****
Dield Meele														
Field Work	2.2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4 50	++++/ 10	****	++++	4 20	1 (1	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23		-	0		1	1		****/ 48 ****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 48 ****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	1 0	0	0		0	1	5.00 4.00	, .	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23 23	0	0	0	1 1	0	1	4.00	****/ 47 ****/ 44	****	****	4.18 4.32	4.47	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	43	U	U	U	Т	U	Τ	4.00	44			4.32	4.40	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 49	****	4.00	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****

Interm Microecon Analy

Instructor: Ma,Bing
Enrollment: 39

Questionnaires: 25

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 470 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	Credits Earned Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	6	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	25	Non-major	25
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_		_	
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Interm Microecon Analy

Instructor: Takacs, Wendy E Enrollment:

Title

39 Questionnaires: 32

Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 471

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Ceneral   Cene	Questions	NR	NA	Fre	quen 2	cie:	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	-	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course   1															
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 3 1 1 0 18 4.34 763/1509 4.01 4.21 4.26 4.25 4.34  3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 17 0 2 4 3 6 3.87 119/1459 3.83 4.07 4.22 4.26 3.87  5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 7 1 1 5 8 9 3.96 873/1406 3.83 4.07 4.22 4.26 3.87  6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 2 8 1 1 0 4 6 4.08 762/184 4.08 2.99 4.11 4.15 4.08  8. Row many Lines was class cancelled 1 0 1 0 1 0 9 20 4.48 485/1489 4.19 4.11 4.17 4.14 4.48  8. Row many Lines was class cancelled 1 0 3 0 0 0 1 8 10 4.36 189/1508 4.77 4.54 4.67 4.56  9. Bow would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 10 3 0 0 0 1 8 10 4.36 189/1508 4.77 4.54 4.67 4.56  9. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 0 0 0 1 5 2 2 4.75 487/1438 4.53 4.53 4.64 4.43 4.76  9. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3 0 0 0 0 1 5 2 2 4.75 487/1438 4.53 4.54 4.67 4.73 4.72  9. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3 0 0 0 0 1 5 2 2 4.75 487/1438 4.53 4.54 4.47 4.73 4.72  9. Did the lecture material presented and explained clearly 3 0 0 2 2 7 18 4.41 725/141 4.24 4.20 4.31 4.29 4.73  9. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5 13 4 2 2 3 3 2.93 1157/1236 3.79 3.77 4.14 4.22 3.78  9. Did the instructor's encouraged to participate 23 0 1 1 1 2 0 5 3.78 924/1250 3.83 3.79 3.77 4.00 4.07 3.89  9. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 23 0 1 1 1 1 1 5 5.00 ***/ 873 4.00 5.99 4.03 4.03 ***  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 31 0 0 0 0 1 1 5.00 ***/ 873 4.00 5.99 4.03 4.03 ***  1. Were successary materials available for lab activities 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 873 ***  2. Were you provided with adequate background information 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 873 ***  3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 873 ***  4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 873 ***  5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 31 0 0		-	•	_	2	2	0	1.4	2 0 1	1026/1500	4 01	4 01	4 21	4 20	2 0 0
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings reflect the expected goals 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Table 1. T			-	-											
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Did the grading system clearly explained 8. How the grading system clearly explained 8. How the grading system clearly explained 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How the grading system clearly explained 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How the grading system clearly explained 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How the grading system clearly explained 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How the grading system clearly explained 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How the grading system clearly explained clearly 10. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 10. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 10. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 10. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10. Did class discussions contribute to make you will be grading the grading system clearly explained participate 10. Did class discussions contribute to make your provided with adequate background information 10. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 10. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 10. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 10. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 10. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 10. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 10. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 10. Did the lab inc		-	-	-		_				,					
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 10. 0 1 1 1 0 4 10 5 4.05 826/1463 3.88 3.99 4.09 4.09 4.08 1. Wars the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. Wars the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. Wars the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. Was electure material presented and explained clearly 1. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 23 0 1 1 1 2 0 5 3.78 924/1260 3.83 3.77 4.14 4.22 3.78 2. Were pour provided with adequate background information 23 0 1 1 1 1 5 3.89 1001/1255 4.01 3.89 4.33 4.37 3.89 2. Were pour provided with adequate background information 23 0 0 1 1 5 10 1 1 5.00 ***/ 184 **** 4.44 4.45 4.43 4.43 2. Were pour provided with adequate background information 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ***/ 184 **** 4.44 4.45 4.43 4.43 3. Were received the provide assistance 31 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ***/ 184 **** 4.44 4.44 4.44 4.44 4.44 4.44 4.				•											
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 10. 3 0 0 0 18 10 4.36 1194/1506 4.47 4.54 4.67 4.67 4.67 4.68  8. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 10. 3 0 0 0 18 10 4.36 1194/1506 4.47 4.54 4.67 4.67 4.67 4.68  10. Where the instructor's lectures well prepared 11. Where the instructor's lectures well prepared 12. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 13. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 14. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 15. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 15. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 15. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 15. Were special techniques successful 16. Where special techniques successful 17. Where special techniques successful 18. Where special techniques outcomes fair and open discussion 23. To 18. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 23. To 18. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 24. Where special techniques successful 25. Where outprivided with adequate background information and the special techniques outcomes fair and open discussion 26. Where all successful 27. Where you provided with adequate background information and the special techniques outcomes fair and open discussion of the special techniques outcomes fair and open discussion of the special techniques outcomes fair and open discussion of the special techniques outcomes fair and open discussion of the special techniques outcomes fair and open discussion of the special techniques outcomes fair and open discussion of the special techniques outcomes fair and open discussion of the special techniques outcomes fair and open discussion of the special techniques outcomes fair and open discussion of the s															
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 1 1 0 0 9 20 4.48 485/1489 4.51 4.31 4.17 4.14 4.48 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 3 0 0 0 18 0 0 0 18 4.36 194/1505 4.47 4.54 4.67 4.67 4.36 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 10 3 0 0 0 1 5 4.05 826/1463 3.88 3.99 4.09 4.08 4.05  Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 3 0 0 0 0 1 5 23 4.76 447/1438 4.53 4.53 4.46 4.43 4.76 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3 0 0 0 0 1 6 22 4.72 933/1421 4.59 4.70 4.73 4.73 4.73 4.74 4.14 4.14 1.15 1.15 1.15 1.15 1.15 1.1							-	-							
8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 10 3 0 0 0 18 10 4.36 1194/1506 4.47 4.54 4.67 4.67 4.36 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 10 3 0 0 0 1 6 20 4.05 826/1463 3.88 3.99 4.09 4.08 4.05   Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 3 0 0 0 1 6 22 4.72 933/1421 4.59 4.70 4.73 4.73 4.72 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3 0 0 1 6 22 4.72 933/1421 4.59 4.70 4.73 4.73 4.72 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3 0 0 2 2 7 18 4.41 725/1411 4.24 4.20 4.31 4.29 4.41 4.10 the lectures contribute to what you learned 4 2 0 3 2 5 16 4.31 859/1405 4.25 4.29 4.32 4.32 4.31 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5 13 4 2 2 3 3 2.93 1157/1236 3.79 3.77 4.00 4.07 2.93   Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 23 0 1 1 2 0 5 3.78 934/1260 3.83 3.77 4.14 4.22 3.78 2.88 2.89 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 23 0 1 1 1 1 6 4.33 770/1258 4.13 4.09 4.33 4.37 3.89 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 23 0 1 1 1 1 6 4.33 770/1258 4.13 4.05 4.38 4.42 4.33 4.88 2.89 2.89 2.89 2.89 2.89 2.89 2.89 2	<u> </u>														
New would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness   10   3   0   0   4   10   5   4.05   826/1463   3.88   3.99   4.09   4.08   4.05			-	_		-									
Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3 0 0 0 1 5 23 4.76 447/1438 4.53 4.54 4.43 4.76 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3 0 0 0 2 1 6 22 4.72 933/1421 4.59 4.70 4.73 4.73 4.72 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4 2 0 3 2 5 16 4.31 8.59/1405 4.25 4.29 4.31 4.29 4.41 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 4 2 0 3 2 5 16 4.31 8.59/1405 4.25 4.29 4.32 4.32 4.33 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5 13 4 2 2 3 3 2.93 1157/1236 3.79 3.77 4.00 4.07 2.93  Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 23 0 1 1 2 0 5 3.78 924/1260 3.83 3.77 4.14 4.22 3.78 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 1 1 1 5 3.89 1001/1255 4.01 3.89 4.33 4.37 3.89 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 23 0 0 1 1 1 6 4.33 770/1258 4.13 4.05 4.3 4.63 4.24 3. Were special techniques successful  23 0 0 1 1 1 6 4.33 770/1258 4.13 4.05 4.3 4.05 4.29  Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/184 **** 4.16 4.07 *** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/184 **** 4.16 4.07 *** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/187 **** 4.18 4.12 *** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/187 **** 4.49 4.86 **** 4. Did the lab instructor available for individual attention 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/187 **** 4.49 4.86 **** 4. Did the lab instructor available for individual attention 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/187 **** 4.49 4.86 **** 4. Did the greentations contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/187 **** 4.49 4.86 **** 4. Did the greentations contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/187 *** 4.49 4.86 **** 4. Did greentations contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/187 *** 4.49 4.86 **** 4. Did greentations contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/187 *** 4.49 4						-									
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared   3				•	•	_		_							
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3 0 0 0 1 1 6 22 4.72 933/1421 4.59 4.70 4.73 4.73 4.72 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3 0 0 2 2 7 18 4.41 725/1411 4.24 4.20 4.31 4.29 4.41 4.51 dthe lectures contribute to what you learned 4 2 0 3 2 5 16 4.31 859/1405 4.25 4.29 4.32 4.32 4.31 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5 13 4 2 2 3 3 2.93 1157/1236 3.79 3.77 4.00 4.07 2.93    Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 2 0 1 1 1 2 0 5 3.78 924/1260 3.83 3.77 4.14 4.22 3.78   3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 23 0 0 1 1 1 5 3.89 1001/1255 4.01 3.89 4.33 4.37 3.89   3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 23 0 0 1 1 1 1 6 4.33 770/1258 4.13 4.05 4.38 4.42 4.33   4. Were special techniques successful 23 7 0 0 1 0 1 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0		2	^	0	0	1	_	2.2	4 76	447/1420	4 52	4 52	1 16	4 42	4 76
3 Nas lecture material presented and explained clearly 4 Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7 Did class discussions  Discussion 1 Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 23 O 1 1 2 O 5 3.78 924/1260 3.83 3.77 4.14 4.22 3.78 2 Were all students actively encouraged to participate 23 O 1 1 1 1 5 3.89 1001/1255 4.01 3.89 4.33 4.37 3.89 3 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 23 O 0 1 1 1 1 6 4.33 770/1258 4.01 3.89 4.33 4.37 3.89 3 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 24 Were special techniques successful 25 O 0 1 0 1 5.00 ***/873 4.00 3.69 4.03 4.08 ***  Laboratory 1 Did the lab increase understanding of the material 2 Were your provided with adequate background information 3 O 0 O 0 D 1 5.00 ***/184 *** 4.16 4.07 *** 3 Were necessary materials available for lab activities 3 Did the lab instructor provide assistance 3 Did the lab instructor provide assistance 3 Did the lab instructor provide assistance 3 Did the lab instructor available for lab activities 3 Did the lab instructor available for lab activities 3 Did the lab instructor available for lab activities 4 Did the lab instructor available for individual attention 5 Did research projects contribute to what you learned 5 Did presentations contribute to what you learned 6 Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 7 Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 8 Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 9 Did you clearly understand your evaluation sile on the instructor available for consultation sile on 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 48 **** 4.00 4.26 5.00 ***  Pield Work 1 Did study questions make clear the expected goal 3 Did research projects contribute to what you learned 3 Did research projects contribute to what you learned 3 Did research projects contribute to what you learned 3 Did produces help you carry out fiel			-	-	-		-			,					
4 2 0 3 2 5 16 4.31 859/1405 4.25 4.29 4.32 4.32 4.31 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5 13 4 2 2 3 3 3 2.93 1157/1236 3.79 3.77 4.00 4.07 2.93    Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 23 0 1 1 1 2 0 5 3.78 924/1260 3.83 3.77 4.14 4.22 3.78 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 23 0 1 1 1 1 5 3.89 1001/1255 4.01 3.89 4.33 4.37 3.89 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 23 0 0 1 1 1 6 4.33 770/1288 4.13 4.05 4.38 4.24 4.33 4. Were special techniques successful 23 7 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/873 4.00 3.69 4.03 4.08 ****  Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/184 **** *** 4.16 4.07 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/184 **** 2.90 4.22 4.17 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 21 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/184 **** 4.48 4.52 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 21 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/184 **** 4.48 4.52 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 21 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/187 **** 4.18 4.11 ****  Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/187 **** 4.18 4.11 ****  Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/197 **** 4.49 4.66 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/92 **** 4.39 4.61 **** 4. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/93 **** 4.09 4.26 5.00 **** 4. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/48 **** 4.41 4.44 ****  5. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/48 **** 4.41 4.44 **** 5. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/48 **** 4.41 4.44 **** 5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/47 **** 4.00 4.26 5.00 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 31 0 0 0 0 0															
Discussion  Discus							-								
Discussion  Discussion  Discussion  Discussion  Discussion  Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 23 0 1 1 2 2 0 5 3.78 924/1260 3.83 3.77 4.14 4.22 3.78 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 23 0 1 1 1 1 5 3.89 1001/1255 4.01 3.89 4.33 4.37 3.89 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 23 0 0 1 1 1 1 6 4.33 770/1258 4.13 4.05 4.38 4.42 4.33 4. Were special techniques successful 23 7 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/ 873 4.00 3.69 4.03 4.08 ****  Laboratory  Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 184 **** **** 4.16 4.07 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 184 **** **** 4.16 4.07 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 184 **** **** 4.48 4.52 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 184 **** **** 4.48 4.52 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 165 **** 4.18 4.11 ****  Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 189 **** **** 4.49 4.86 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.54 4.67 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.54 4.67 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** 4.49 4.86 ****  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** 4.41 4.34 ****  3. Was the instructor available for consultation 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** 4.49 4.66 3.94 ****  2. Did self-pace countribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** 4.49 4.66 3.94 ****  2. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 49 **** 4.00 4.26 5.00 ****  3. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 49 **** 4.00 4.26 5.00 ****  3. Did self-paced system con	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	13	4	2	2	3	3	2.93	115//1230	3.79	3.77	4.00	4.07	2.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 23 0 1 1 1 1 1 5 3.89 1001/1255 4.01 3.89 4.33 4.37 3.89 3.Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 23 0 0 1 1 1 1 6 4.33 770/1258 4.03 4.05 4.38 4.42 4.33 4. Were special techniques successful 23 7 0 0 1 1 0 1 4.00 ****/ 873 4.00 3.69 4.03 4.08 ****  Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 184 **** **** 4.16 4.07 ****  2. Were you provided with adequate background information 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 184 **** **** 4.16 4.07 ****  3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 31 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 184 **** **** 4.48 4.52 ****  4. Did the lab intructor provide assistance 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 184 **** **** 4.48 4.52 ****  5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 31 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 165 **** 4.18 4.11 ****  Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 21 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 165 **** 4.48 4.67 ****  3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** *** 4.54 4.67 ****  5. Were criteria for grading made clear 31 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.54 4.67 ****  5. Were criteria for grading made clear 31 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 93 **** 4.54 4.67 ****  5. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 93 **** 4.39 4.61 ****  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** 4.40 4.84 ****  3. Did you clearly understand your evaluation 31 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** 4.41 4.34 *****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** 4.41 4.34 ****  5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 49 **** 4.00 4.26 5.00 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 49 **** 4.00 4.26 5.00 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 40 **** 4.00 4.26 5.00 ****  3. Were your co	Discussion														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 23 0 0 1 1 1 1 6 4.33 770/1258 4.13 4.05 4.38 4.42 4.33 4. Were special techniques successful 23 7 0 0 1 1 0 1 4.00 ****/ 873 4.00 3.69 4.03 4.08 ****  Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 184 **** **** 4.16 4.07 ****  2. Were you provided with adequate background information 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 184 **** **** 4.16 4.07 ****  3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 184 **** **** 4.46 4.52 ****  4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 184 **** **** 4.48 4.52 ****  5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 165 **** **** 4.36 4.30 ****  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 165 **** **** 4.18 4.11 ****  2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.54 4.67 ****  3. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.54 4.67 ****  5. Were criteria for grading made clear 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.54 4.67 ****  5. Were criteria for grading made clear 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 93 **** *** 4.06 3.94 ****  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 93 **** *** 4.06 3.94 ****  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 47 **** 4.39 4.61 ****  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluations 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.41 4.34 ****  3. Was the instructor available for consultation 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** *** 4.41 4.34 ****  3. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 47 **** 4.50 4.63 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** 4.00 4.26 5.00 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 49 **** 4.00 4.26 5.00 ****  3.	1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	1	2	0	5	3.78	924/1260	3.83	3.77	4.14	4.22	3.78
Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 23 7 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/ 873 4.00 3.69 4.03 4.08 ****  Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 184 **** 4.16 4.07 ****  3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 184 **** 2.90 4.22 4.17 ****  4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 184 **** 4.48 4.52 ****  4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 184 **** 4.48 4.52 ****  5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 165 **** 4.48 4.51 ****  Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 165 **** 4.49 4.86 ****  2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.54 4.67 ****  4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.50 4.63 ****  4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.50 4.63 ****  4. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.50 4.63 ****  5. Were criteria for grading made clear  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.50 4.63 ****  4. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** 4.39 4.61 ****  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation silence of the consultation sil		23		1			1	5	3.89	1001/1255	4.01	3.89	4.33		3.89
Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  2. Were you provided with adequate background information  3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities  3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities  3. Under necessary materials  3. Under necessary materials  3. Under necessary materials  3. Under necessary materials  3. Under necessary necessary necessary  4. Under necessary necessary  4. Under necessary necessary  4. Under necessary								-							
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 184 **** **** 4.16 4.07 ****  2. Were you provided with adequate background information 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 198 **** 2.90 4.22 4.17 ****  3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 184 **** *** 4.48 4.52 ****  4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 31 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 177 **** **** 4.36 4.30 ****  5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 165 **** **** 4.18 4.11 ****  Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 165 **** **** 4.49 4.86 ****  2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.54 4.67 ****  3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.50 4.63 ****  5. Were criteria for grading made clear 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 93 **** **** 4.36 4.31 ****  5. Were criteria for grading made clear 31 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 93 **** **** 4.36 4.73 ****  5. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 93 **** **** 4.39 4.61 ****  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.39 4.61 ****  4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 47 **** **** 4.18 4.47 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 47 **** **** 4.18 4.47 ****  5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 47 **** **** 4.18 4.47 ****  5. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 47 **** 5.00 4.14 5.00 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 46 **** 5.00 4.14 5.00 ****  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 46 **** 5.00 4.31 5.00 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 46 **** 5.00 4.31	4. Were special techniques successful	23	7	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 873	4.00	3.69	4.03	4.08	****
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 184 **** **** 4.16 4.07 ****  2. Were you provided with adequate background information 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 198 **** 2.90 4.22 4.17 ****  3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 184 **** *** 4.48 4.52 ****  4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 31 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 177 **** **** 4.36 4.30 ****  5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 165 **** **** 4.18 4.11 ****  Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 165 **** **** 4.49 4.86 ****  2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.54 4.67 ****  3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.50 4.63 ****  5. Were criteria for grading made clear 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 93 **** **** 4.36 4.31 ****  5. Were criteria for grading made clear 31 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 93 **** **** 4.36 4.73 ****  5. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 93 **** **** 4.39 4.61 ****  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.39 4.61 ****  4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 47 **** **** 4.18 4.47 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 47 **** **** 4.18 4.47 ****  5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 47 **** **** 4.18 4.47 ****  5. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 47 **** 5.00 4.14 5.00 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 46 **** 5.00 4.14 5.00 ****  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 46 **** 5.00 4.31 5.00 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 46 **** 5.00 4.31	Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 198 **** 2.90 4.22 4.17 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 184 **** **** 4.48 4.52 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 177 **** **** 4.36 4.30 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 165 **** **** 4.18 4.11 ****  Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 89 **** **** 4.49 4.86 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.54 4.67 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.54 4.67 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.38 4.73 ****  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 93 **** **** 4.06 3.94 ****  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.39 4.61 ****  3. Was the instructor available for consultation 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.41 4.34 ****  3. Was the instructor available for consultation 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 47 **** 4.41 4.34 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 47 **** **** 4.18 4.47 ****  5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 47 **** **** 4.18 4.47 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.32 4.40 ****  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 46 **** 5.00 4.14 5.00 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 46 **** 5.00 4.14 5.00 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 46 **** 5.00 5.00 ****	<del>_</del>	31	0	Ο	0	Ο	0	1	5 00	****/ 184	****	****	4 16	4 07	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 184 **** **** 4.48 4.52 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 177 **** **** 4.36 4.30 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 165 **** **** 4.18 4.11 ****  Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 89 **** **** 4.49 4.86 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.54 4.67 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.50 4.63 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 31 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 93 **** **** 4.06 3.94 ****  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 93 **** **** 4.06 3.94 ****  3. Was the instructor available for consultation 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.41 4.34 ****  3. Was the instructor available for consultation 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.41 4.34 ****  4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 47 **** 4.51 4.62 ****  4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 47 **** 4.32 4.40 ****  Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 47 **** 4.32 4.40 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 49 **** 4.00 4.26 5.00 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 41 **** 5.00 4.14 5.00 ****  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 46 **** 5.00 4.31 5.00 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 37 *** *** 4.05 5.00 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 31 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 37 *** *** 4.05 5.00 ****	<del>_</del>			-						, -	****	2.90			****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 177 **** **** 4.36 4.30 ****  Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 89 **** **** 4.49 4.86 ****  3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.50 4.63 ****  4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.38 4.73 ****  5. Were criteria for grading made clear  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 93 **** **** 4.40 3.94 ****  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 93 **** **** 4.38 4.73 ****  Sample of the approach				-	-	-	-	_		,	****				****
Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme			0	0		0	0	1	5.00		****	****			****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme		31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	***	****			****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.54 4.67 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 90 **** **** 4.50 4.63 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.38 4.73 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 93 **** **** 4.06 3.94 ****  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.39 4.61 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.41 4.34 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.51 4.62 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 47 **** **** 4.18 4.47 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 44 **** **** 4.32 4.40 ****  Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 44 **** **** 4.32 4.40 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 44 **** 5.00 4.14 5.00 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 46 **** 5.00 4.31 5.00 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 37 **** **** 4.05 5.00 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 37 **** 4.05 5.00 ****		31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.86	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 5. Were criteria 6.				0						,	****	****			****
Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.06 3.94 ****  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.41 4.34 ****  3. Was the instructor available for consultation 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 47 **** **** 4.51 4.62 ****  4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 47 **** **** 4.18 4.47 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 44 **** **** 4.32 4.40 ****  Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 49 **** 4.00 4.26 5.00 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 41 **** 5.00 4.14 5.00 ****  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 46 **** 5.00 4.31 5.00 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 46 **** 5.00 4.31 5.00 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 47 **** **** 4.05 5.00 ****	3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.63	****
Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.39 4.61 ****  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.41 4.34 ****  3. Was the instructor available for consultation 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 47 **** **** 4.51 4.62 ****  4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 47 **** **** 4.18 4.47 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 44 **** **** 4.32 4.40 ****  Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 49 **** 4.00 4.26 5.00 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 41 **** 5.00 4.14 5.00 ****  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 46 **** 5.00 4.31 5.00 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 37 **** **** 4.05 5.00 ****	4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.73	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.39 4.61 ****  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.41 4.34 ****  3. Was the instructor available for consultation 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 47 **** **** 4.51 4.62 ****  4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 47 **** **** 4.18 4.47 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 44 **** **** 4.32 4.40 ****  Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 49 **** 4.00 4.26 5.00 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 41 **** 5.00 4.14 5.00 ****  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 46 **** 5.00 4.31 5.00 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 37 **** **** 4.05 5.00 ****	5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	***	****	4.06	3.94	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.39 4.61 ****  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.41 4.34 ****  3. Was the instructor available for consultation 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 47 **** **** 4.51 4.62 ****  4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 47 **** **** 4.18 4.47 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 44 **** **** 4.32 4.40 ****  Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 49 **** 4.00 4.26 5.00 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 41 **** 5.00 4.14 5.00 ****  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 46 **** 5.00 4.31 5.00 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 37 **** **** 4.05 5.00 ****	Field Work														
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.41 4.34 ****  3. Was the instructor available for consultation 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 47 **** **** 4.51 4.62 ****  4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 47 **** **** 4.18 4.47 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 44 **** **** 4.32 4.40 ****  Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 49 **** 4.00 4.26 5.00 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 41 **** 5.00 4.14 5.00 ****  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 46 **** 5.00 4.31 5.00 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 37 **** **** 4.05 5.00 ****		31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 47 **** **** 4.51 4.62 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 47 **** **** 4.18 4.47 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 44 **** **** 4.32 4.40 ****  Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 49 **** 4.00 4.26 5.00 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 41 **** 5.00 4.14 5.00 ****  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 46 **** 5.00 4.31 5.00 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 37 **** **** 4.05 5.00 ****		31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41		****
Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 44 **** 4.00 4.26 5.00 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 41 **** 5.00 4.14 5.00 ****  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 46 **** 5.00 4.31 5.00 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 37 **** **** 4.05 5.00 ****		31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 4.00 4.26 5.00 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 41 *** 5.00 4.14 5.00 ****  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 46 *** 5.00 4.31 5.00 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 4.05 5.00 ****	4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 4.00 4.26 5.00 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 41 *** 5.00 4.14 5.00 ****  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 46 *** 5.00 4.31 5.00 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 4.05 5.00 ****	5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	***	****	4.32	4.40	***
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 4.00 4.26 5.00 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 41 *** 5.00 4.14 5.00 ****  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 46 *** 5.00 4.31 5.00 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 4.05 5.00 ****	Self Paced														
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 41 **** 5.00 4.14 5.00 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 46 **** 5.00 4.31 5.00 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 4.05 5.00 ****		31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	4.00	4.26	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 4.05 5.00 ****		31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.14	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 31 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 37 **** **** 4.05 5.00 ****			0				0				****				****
	-	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
	5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****

