

Course-Section: ECON 101 0101  
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS  
 Instructor: APPIAH, ELIZABE  
 Enrollment: 35  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 512  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies							Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	4	7	4.13	1139/1670	4.08	4.13	4.31	4.23	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	6	6	4.06	1161/1666	4.07	4.16	4.27	4.30	4.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	7	4.19	932/1406	4.19	4.23	4.32	4.31	4.19
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	3	4	2	4	3.54	1439/1615	3.96	4.02	4.24	4.17	3.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	1	6	6	4.00	851/1566	4.09	3.89	4.07	4.03	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	853/1528	3.90	3.90	4.12	4.00	4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	4	4	6	4.00	1135/1650	4.07	4.26	4.22	4.28	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	12	2	4.14	1444/1667	4.35	4.50	4.67	4.61	4.14
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	2	2	5	2	3.42	1432/1626	3.88	4.04	4.11	4.07	3.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	5	8	4.25	1157/1559	4.41	4.38	4.46	4.47	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	2	0	1	13	4.56	1197/1560	4.68	4.60	4.72	4.68	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	1	3	1	9	3.88	1251/1549	4.09	4.16	4.31	4.32	3.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	2	9	4.06	1117/1546	4.16	4.23	4.32	4.32	4.06
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	6	3	5	3.80	894/1323	3.72	3.72	4.00	3.91	3.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	777/1384	3.90	3.82	4.10	3.92	4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	860/1378	4.10	3.94	4.29	4.09	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	867/1378	4.13	4.07	4.31	4.08	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	761/ 904	3.43	3.83	4.03	3.94	3.40

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	2	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	3	Under-grad	16	Non-major	15
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 101 0201  
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS  
 Instructor: PAPANANTONAKIS,  
 Enrollment: 36  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 513  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect					
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	1	3	7	5	3.67	1486/1670	4.08	4.13	4.31	4.23	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	6	6	3.83	1363/1666	4.07	4.16	4.27	4.30	3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	4	2	4	8	3.89	1142/1406	4.19	4.23	4.32	4.31	3.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	922/1615	3.96	4.02	4.24	4.17	4.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	11	4.44	450/1566	4.09	3.89	4.07	4.03	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	5	6	4	3.65	1212/1528	3.90	3.90	4.12	4.00	3.65
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	8	2	6	3.61	1425/1650	4.07	4.26	4.22	4.28	3.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	712/1667	4.35	4.50	4.67	4.61	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	2	3	6	4	3.63	1335/1626	3.88	4.04	4.11	4.07	3.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	4	4	8	4.00	1280/1559	4.41	4.38	4.46	4.47	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	1090/1560	4.68	4.60	4.72	4.68	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	4	4	4	6	3.67	1345/1549	4.09	4.16	4.31	4.32	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	6	0	7	3.33	1425/1546	4.16	4.23	4.32	4.32	3.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	3	2	1	1	3	2.90	1227/1323	3.72	3.72	4.00	3.91	2.90
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	3	3	2	4	3.58	1066/1384	3.90	3.82	4.10	3.92	3.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	0	3	1	6	3.75	1110/1378	4.10	3.94	4.29	4.09	3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	3	1	7	4.17	915/1378	4.13	4.07	4.31	4.08	4.17
4. Were special techniques successful	7	8	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 904	3.43	3.83	4.03	3.94	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****

Course-Section: ECON 101 0201  
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS  
 Instructor: PAPADANTONAKIS,  
 Enrollment: 36  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 513  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 101 0301  
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS  
 Instructor: COOMBER, WILLIA  
 Enrollment: 46  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 514  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	2	5	7	6	3.71	1464/1670	4.08	4.13	4.31	4.23	3.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	8	6	6	3.76	1403/1666	4.07	4.16	4.27	4.30	3.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	4	4	5	7	3.75	1206/1406	4.19	4.23	4.32	4.31	3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	4	2	5	6	3.76	1318/1615	3.96	4.02	4.24	4.17	3.76
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	2	3	6	8	3.76	1137/1566	4.09	3.89	4.07	4.03	3.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	2	3	2	4	4	3.33	1368/1528	3.90	3.90	4.12	4.00	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	1	2	7	10	4.14	1032/1650	4.07	4.26	4.22	4.28	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	19	1	4.00	1524/1667	4.35	4.50	4.67	4.61	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	1	4	6	3	3.60	1347/1626	3.88	4.04	4.11	4.07	3.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	572/1559	4.41	4.38	4.46	4.47	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	725/1560	4.68	4.60	4.72	4.68	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	0	4	7	8	3.90	1237/1549	4.09	4.16	4.31	4.32	3.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	4	5	8	3.71	1309/1546	4.16	4.23	4.32	4.32	3.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	3	1	4	11	4.05	674/1323	3.72	3.72	4.00	3.91	4.05
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	1	2	7	1	3.50	1103/1384	3.90	3.82	4.10	3.92	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	2	1	6	3	3.83	1081/1378	4.10	3.94	4.29	4.09	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	2	6	2	3.82	1082/1378	4.13	4.07	4.31	4.08	3.82
4. Were special techniques successful	10	4	1	3	2	1	1	2.75	855/ 904	3.43	3.83	4.03	3.94	2.75

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 2	General	0	Under-grad 22
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			Non-major 22
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
				P 0			
				I 0	Other	9	
				? 2			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	2	8	16	4.36	876/1670	4.08	4.13	4.31	4.23	4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	22	4.64	440/1666	4.07	4.16	4.27	4.30	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	22	4.79	283/1406	4.19	4.23	4.32	4.31	4.79
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	1	1	3	6	5	3.81	1288/1615	3.96	4.02	4.24	4.17	3.81
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	0	2	5	5	10	4.05	826/1566	4.09	3.89	4.07	4.03	4.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	19	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	532/1528	3.90	3.90	4.12	4.00	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	1	4	6	14	4.19	973/1650	4.07	4.26	4.22	4.28	4.19
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	3	19	4	4.04	1508/1667	4.35	4.50	4.67	4.61	4.04
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	2	0	0	1	9	9	4.42	531/1626	3.88	4.04	4.11	4.07	4.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	3	5	15	4.42	1009/1559	4.41	4.38	4.46	4.47	4.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	2	21	4.83	777/1560	4.68	4.60	4.72	4.68	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	1	2	9	11	4.17	1053/1549	4.09	4.16	4.31	4.32	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	5	16	4.61	595/1546	4.16	4.23	4.32	4.32	4.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	10	0	1	3	3	6	4.08	666/1323	3.72