Title Interm Microecon Analy

Instructor: Takacs, Wendy E

Enrollment: 39
Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2009

Page 471 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits 1	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	32	Non-major	31
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	2	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	1			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_	_		
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 311 4 University of Maryland Title

Baltimore County

Interm Microecon Analy Instructor: Lord,William A

Enrollment: 41 Questionnaires: 17

Page 472 MAR 22, 2010 Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies							Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	5	8	2	3.53	1393/1509	4.01	4.21	4.31	4.32	3.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	5	5	3	3	3.12	1455/1509	4.01	4.21	4.26	4.25	3.12
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	1	6	5	3.53	1161/1287	4.23	4.28	4.30	4.33	3.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	2	1	2	2	3.57	1283/1459	3.83	4.07	4.22	4.26	3.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	4	5	3	3.69	1087/1406	3.83	4.05	4.09	4.12	3.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	807/1384	4.08	3.99	4.11	4.15	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	2	3	9	4.06	951/1489	4.51	4.31	4.17	4.14	4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	973/1506	4.47	4.54	4.67	4.67	4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	1	4	2	2	3.30	1323/1463	3.88	3.99	4.09	4.08	3.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	1	4	5	5	3.59	1360/1438	4.53	4.53	4.46	4.43	3.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	2	2	4	8	3.94	1358/1421	4.59	4.70	4.73	4.73	3.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	3	3	7	2	3.24	1336/1411	4.24	4.20	4.31	4.29	3.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	5	3	4	3	3.19	1332/1405	4.25	4.29	4.32	4.32	3.19
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	2	1	1	3	4	3.55	964/1236	3.79	3.77	4.00	4.07	3.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	0	2	2	2	3.25	1120/1260	3.83	3.77	4.14	4.22	3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	1	2	0	4	3.63	1097/1255	4.01	3.89	4.33	4.37	3.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	2	2	0	4	3.75	1070/1258	4.13	4.05	4.38	4.42	3.75
4. Were special techniques successful	9	5	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 873	4.00	3.69	4.03	4.08	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	10
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	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	0	_			
				?	2						

Course-Section: ECON 312 1 University of Maryland Title

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Interm Macroecon Analy Instructor: Carpenter, Rober

Enrollment: 44 Questionnaires: 21

Page 473 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

	Evaluation	

		-				ructor	Course	_		Level	Sect			
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	7	11	4.33	800/1509	4.10	4.21	4.31	4.32	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	5	10	4.25	859/1509	4.13	4.21	4.26	4.25	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	8	8	4.10	886/1287	4.21	4.28	4.30	4.33	4.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	1	4	1	0	3.00	1422/1459	3.45	4.07	4.22	4.26	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	10	6	4.05	783/1406	3.93	4.05	4.09	4.12	4.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	12	2	2	1	2	1	2.75	1359/1384	3.56	3.99	4.11	4.15	2.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	10	8	4.24	781/1489	4.18	4.31	4.17	4.14	4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	2	10	7	4.26	1251/1506	4.11	4.54	4.67	4.67	4.26
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	0	1	5	8	4.27	618/1463	3.74	3.99	4.09	4.08	4.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	3	6	9	4.21	1102/1438	4.25	4.53	4.46	4.43	4.21
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	933/1421	4.38	4.70	4.73	4.73	4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	4	6	8	4.11	1000/1411	4.10	4.20	4.31	4.29	4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	9	8	4.32	848/1405	4.23	4.29	4.32	4.32	4.32
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	0	3	5	8	4.12	607/1236	3.98	3.77	4.00	4.07	4.12
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	876/1260	3.58	3.77	4.14	4.22	3.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	0	3	0	4	3.75	1054/1255	3.58	3.89	4.33	4.37	3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	2	0	4	3	3.89	1021/1258	3.54	4.05	4.38	4.42	3.89
4. Were special techniques successful	12	7	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 873	****	3.69	4.03	4.08	****
Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	ason	.s			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 1		Re	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s 1	.9	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	3

Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA			Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	5	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	18
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				2	3						

2 University of Maryland

Interm Macroecon Analy Baltimore County

Thomas, Mark

Enrollment: 41
Ouestionnaires: 25

Title

Instructor:

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Fall 2009

Page 474

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 1 0 1 1 6 8 8 3.88 1236/1509 4.10 4.21 4.31 4.32 3.88 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 0 1 7 7 9 4.00 1086/1509 4.13 4.21 4.26 4.25 4.00 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 0 0 0 3 10 11 4.33 708/1287 4.21 4.28 4.30 4.33 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 2 12 1 1 1 1 3 5 3.91 1088/1459 3.45 4.07 4.22 4.26 3.91 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 12 1 1 1 4 4 3.82 1001/1406 3.93 4.05 4.09 4.12 3.82 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 15 0 0 0 5 3 4.38 479/1384 3.56 3.99 4.11 4.15 4.38 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 2 0 1 1 1 11 9 4.13 885/1489 4.18 4.31 4.17 4.14 4.13 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 0 0 0 1 22 0 3.96 1415/1506 4.11 4.54 4.67 4.67 3.96 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 0 1 0 13 4 1 3.21 1350/1463 3.74 3.99 4.09 4.08 3.21 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 4 0 0 1 3 6 11 4.29 1047/1438 4.25 4.53 4.46 4.43 4.29 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3 0 0 2 4 7 9 4.05 1339/1421 4.38 4.70 4.73 4.73 4.05 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3 0 0 1 4 9 8 4.09 1005/1411 4.10 4.20 4.31 4.29 4.09 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 1 5 6 10 4.14 980/1405 4.23 4.29 4.32 4.32 4.14 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 4 2 0 4 5 7 3.83 809/1236 3.98 3.77 4.00 4.07 3.83 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 14 0 3 1 1 2 4 3.27 1115/1260 3.58 3.77 4.14 4.22 3.27 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 2 3 3.40 1154/1255 3.58 3.89 4.33 4.37 3.40 15 0 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 15 0 2 1 3 1 3 3.20 1209/1258 3.54 4.05 4.38 4.42 3.20 4. Were special techniques successful 15 6 1 0 0 1 2 3.75 \*\*\*\* 873 \*\*\*\* 3.69 4.03 4.08 \*\*\*\* Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 184 \*\*\*\* \*\*\* 4.16 4.07 \*\*\*\* 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 198 \*\*\*\* 2.90 4.22 4.17 \*\*\*\* 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 24 0 0 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 24 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 184 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.48 4.52 \*\*\*\* 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 24 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 177 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.36 4.30 \*\*\*\* 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 24 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\* / 165 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.18 4.11 \*\*\*\* Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 89 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.49 4.86 \*\*\*\* 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 24 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 92 \*\*\*\* \*\*\* 4.54 4.67 \*\*\*\* 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 90 \*\*\*\* \*\*\* 4.50 4.63 \*\*\*\* 2.4 0 0 24 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 92 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.38 4.73 \*\*\*\* 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 24 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 93 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.06 3.94 \*\*\*\* Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 24 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 48 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.39 4.61 \*\*\*\* 24 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 48 \*\*\*\* 4.41 4.34 \*\*\*\* 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 24 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 47 \*\*\* 4.51 4.62 \*\*\*\* 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 24 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\* 47 \*\*\* \*\*\* 4.18 4.47 \*\*\*\* 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 24 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 44 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.32 4.40 \*\*\*\* Self Paced 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 49 \*\*\*\* 4.00 4.26 5.00 \*\*\*\* 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 24 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\* 41 \*\*\* 5.00 4.14 5.00 \*\*\*\* 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 24 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\* 46 \*\*\* 5.00 4.31 5.00 \*\*\*\* 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 24 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\* 4.05 5.00 \*\*\*\* 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 24 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\* 4.27 5.00 \*\*\*\*

Interm Macroecon Analy

Instructor: Thomas, Mark

Enrollment: 41
Questionnaires: 25

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 474 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Tarned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	25	Non-major	25
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_			
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 320 1 University of Maryland Page 475 Title Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010 Quant Mthds:Management

Instructor: Palmateer, Jason

Enrollment: 58 Questionnaires: 21

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

Fall 2009

	NR 	NA 	1	-	cies 3	4	_		ructor	Course	DCPC	OPIDC	псуст	Sect
					_	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	Ü	0	1	0	7	4	9		1164/1509					
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	5	7			1196/1509	3.85		4.26		3.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	7			972/1287	3.95	4.28	4.30	4.33	3.95
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	3	2	4			1119/1459		4.07	4.22	4.26	3.87
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	1	2	3	5			1243/1406	3.38	4.05	4.09	4.12	3.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	2	6	3	3	3.33	1264/1384	3.33	3.99	4.11	4.15	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	6	6	7	3.86	1141/1489	3.86	4.31	4.17	4.14	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	4	8	7	4.05	1364/1506	4.05	4.54	4.67	4.67	4.05
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	2	1	3	9	2	3.47	1257/1463	3.47	3.99	4.09	4.08	3.47
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	5	6	6	3.79	1304/1438	3.79	4.53	4.46	4.43	3.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	9			1269/1421	4.32	4.70	4.73	4.73	4.32
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	2	4	6			1211/1411			4.31	4.29	3.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	3	2				1047/1405	4.00		4.32	4.32	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	5	1	1	0	6			819/1236					3.82
									,					
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	597/1260	4.29	3.77	4.14	4.22	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	1110/1255	3.57	3.89	4.33	4.37	3.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	932/1258	4.00	4.05	4.38	4.42	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	15	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 873	****	3.69	4.03	4.08	****
Freque	ency	Dist	ribu	tion	ı									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	sons				Тур	pe			Majors	

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 374 1 University of Maryland
Title Fund Financial Mgmt Baltimore County

Instructor: Lamdin, Douglas

Enrollment: 39
Questionnaires: 24

Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010 Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029

Page 476

Student Cou	rse Evaluatio	n Questionnaire
-------------	---------------	-----------------

	3.00				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	Λ	Λ	3	g	12	4.39	734/1509	4.54	4.21	4.31	4.32	4.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	7	14	4.52	519/1509	4.58	4.21	4.26	4.25	4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	5	15	4.52	500/1287	4.65	4.28	4.30	4.33	4.52
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	3	8	10	4.23	803/1459		4.07	4.22	4.26	4.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	6	1	2	1	7	5		1001/1406	4.14	4.05	4.09	4.12	3.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	3	8	9	4.30	570/1384	4.09	3.99	4.11	4.15	4.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	2	9	10	4.38	619/1489	4.62	4.31	4.17	4.14	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	0	5	16	4.64	965/1506	4.46	4.54	4.67	4.67	4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	1	0	3	5	7	4.06	820/1463	4.16	3.99	4.09	4.08	4.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	Λ	Λ	Λ	2	4	15	4.62	660/1438	4.68	4.53	4.46	4.43	4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	950/1421	4.73	4.70	4.73	4.73	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	9	9	4.35	789/1411	4.54	4.20	4.31	4.29	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	526/1405	4.70	4.29	4.32	4.32	4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	354/1236		3.77	4.00	4.07	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	2	3	3	3.78	924/1260	3.54	3.77	4.14	4.22	3.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	4	1	4	4.00	904/1255	3.80	3.89	4.33	4.37	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	895/1258	3.96	4.05	4.38	4.42	4.11
4. Were special techniques successful	15	2	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	560/ 873	3.86	3.69	4.03	4.08	3.86
Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	ution	n									

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons	Reasons			Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	1	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	7							
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	23	
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant		
				I	0	Other						
				?	0							

Course-Section: ECON 374 2 University of Maryland

Page 477 Title Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010 Fund Financial Mgmt Instructor: Rose,Morgan J Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	38		
Questionnaires:	22	Student Course Evaluation Question	onnaire

							Fre	_	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 vo	u gain n	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	386/1509	4.54	4.21	4.31	4.32	4.68
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	3	2	17	4.64	390/1509	4.58	4.21	4.26	4.25	4.64
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	240/1287	4.65	4.28	4.30	4.33	4.77
		uations reflect			1	7	0	3	0	1	10	4.29	737/1459	4.26	4.07	4.22	4.26	4.29
				what you learned	1	4	0	1	1	4	11	4.47	366/1406		4.05	4.09	4.12	4.47
	-	-		o what you learned	1	13	2	0	0	1	5	3.88	962/1384		3.99	4.11	4.15	3.88
		g system clearl		-	1	0	0	0	0	3	18		121/1489	4.62	4.31	4.17	4.14	4.86
		was class canc		IIICa	1	0	0	0	1	13	7		1236/1506	4.46	4.54	4.67	4.67	4.29
				hing effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	8	6	4.25	628/1463	4.16	3.99	4.09	4.08	4.25
J. 110W WO	ara you	grade the overa	II ccac	ning circuit veness	O	O	O	O	2	O	O	1.25	020/1103	1.10	3.77	1.05	1.00	1.23
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	2	0	1	0	0	1	18	4.75	447/1438	4.68	4.53	4.46	4.43	4.75
		tructor seem interested in the subject				0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	915/1421	4.73	4.70	4.73	4.73	4.74
3. Was le	s lecture material presented and explained clearly				3	0	0	0	2	1	16	4.74	327/1411	4.54	4.20	4.31	4.29	4.74
4. Did th	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					1	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	321/1405	4.70	4.29	4.32	4.32	4.78
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	3	14	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/1236	4.40	3.77	4.00	4.07	****
		Discus	gion															
1. Did cl	ass disc			what you learned	12	0	2	2	0	3	3	3.30	1108/1260	3.54	3.77	4.14	4.22	3.30
				d to participate	12	0	2	1	0	3	4		1104/1255	3.80	3.89	4.33	4.37	3.60
				d open discussion	12	0	1	1	2	1	5		1054/1258	3.96	4.05	4.38	4.42	3.80
		echniques succe		a open albeabbion	12	8	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 873			4.03	4.08	****
	_	1											,					
				Frequ	ıency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	}
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 8		Red	 quir	ed f	or Ma	 aior	 s 2	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	3
28-55						1.0	-1			)		-	or adda	-	-		-	
56-83						Gei	nera	1				0	Under-q	rad 2	22	Non-	-major	19
84-150												-					5	
Grad.						Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enous	rh
2200.	ŭ	3.33 1.00	•	P 0								-	respons				_	,
				I O		O+1	her					0	_ copond	L	5191			
				2 0		003						•						
				: 0														

Course-Section: ECON 408 1 University of Maryland Title Managerial Economics

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Instructor: Dasgupta, Nandit Enrollment: 44 Questionnaires: 19

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 478

MAR 22, 2010

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														
	0	0	0	0	2	2	1 /	1 (2	446/1500	1 (2	4 01	4 21	4 20	1 (2
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	446/1509	4.63	4.21	4.31	4.39	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	390/1509	4.63	4.21	4.26	4.26	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	392/1287	4.63	4.28	4.30	4.38	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	569/1459	4.44	4.07	4.22	4.32	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	238/1406	4.65	4.05	4.09	4.11	4.65
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	0	1	2	11	4.47	385/1384	4.47	3.99	4.11	4.23	4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	2	14	4.47	499/1489	4.47	4.31	4.17	4.18	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	6	10	3	3.84	1458/1506	3.84	4.54	4.67	4.67	3.84
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	4	1	11	4.44	424/1463	4.44	3.99	4.09	4.18	4.44
Lecture														
	0	0	0	0	0	_	1 2	1 60	559/1438	1 60	4 52	1 10	4 50	1 (0
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	4.68	,		4.53	4.46	4.50	4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	828/1421	4.79	4.70	4.73	4.76	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	532/1411	4.58	4.20	4.31	4.35	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	568/1405	4.58	4.29	4.32	4.34	4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	8	1	2	0	2	4	3.67	904/1236	3.67	3.77	4.00	4.03	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	415/1260	4.50	3.77	4.14	4.25	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	484/1255	4.63	3.89	4.33	4.46	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion		0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	535/1258	4.63	4.05	4.38	4.51	4.63
4. Were special techniques successful		5	n	0	0	2	1		****/ 873	****	3.69	4.03	4.26	****
4. were special techniques successful		5	U	U	U	۷	_	1.33	/ 6/3		3.09	4.03	1.20	
Frequ	lency	Dist	ribu	ution	า									

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA	-	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	19	Non-major	17
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other		_			
				?	0						

Topics In Fin Econ

Title Topics In Fin :
Instructor: Rose, Morgan J

Enrollment: 40

Questionnaires: 17

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 479 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Ctudant	('011200	Evaluation	Ougetion	n $n$ $n$ $n$ $n$

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
*·····														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	4	8	4.12	1032/1509	4.12	4.21	4.31	4.39	4.12
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	3	8		1049/1509	4.06	4.21	4.26	4.26	4.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	688/1287		4.28	4.30	4.38	4.35
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	553/1459	4.44	4.07	4.22	4.32	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	6	2	8	4.00	813/1406	4.00	4.05	4.09	4.11	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	1	0		4.67		4.67	3.99	4.11	4.23	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	6	4	-		1120/1489	3.88	4.31	4.17	4.18	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	12	4		1258/1506		4.54	4.67	4.67	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	8	_	4.25	804/1463		3.99	4.09	4.18	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	О	U	U	U	1	8	2	4.09	804/1463	4.09	3.99	4.09	4.18	4.09
Taskuus														
Lecture	-1	0	0	0	0	2	1 2	4 01	240/1420	4 01	4 52	1 10	4 50	4 01
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	348/1438	4.81	4.53	4.46	4.50	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	2	12		1115/1421	4.56	4.70	4.73	4.76	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	6	7	4.19	943/1411	4.19	4.20	4.31	4.35	4.19
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	0	4	10	4.38	788/1405	4.38	4.29	4.32	4.34	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	13	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1236	****	3.77	4.00	4.03	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	2	0	2		****/1260	****	3.77	4.14	4.25	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	0	1	0	2		****/1255	****	3.89	4.33	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/1258	****	4.05	4.38	4.51	****
4. Were special techniques successful	12	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 873	****	3.69	4.03	4.26	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	2.90	4.22	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.66	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.47	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.83	***
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.69	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	4.32	****
••• ··· • J-···· J.····· •									,					
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.54	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.51	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.19	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.19	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out freid activities	10	U	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	/ 44			4.34	4.07	
Self Paced														
	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/ 49	****	4 00	1 26	1 67	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16					0	_		,	****	4.00	4.26	4.67	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,	****	5.00	4.14	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.31	4.67	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.67	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	***	****	4.27	4.33	****

Course-Section: ECON 410 1 Title

Topics In Fin Econ

Instructor: Enrollment: 40 Questionnaires: 17

Rose,Morgan J

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 479 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned Cum. GPA			Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	С	2	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	16
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_		_	
				?	1						

Orgs, Incentives, Behavi

Instructor: Carroll, Kathlee

Enrollment: 23
Questionnaires: 12

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 480 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

	Frequencies NR NA 1 2 3 4 5						tructor	Course	_	UMBC		Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	Τ	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	3	6	4.25	882/1509	4.25	4.21	4.31	4.39	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	3	5	3.92	1156/1509	3.92	4.21	4.26	4.26	3.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	2	5	3.92	1010/1287	3.92	4.28	4.30	4.38	3.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	1088/1459	3.91	4.07	4.22	4.32	3.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	502/1406	4.33	4.05	4.09	4.11	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	3	5	3.92	925/1384	3.92	3.99	4.11	4.23	3.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	3	7	4.25	760/1489	4.25	4.31	4.17	4.18	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	524/1506	4.92	4.54	4.67	4.67	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	0	3	2	3	3.67	1168/1463	3.67	3.99	4.09	4.18	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	588/1438	4.67	4.53	4.46	4.50	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	768/1421	4.82	4.70	4.73	4.76	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	1	5	5	4.08	1010/1411	4.08	4.20	4.31	4.35	4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	828/1405	4.33	4.29	4.32	4.34	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	1	1	3	0	1	2.83	1171/1236	2.83	3.77	4.00	4.03	2.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	908/1260	3.80	3.77	4.14	4.25	3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	904/1255	4.00	3.89	4.33	4.46	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	1054/1258	3.80	4.05	4.38	4.51	3.80
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 873	****	3.69	4.03	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme			0	0	1	0	0	3 00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.71	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned		0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear			0	1	0	0	0		****/ 93	****	****	4.06	4.32	****
o. Note official for grading made office	11	J	3	_	3	J	o	2.00	, ,,			1.00	1.32	

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

#### Course-Section: ECON 421 1 University of Maryland Page 481 Title Intro To Econometrics Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Instructor: Ma,Bing

Enrollment: 39 Questionnaires: 22

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

Fall 2009

		-		Frequencies		Instructor		Course D		UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	8	10	4.33	800/1509	4.33	4.21	4.31	4.39	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	2	15	4.52	519/1509	4.52	4.21	4.26	4.26	4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	6	12	4.43	614/1287	4.43	4.28	4.30	4.38	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	2	1	6	11	4.30	715/1459	4.30	4.07	4.22	4.32	4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	5	0	0	5	3	7	4.13	711/1406	4.13	4.05	4.09	4.11	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	1	9	9	4.42	421/1384	4.42	3.99	4.11	4.23	4.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	1	3	6	9	4.21	802/1489	4.21	4.31	4.17	4.18	4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	11	8	4.42	1146/1506	4.42	4.54	4.67	4.67	4.42
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	500/1463	4.38	3.99	4.09	4.18	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	131/1438	4.95	4.53	4.46	4.50	4.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	322/1421	4.95	4.70	4.73	4.76	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	3	5	11	4.42	713/1411	4.42	4.20	4.31	4.35	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	7	11	4.53	615/1405	4.53	4.29	4.32	4.34	4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	11	2	1	3	0	2		1167/1236		3.77	4.00	4.03	2.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned		0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	272/1260	4.71	3.77	4.14	4.25	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate		0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	246/1255	4.86	3.89	4.33	4.46	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion		0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	468/1258	4.71	4.05	4.38	4.51	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	15	5	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 873	****	3.69	4.03	4.26	***

Credits	Earned	arned Cum. GPA			Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	19
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	6	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				?	3						

SCON 439 I

Environmental Economic

Instructor: McConnell, Virgi

Enrollment: 39
Questionnaires: 25

Title

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 482 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

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

Questions			Fre	equer 2	ncie 3	s 1	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean	UMBC	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Quescions		NA											Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	4	7	12	4.25	882/1509	4.25	4.21	4.31	4.39	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	4	9	9	3.96	1117/1509	3.96	4.21	4.26	4.26	3.96
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	5	14	4.20	826/1287		4.28	4.30	4.38	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	8	11	4.04	951/1459		4.07	4.22	4.32	4.04
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	6	5		3.92	909/1406			4.09	4.11	3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	6	7	9	3.88	962/1384		3.99	4.11	4.23	3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	16	9	4.36	641/1489		4.31	4.17	4.18	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	466/1506		4.54	4.67	4.67	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	5	7	8	4.15	738/1463	4.15	3.99	4.09	4.18	4.15
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	11	13	4.48	826/1438	4.48	4.53	4.46	4.50	4.48
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	429/1421	4.92	4.70	4.73	4.76	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	4	8	10	4.08	1010/1411	4.08	4.20	4.31	4.35	4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	1	9	12	4.20	940/1405	4.20	4.29	4.32	4.34	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	2	2	6	10	4	3.50	984/1236	3.50	3.77	4.00	4.03	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	2	5	1	3	3 45	1068/1260	3.45	3.77	4.14	4.25	3.45
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	2	2	1	6	4.00	904/1255		3.89	4.33	4.46	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	749/1258			4.38	4.51	4.36
4. Were special techniques successful	14	3	1	1	1	1	-	3.75			3.69			3.75
Laboratory				_										
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 198	****	2.90	4.22	4.37	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.83	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	4.32	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.54	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.51	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	***	****	4.18	4.19	****
Colf Daged														
Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned		0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	4.00	4.26	4.67	****
	24 24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.20	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful			U	U	U	U	_	5.00	, 40		3.00	1.31	1.07	
Tree en		- <b>-</b>	1											

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	5	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	3	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	8	General	1	Under-grad	22	Non-major	14
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	11	#### - Means	there a	are not enough	h
				P	1			responses to	be sigr	nificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_			

? 1

Course-Section: ECON 442 1

European Economic Hist

Instructor: Mitch, David F

Enrollment: 36
Questionnaires: 16

Title

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 483 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eaner	ncies	1		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	6	6	4.13	1021/1509	4.13	4.21	4.31	4.39	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	4	8	4.19	932/1509	4.19	4.21	4.26	4.26	4.19
Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals		0	1	0	1	5	9	4.31	728/1287	4.31	4.28	4.30	4.38	4.31
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	6	7	4.13	894/1459	4.13	4.07	4.22	4.32	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	3	9	4.13	720/1406	4.13	4.05	4.09	4.11	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	5	7	4.13	734/1384	4.13	3.99	4.11	4.23	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	5	8	4.25	760/1489	4.25	4.31	4.17	4.18	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	1	14	4.75	845/1506	4.75	4.54	4.67	4.67	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	1	6	3	4.00	853/1463	4.00	3.99	4.09	4.18	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	852/1438	4.47	4.53	4.46	4.50	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	1	13	4.73	915/1421	4.73	4.70	4.73	4.76	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	3	2	2	8	4.00	1051/1411	4.00	4.20	4.31	4.35	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	4	8	4.13	980/1405	4.13	4.29	4.32	4.34	4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	3	1	3	2	5	3.36	1049/1236	3.36	3.77	4.00	4.03	3.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	415/1260	4.50	3.77	4.14	4.25	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	2	0	7	4.30	749/1255	4.30	3.89	4.33	4.46	4.30
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	620/1258	4.50	4.05	4.38	4.51	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	442/ 873	4.00	3.69	4.03	4.26	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.62	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	2.90	4.22	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.66	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.47	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.83	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.69	***
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	4.32	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.54	***
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.51	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.19	***
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.07	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 49	****	4.00	4.26	4.67	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.14	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.31	4.67	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.33	****

Course-Section: ECON 442 1

Title European Economic Hist

Instructor: Mitch, David F

Enrollment: 36
Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 483 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	ed Cum. GPA			l Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	 А	4	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	С	1	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	9
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 454 1

Title Econ: Educ/Human Capita

Instructor: Dickson, Lisa M

Enrollment: 30
Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 484 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions			Fre 1	equer 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
G1														
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	1	0	13	4.29	842/1509	4.29	4.21	4.31	4.39	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	6	11		1027/1509	4.08	4.21	4.26	4.26	4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	5	16	4.46	578/1287	4.46	4.28	4.30	4.38	4.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	1	4	5	11	4.24	792/1459	4.24	4.07	4.22	4.32	4.24
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	7	12	4.22	635/1406	4.22	4.05	4.09	4.11	4.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	4	15	4.25	619/1384	4.25	3.99	4.11	4.23	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	4	5	13	4.26	749/1489	4.26	4.31	4.17	4.18	4.26
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	21	2	4.09	1353/1506	4.09	4.54	4.67	4.67	4.09
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	3	7	5	4.13	762/1463	4.13	3.99	4.09	4.18	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	1	4	16	4.55	750/1438	4.55	4.53	4.46	4.50	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	1	4	17	4.57	1115/1421	4.57	4.70	4.73	4.76	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	4	16	4.64	456/1411	4.64	4.20	4.31	4.35	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	7	14	4.50	634/1405	4.50	4.29	4.32	4.34	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	11	3	1	2	2	3	3.09	1117/1236	3.09	3.77	4.00	4.03	3.09
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	2	3	1	7	4.00	746/1260	4.00	3.77	4.14	4.25	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	333/1255	4.77	3.89	4.33	4.46	4.77
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	189/1258	4.92	4.05	4.38	4.51	4.92
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	366/ 873	4.20	3.69	4.03	4.26	4.20
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.83	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.69	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	4.32	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	3	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	17
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	7	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Course-Section: ECON 467 1 University of Maryland Title Health Economics Goldfarb,M G Instructor:

Enrollment: 45 Questionnaires: 28

Page 485 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

uestionnaires:	28	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
				Freq	uencies

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	Ω	Λ	2	3	10	13	4.21	921/1509	4.33	4.21	4.31	4.39	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	7	14	4.21	901/1509	4.43	4.21	4.26	4.26	4.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	9	13	4.21	811/1287	4.31	4.28	4.30	4.38	4.21
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	586/1459		4.07	4.22	4.32	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	9	7	9	3.92	909/1406		4.05	4.09	4.11	3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	17	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	599/1384		3.99	4.11	4.23	4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	- 0	0	2	2	6	18	4.43	569/1489		4.31	4.17	4.18	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	25	4.89	602/1506		4.54	4.67	4.67	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	0	6	10	5		1052/1463		3.99	4.09	4.18	3.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	3	3	19	4.64	617/1438	4.78	4.53	4.46	4.50	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	0	6	18	4.64	1037/1421	4.66	4.70	4.73	4.76	4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	0	2	6	15	4.42	725/1411	4.49	4.20	4.31	4.35	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	4	18	4.56	577/1405	4.64	4.29	4.32	4.34	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	18	2	0	0	1	3	3.50	****/1236	****	3.77	4.00	4.03	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	2	2	4	3	3.73	952/1260	3.39	3.77	4.14	4.25	3.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	2	0	5	1	3	3.27	1177/1255	2.96	3.89	4.33	4.46	3.27
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	2	0	2	2	4	3.60	1126/1258	3.39	4.05	4.38	4.51	3.60
4. Were special techniques successful	17	7	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 873	****	3.69	4.03	4.26	****
Frequency	ion as	Diet	-rih	it i or	1									

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	5	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	14						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	2	Under-grad	28	Non-major	21
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_		_	
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 467 2 University of Ma Title Health Economics Baltimore Cou Instructor: Goldfarb,M G Fall 200

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 486

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	33	
Questionnaires:	25	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Question	s		NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		 Genera	 1																
1. Did voi	u gain ne	w insights,ski	_	this course	0	0	0	3	0	5	17	4.44	673/15	09	4.33	4.21	4.31	4.39	4.44
		tor make clear			0	0	0	1	0	6	18	4.64			4.43	4.21	4.26	4.26	4.64
		estions reflec			0	0	0	0	4	7	14	4.40	638/12	87	4.31	4.28	4.30	4.38	4.40
4. Did oth	her evalu	ations reflect	the exp	ected goals	1	9	0	1	3	5	6	4.07	938/14	59	4.25	4.07	4.22	4.32	4.07
5. Did ass	signed re	adings contrib	ute to w	hat you learned	0	0	3	1	2	8	11	3.92	909/14	06	3.92	4.05	4.09	4.11	3.92
				what you learned	0	8	2	2	2	3	8	3.76	1043/13	84	4.02	3.99	4.11	4.23	3.76
7. Was the	e grading	system clearl	y explai	ned	0	0	0	0	0	7	18	4.72	224/14	89	4.57	4.31	4.17	4.18	4.72
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/15	06	4.95	4.54	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	4	1	1	0	5	9	5	3.85	1021/14	63	3.83	3.99	4.09	4.18	3.85
		Lectur	е																
1. Were th	he instru	ctor's lecture	s well p	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	175/14	38	4.78	4.53	4.46	4.50	4.92
2. Did the	e instruc	tor seem inter	ested in	the subject	0	0	0	0	3	2	20	4.68	1002/14	21	4.66	4.70	4.73	4.76	4.68
3. Was led	cture mat	erial presente	d and ex	plained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	2	19	4.56	544/14	11	4.49	4.20	4.31	4.35	4.56
4. Did the	e lecture	s contribute t	o what y	ou learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	20	4.72	393/14	0.5	4.64	4.29	4.32	4.34	4.72
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques en	hance yo	our understanding	1	18	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	****/12	36	****	3.77	4.00	4.03	****
		Discus																	
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute to w	hat you learned	8	0	4	3	3	2	5	3.06	1155/12	60	3.39	3.77	4.14	4.25	3.06
2. Were a	ll studer	its actively en	couraged	l to participate	8	0	8	1	2	1	5	2.65	1235/12	55	2.96	3.89	4.33	4.46	2.65
3. Did the	e instruc	tor encourage	fair and	l open discussion	9	0	5	1	2	2	6	3.19	1210/12	58	3.39	4.05	4.38	4.51	3.19
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succe	ssful		8	14	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 8	73	****	3.69	4.03	4.26	****
		Self	Paced																
1. Did sel	lf-paced	system contrib	ute to w	hat you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	49	****	4.00	4.26	4.67	****
2. Did st	udy quest	ions make clea	r the ex	spected goal	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	41	****	5.00	4.14	4.50	****
3. Were yo	our conta	cts with the i	nstructo	or helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	46	****	5.00	4.31	4.67	****
				Frequ	lency	Dis	trib	ution	n										
Credits Ea	arned	Expected Grades				Rea	asons					Тур	oe .			Majors	\$		
00-27						Re	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s 1	.1	Gradu	ate	3	8	Majo	r	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 9				_								_			
56-83				Ge:	nera	Τ				0	Under	-gr	rad 1	.7	Non-	major	21		
84-150																			
Grad.	Grad. 8 3.50-4.00 6 F 0					El	ecti	ves				9			Means t			_	jh
	P 0					٥.,						0	respo	nse	es to b	e sign	ıiıcan	ıt	
						Ot.	her					2							
	I 0 ? 2																		

Course-Section: ECON 472 1 Title

University of Maryland Monetary Theory & Poli Baltimore County Fall 2009

Ρ

I ?

0

0

2

Instructor: Carpenter, Rober Enrollment:

30

Questionnaires: 16

Page 487 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

						Fre	equei	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	_		_			_										
		ew insights,ski			0	0	1	0	2	2	11	4.38	756/1509	4.38	4.21	4.31	4.39	4.38
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	1	3	2	9	4.27	849/1509	4.27	4.21	4.26	4.26	4.27
		estions reflect			0	0	0	1	2	3	10	4.38	668/1287	4.38	4.28	4.30	4.38	4.38
		ations reflect			0	8	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	454/1459	4.50	4.07	4.22	4.32	4.50
	_	-		what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	502/1406	4.33	4.05	4.09	4.11	4.33
6. Did wri	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	0	11	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	677/1384	4.20	3.99	4.11	4.23	4.20
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearly	y expla	ained	0	1	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	276/1489	4.67	4.31	4.17	4.18	4.67
8. How man	ny times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	1	11	4	4.19	1305/1506	4.19	4.54	4.67	4.67	4.19
9. How wor	ıld you g	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	648/1463	4.23	3.99	4.09	4.18	4.23
		Lecture		•					_	_		4 0 4	0.40./1.400	4 04	4 = 0			4 0.5
		uctor's lecture:			0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	348/1438	4.81	4.53	4.46	4.50	4.81
		n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	376/1421	4.94	4.70	4.73	4.76	4.94		
		explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	389/1411	4.69	4.20	4.31	4.35	4.69		
		es contribute to		2	0	0	1	0	1	5	9	4.31	848/1405	4.31	4.29	4.32	4.34	4.31
5. Did aud	diovisual	l techniques enl	nance y	our understanding	0	5	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	193/1236	4.64	3.77	4.00	4.03	4.64
1 5 1 1		Discus			_	0	-	_	-	-		4 00	E46 (1060	4 00	2 55	4 1 4	4 05	4 00
				what you learned	9	0	Ι	0	Τ	Τ	4	4.00	746/1260	4.00	3.77	4.14	4.25	4.00
		-	_	ed to participate	10	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	575/1255	4.50	3.89	4.33	4.46	4.50
		_		nd open discussion	9	0	1	0	0	2	4		0.0, ==00	4.14	4.05	4.38	4.51	4.14
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succes	ssful		9	5	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 873	****	3.69	4.03	4.26	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	rib	ution	n									
						_					_							
Credits Ea	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	S			Туј	pe			Majors	5			
00-27							quir	ed fo	or Ma	 ajor	`s	5	Graduate	======	1	Majo	r	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 5														
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 2		Ger	nera:	L				1	Under-g	rad 1	.5	Non-	major	12
84-150	84-150 5 3.00-3.49 4 D 0																	
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				3	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh

Other

Course-Section: ECON 475 1 University of Maryland Page 488
Title Financial Invstmnt Ana Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Instructor: Lamdin, Douglas

Enrollment: 39
Questionnaires: 26

84-150

Grad.

13

0

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

10

3

D

F

Ρ

I

0

0

0

0

0

Fall 2009

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General	•	0	•	•	2	0	1 -	4 46	640/1500	1 16	4 01	4 21	4 20	1 16
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	8	15	4.46	648/1509	4.46	4.21	4.31	4.39	4.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0 1	0	/ 6	17 19	4.58	459/1509 370/1287	4.58 4.65	4.21	4.26 4.30	4.26 4.38	4.58 4.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0 1	0	0 T	3	6	19 16	4.55	432/1459	4.65	4.28	4.30	4.38	4.52
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals		6	0	2	3 7	2	Τρ	3.84	979/1406	3.84	4.07	4.22	4.32	3.84
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	1	7	2	8		1076/1384	3.84	3.99			
3	0	0	0	U T	2	8	16	4.54	422/1489	4.54	4.31	4.11 4.17	4.23	3.71 4.54
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	8	16 17	4.54	933/1506	4.54	4.54	4.17	4.18	4.54
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	3	9	10	4.32	567/1463	4.32	3.99	4.09		4.32
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	Т	U	U	3	9	10	4.32	50//1403	4.32	3.99	4.09	4.18	4.32
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	247/1438	4.88	4.53	4.46	4.50	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	22	4.84		4.84	4.70	4.73	4.76	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	9	14	4.48	641/1411	4.48	4.20	4.31	4.35	4.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	1	4	17	4.50	634/1405	4.50	4.29	4.32	4.34	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	1	0	2	7	10	4.25	489/1236	4.25	3.77	4.00	4.03	4.25
or pro addressed coominged commiss your anadistanding	_	-	_	Ü	_	•		1.25	105, 1250	11.25	J.,,	1.00	1.05	1123
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	1021/1260	3.57	3.77	4.14	4.25	3.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	1	0	1	4	0	3.33	****/1255	****	3.89	4.33	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	1	2	3	0	3.33	****/1258	****	4.05	4.38	4.51	****
4. Were special techniques successful	20	4	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 873	****	3.69	4.03	4.26	****
Freque	ency	Dist	cribu	ution	1									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	sons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 13		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	 ajor	s 2	1	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r	1
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 12			_			-						-		
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 5 C 0		Ger	neral	L				1	Under-g	rad 2	6	Non-	major	25

Electives

Other

1

0

### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Course-Section: ECON 476 1 University of Maryland Title Portfolio Management

Instructor:

Yuan,Chunming

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 489

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 36 Questionnaires: 19 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Questions		NTD	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	3	_	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean	
		Questions	5 			INA				<del></del>		Mean	Railk		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	l															
		ew insights,ski			0	0	0	1	4	6	8	4.11	1044/1509		4.21	4.31	4.39	4.11
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	2	2	4	10	4.22	891/1509		4.21	4.26	4.26	4.22
		uestions reflect			1	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	658/1287		4.28	4.30	4.38	4.39
		uations reflect			0	1	0	1	5	8			1143/1459		4.07	4.22	4.32	3.83
				what you learned	1	7	1	1	3	3	3		1162/1406		4.05	4.09	4.11	3.55
				o what you learned	1	4	1	1	5	3	4		1159/1384		3.99	4.11	4.23	3.57
		g system clearly		ined	1	0	0	0	2			4.50	458/1489		4.31	4.17	4.18	4.50
		was class cance			1	0	0	0	0	4		4.78	820/1506		4.54	4.67	4.67	4.78
9. How wou	ıld you	grade the overal	ll teac	hing effectiveness	2	1	0	0	4	9	3	3.94	944/1463	3.94	3.99	4.09	4.18	3.94
		Lecture	2															
1. Were th	ne instr	uctor's lectures	s well	prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	588/1438	4.67	4.53	4.46	4.50	4.67
2. Did the	e instru	ctor seem intere	ested i	n the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	846/1421	4.78	4.70	4.73	4.76	4.78
3. Was led	ture ma	terial presented	d and e	xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	7	4	8	4.05	1025/1411	4.05	4.20	4.31	4.35	4.05
4. Did the	electur	es contribute to	what	you learned	0	0	0	1	2	6	10	4.32	848/1405	4.32	4.29	4.32	4.34	4.32
5. Did aud	diovisua	l techniques enl	nance y	our understanding	1	9	4	1	1	2	1	2.44	1203/1236	2.44	3.77	4.00	4.03	2.44
		Discuss																
1. Did cla	Discussion Oid class discussions contribute to what you learn					0	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	880/1260	3.88	3.77	4.14	4.25	3.88
	oid class discussions contribute to what you learne					0	0	1	2	3	3		1001/1255		3.89	4.33	4.46	3.89
	ere all students actively encouraged to participat id the instructor encourage fair and open discussi					0	0	0	3	3	3		932/1258		4.05	4.38	4.51	4.00
		echniques succes		a open arbeablin	10 9	7	0	0	1	1	1		****/ 873		3.69	4.03	4.26	****
		Field V	vio rele															
1. Did fie	eld expe	rience contribut		hat vou learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.75	****
1. 214 110	ord one	1101100 0011011200		nao you rournou		Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	-	Ü	1.00	, 10			1.00	1.75	
1 Did sel	f-naced	Self I		what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 49	****	4.00	4.26	4.67	****
i. Dia sei	II-paceu	system contrib	ice co	what you rearned	10	U	U	U	U	_	U	4.00	/ 49		4.00	4.20	4.07	
		Frequ	ency	Dist	tribu	ıtior	1											
Credits Ea	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad							Rea	sons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 10						 guire	ed fo	or Ma	ior	 s 1	4	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r r	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 5						J						5		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 1		Gei	neral					2	Under-9	rad 1	9	Non-	major	18
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	7	D 0									3				3 -	
Grad.						Ele	ectiv	res				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h
	P 0												respons				_	
	I O					Otl	ner					0	-					
				? 1														

Course-Section: ECON 477 1

Title

University of Maryland

Derivative Securities Baltimore County

Instructor: Getter,Darryl E

Getter,Darryl E

Enrollment: 21
Ouestionnaires: 18

Fall 2009
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 490

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 1 0 0 0 3 3 11 4.47 635/1509 4.47 4.21 4.31 4.39 4.47 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 0 2 1 4 10 4.29 817/1509 4.29 4.21 4.26 4.26 4.29 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 2 0 0 1 1 4 10 4.44 602/1287 4.44 4.28 4.30 4.38 4.44 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 2 2 0 0 1 5 8 4.50 454/1459 4.50 4.07 4.22 4.32 4.50 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 5 2 0 4 2 4 3.50 1178/1406 3.50 4.05 4.09 4.11 3.50 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 4 0 1 4 3 5 3.92 912/1384 3.92 3.99 4.11 4.23 3.92 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 2 0 3 12 4.47 499/1489 4.47 4.31 4.17 4.18 4.47 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 2 15 4.88 622/1506 4.88 4.54 4.67 4.67 4.88 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 0 1 0 6 7 4.36 523/1463 4.36 3.99 4.09 4.18 4.36 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 0 4 13 4.76 430/1438 4.76 4.53 4.46 4.50 4.76 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 1 16 4.94 322/1421 4.94 4.70 4.73 4.76 4.94 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 1 4 12 4.65 442/1411 4.65 4.20 4.31 4.35 4.65 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 1 3 12 4.69 432/1405 4.69 4.29 4.32 4.34 4.69 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 11 0 1 2 2 1 3.50 984/1236 3.50 3.77 4.00 4.03 3.50 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 5 4 4.18 671/1260 4.18 3.77 4.14 4.25 4.18 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 2 9 4.82 278/1255 4.82 3.89 4.33 4.46 4.82 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 1 0 1 0 9 4.45 670/1258 4.45 4.05 4.38 4.51 4.45 4. Were special techniques successful 7 7 0 1 0 3 0 3.50 \*\*\*\*/ 873 \*\*\*\* 3.69 4.03 4.26 \*\*\*\* Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 16 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 \*\*\*\*/ 184 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.16 4.62 \*\*\*\* 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 16 0 0 1 0 3.00 \*\*\*\*/ 198 \*\*\*\* 2.90 4.22 4.37 \*\*\*\* 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 16 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 \*\*\*\*/ 184 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.48 4.66 \*\*\*\* 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 17 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 \*\*\*\*/ 177 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.36 4.47 \*\*\*\* 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 17 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 165 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.18 4.29 \*\*\*\* Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 17 0 0 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 89 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.49 4.71 \*\*\*\* 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 17 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 \*\*\*\*/ 92 \*\*\*\* \*\*\* 4.54 4.83 \*\*\*\* 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 17 0 1 0 0 3.00 \*\*\*\*/ 90 \*\*\*\* \*\*\* 4.50 4.69 \*\*\*\* 0 0 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 92 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.38 4.64 \*\*\*\* 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 17 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 \*\*\*\*/ 93 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.06 4.32 \*\*\*\* Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 \*\*\*\*/ 48 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.39 4.75 \*\*\*\* 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 17 0 0 1 0 0 2.00 \*\*\*\*/ 48 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.41 4.54 \*\*\*\* 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 17 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 \*\*\*\*/ 47 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.51 4.51 \*\*\*\* 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 17 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 \*\*\*\*/ 47 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.18 4.19 \*\*\*\* 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 17 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 \*\*\*\*/ 44 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.32 4.07 \*\*\*\* Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 17 0 00 0 1 0 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 49 \*\*\*\* 4.00 4.26 4.67 \*\*\*\* 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 17 0 00 0 1 0 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 41 \*\*\*\* 5.00 4.14 4.50 \*\*\*\* 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 17 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 \*\*\*\*/ 46 \*\*\*\* 5.00 4.31 4.67 \*\*\*\* 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 17 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 37 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.05 4.67 \*\*\*\* 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 17 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 \*\*\*\*/ 30 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.27 4.33 \*\*\*\*

Course-Section: ECON 477 1

Derivative Securities

Instructor: Getter, Darryl E

Enrollment: 21
Questionnaires: 18

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 490 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	16
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-		_	
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 481 1 University of Maryland Page 491 Title Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010 International Trade Th

Instructor: Takacs, Wendy E 40

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 18

# Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	7	5	6	3.94	1174/1509	3.94	4.21	4.31	4.39	3.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	6	6	4.00	1086/1509	4.00	4.21	4.26	4.26	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	8	3	7	3.94	981/1287	3.94	4.28	4.30	4.38	3.94
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	2	1	4	0	2	2.89	1443/1459	2.89	4.07	4.22	4.32	2.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	2	5	3	5	3.56	1155/1406	3.56	4.05	4.09	4.11	3.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	1	3	1	2	2	3.11	1311/1384	3.11	3.99	4.11	4.23	3.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	3	2	9	3.94	1058/1489	3.94	4.31	4.17	4.18	3.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	957/1506	4.65	4.54	4.67	4.67	4.65
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	690/1463	4.20	3.99	4.09	4.18	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	1001/1438	4.33	4.53	4.46	4.50	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	3	2	11	4.50	1162/1421	4.50	4.70	4.73	4.76	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	3	5	7	4.06	1020/1411	4.06	4.20	4.31	4.35	4.06
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	5	2	7	4.00	1047/1405	4.00	4.29	4.32	4.34	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	6	0	1	3	2	2	3.63	925/1236	3.63	3.77	4.00	4.03	3.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	Λ	1	1	1	2	3.80	908/1260	3.80	3.77	4.14	4.25	3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	1	1	2	1	5.00	1104/1255	3.60	3.89	4.33	4.46	3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	1	2	1	1		1170/1258	3.40	4.05	4.38	4.51	3.40
4. Were special techniques successful	13	2	0	1	ñ	1	1		****/ 873	****	3.69	4.03	4.26	****
1. Here opecial econicated bucceptur	13	2	3	_	3	_	_	3.07	, 673		3.03	1.05	1.20	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	18	Non-major	15
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				?	2						

Course-Section: ECON 482 1

University of Maryland Baltimore County

International Finance

Yuan,Chunming Instructor:

Enrollment: 41 Questionnaires: 20

Title

## Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 492 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	9	8	4.20	942/1509	4.20	4.21	4.31	4.39	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	9	9	4.35	753/1509	4.35	4.21	4.26	4.26	4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	10	4.35	688/1287	4.35	4.28	4.30	4.38	4.35
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	3	5	7	4.27	759/1459	4.27	4.07	4.22	4.32	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	2	6	8	4.24	611/1406	4.24	4.05	4.09	4.11	4.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	479/1384	4.38	3.99	4.11	4.23	4.38
<ol> <li>Was the grading system clearly explained</li> </ol>	0	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	243/1489	4.70	4.31	4.17	4.18	4.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	925/1506	4.68	4.54	4.67	4.67	4.68
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	8	6	4.18	714/1463	4.18	3.99	4.09	4.18	4.18
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	603/1438	4.65	4.53	4.46	4.50	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	3	14		1049/1421	4.63	4.70	4.73	4.76	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	5	11	4.35	789/1411	4.35	4.20	4.31	4.35	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1 7	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	615/1405	4.53	4.29	4.32	4.34	4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	545/1236	4.18	3.77	4.00	4.03	4.18
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	469/1260	4.44	3.77	4.14	4.25	4.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	868/1255	4.11	3.89	4.33	4.46	4.11
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	932/1258	4.00	4.05	4.38	4.51	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	U	U	U	2	4	4.67	152/ 873	4.67	3.69	4.03	4.26	4.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.62	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	2.90	4.22	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.66	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.47	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.83	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.69	***
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	4.32	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.54	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.51	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.19	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.07	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 49	****	4.00	4.26	4.67	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 41	****	5.00	4.14	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	***	5.00	4.31	4.67	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.33	***

Course-Section: ECON 482 1

Title International Finance

Instructor: Yuan, Chunming

Enrollment: 41
Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 492 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA			Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	18
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	า
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 490 1

Analytic Methods In Ec

Instructor: Cinyabuguma, Mat

Enrollment: 41
Questionnaires: 22

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 493 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies							Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	5	6	9	3.95	1164/1509	3.95	4.21	4.31	4.39	3.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	7	9		1020/1509	4.09	4.21	4.26	4.26	4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	7	10	4.09	886/1287	4.09	4.28	4.30	4.38	4.09
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	3	2	2	7	3.73	1202/1459	3.73	4.07	4.22	4.32	3.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	1	4	2	7	4.07	761/1406	4.07	4.05	4.09	4.11	4.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	2	1	1	6	4.10	751/1384	4.10	3.99	4.11	4.23	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	6	3	9	3.73	1210/1489	3.73	4.31	4.17	4.18	3.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	15	7	4.32	1216/1506	4.32	4.54	4.67	4.67	4.32
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	6	7	2	3.63	1194/1463	3.63	3.99	4.09	4.18	3.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	1	7	11	4.29	1047/1438	4.29	4.53	4.46	4.50	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	2	1	5	13	4.38	1228/1421	4.38	4.70	4.73	4.76	4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	4	5	9	4.00	1051/1411	4.00	4.20	4.31	4.35	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	4	12	4.29	874/1405	4.29	4.29	4.32	4.34	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	12	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	274/1236	4.50	3.77	4.00	4.03	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	2	0	3	0	1	2.67	1226/1260	2.67	3.77	4.14	4.25	2.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	2	1	1	1	1		1235/1255	2.67	3.89	4.33	4.46	2.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	1	2	2	0	1	2.67	1246/1258	2.67	4.05	4.38	4.51	2.67
4. Were special techniques successful	17	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 873	****	3.69	4.03	4.26	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	12	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	5	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	22	Non-major	20
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	1			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 600 1 University of Maryland Title Policy Consq:Econ Anal

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Brennan, Timothy Instructor: Enrollment: 25

Questionnaires: 23

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 494

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

			Frequencies						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	3	8	12	4.39	734/1509	4.39	4.21	4.31	4.39	4.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	9		3.87	1189/1509	3.87	4.21	4.26	4.25	3.87
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	6	11	3	3.61	1134/1287	3.61	4.28	4.30	4.22	3.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	1	6	9	4	3.67	1238/1459	3.67	4.07	4.22	4.16	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	4	8	9	4.00	813/1406	4.00	4.05	4.09	4.12	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	0	6	3	7	3.88	954/1384	3.88	3.99	4.11	4.16	3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	3	4	6	8	3.65	1241/1489	3.65	4.31	4.17	4.14	3.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.54	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	3	10	4	3.94	931/1463	3.94	3.99	4.09	4.15	3.94
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	5	16	4.61	675/1438	4.61	4.53	4.46	4.49	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	269/1421	4.96	4.70	4.73	4.78	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	2	10	9	4.09	1010/1411	4.09	4.20	4.31	4.33	4.09
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	7	11	4.13	980/1405	4.13	4.29	4.32	4.33	4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	13	1	0	4	2	3	3.60	936/1236	3.60	3.77	4.00	3.98	3.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	4	1	4	5	6	3.40	1091/1260	3.40	3.77	4.14	4.21	3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	3	5	2	9		1054/1255	3.75	3.89	4.33	4.43	3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	2	5	3	9		1033/1258		4.05	4.38	4.50	3.85
4. Were special techniques successful	3	16	0	0	1	0	3		****/ 873	****	3.69	4.03	4.01	***
_														

Credits 1	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	2	А	10	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	 16	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	12						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	23
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	16	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3	=		-	
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 601 1 University of Maryland Title

Baltimore County Microeconomic Analysis Farrow, Robert S Instructor: Fall 2009

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 16

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 495

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fr 1	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.75	303/1509	4.75	4.21	4.31	4.39	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.75	796/1509		4.21	4.26	4.25	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	5	6	4.00	924/1287		4.28	4.30	4.22	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	421/1459		4.07	4.22	4.16	4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	3			411/1406		4.05	4.09	4.12	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	5	9		479/1384		3.99	4.11	4.16	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	5	9		555/1489		4.31	4.17	4.14	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	642/1506		4.54	4.67	4.71	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	7	7		325/1463		3.99	4.09		4.50
J. now would jou grade the overall teaching effectiveness	_	_	O	Ü	0	,	,	1.50	323/1103	1.50	3.77	1.05	1.13	1.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	153/1438	4.94	4.53	4.46	4.49	4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1421		4.70	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	7	8		701/1411			4.31	4.33	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63				4.32	4.33	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	0	0	0	3	5		199/1236		3.77		3.98	
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	5	6	4.07	722/1260	4.07	3.77	4.14	4.21	4.07
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	2	5	6	4.14	851/1255		3.89	4.33	4.43	4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	521/1258	4.64	4.05	4.38	4.50	4.64
4. Were special techniques successful	2	10	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	845/ 873	2.75	3.69	4.03	4.01	2.75
*														
Freq	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ty	pe			Majors	
00-27 3 0.00-0.99 3 A 4		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	s 1	4	Graduat	 e	6	Majo	r r	5
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 11	Required for Maj													
56-83 2 2.00-2.99 0 C 0		Ge	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.0	Non-	major	11
84-150 2 3.00-3.49 2 D 0													-	
Grad. 6 3.50-4.00 5 F 0		El	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h
P 0								respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	nt		
I 0		Other					1							
? 1		CCITCI												

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Fall 2009

Course-Section: ECON 611 1

15

Econometrics I

Gindling JR, Tho

Questions

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 11

Page 496 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

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

Frequencies Instructor

0

NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean

		Genera	.1															
1. Did you	u gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	244/1509	4.80	4.21	4.31	4.39	4.80
2. Did the	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	699/1509	4.40	4.21	4.26	4.25	4.40
3. Did the	e exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	2	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	359/1287	4.67	4.28	4.30	4.22	4.67
4. Did oth	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	454/1459	4.50	4.07	4.22	4.16	4.50
5. Did ass	signed r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	527/1406	4.30	4.05	4.09	4.12	4.30
6. Did wr:	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	313/1384	4.56	3.99	4.11	4.16	4.56
7. Was the	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	1	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	341/1489	4.60	4.31	4.17	4.14	4.60
8. How man	ny times	was class cand	elled		1	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	1070/1506	4.50	4.54	4.67	4.71	4.50
9. How wor	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	500/1463	4.38	3.99	4.09	4.15	4.38
1. Were th	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	363/1438	4.80	4.53	4.46	4.49	4.80
2. Did the	e instru	n the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	537/1421	4.90	4.70	4.73	4.78	4.90		
3. Was led	cture ma	xplained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	738/1411	4.40	4.20	4.31	4.33	4.40		
4. Did the	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned							0	0	3	7	4.70	419/1405	4.70	4.29	4.32	4.33	4.70
5. Did aud	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding							0	2	3	4	4.22	512/1236	4.22	3.77	4.00	3.98	4.22
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	746/1260	4.00	3.77	4.14	4.21	4.00
2. Were a	ll stude:	nts actively en	.courage	d to participate	4	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	647/1255	4.43	3.89	4.33	4.43	4.43
3. Did the	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	570/1258	4.57	4.05	4.38	4.50	4.57
4. Were sp	pecial t	echniques succe	ssful		4	5	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 873	****	3.69	4.03	4.01	****
				Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	S			Тур	e			Majors	}
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	2	A 5			anir	ed f	 or M:	aior		7	 Graduate		3	Majo		1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 3		Required for Majo						•	Graduate	•	5	1.10.10	<i>,</i> _	_
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		General						0	Under-gr	ad	8	Non-	-major	10
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0		General						•	onder gr		•	1,011		
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		E1.	ecti <sup>.</sup>	ves				0	#### - M	leans t	here a	re not	enous	rh
grau.	5	3.30-4.00	J	P 0		11.1	CCLI	v C D				U	response				_	111
				F 0									r ephonie	55 LU L	e sigi	ıııcaı.	10	

Other

I

0

0

Course-Section: ECON 801 15	University of Maryland	Page 497
Title Individual Study In Ec	Baltimore County	MAR 22, 2010
Instructor: Ma, Bing	Fall 2009	Job IRBR3029

Ma,Bing Instructor:

Enrollment: 1

Questionnaires: 1

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Frequencies						Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.21	4.31	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.21	4.26	4.25	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	979/1459	4.00	4.07	4.22	4.16	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	813/1406	4.00	4.05	4.09	4.12	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	986/1489	4.00	4.31	4.17	4.14	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.54	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1463	5.00	3.99	4.09	4.15	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	28/ 49	4.00	4.00	4.26	4.16	4.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 41	5.00	5.00	4.14	4.08	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 46	5.00	5.00	4.31	4.11	5.00

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	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	0	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-		_	
				2	1						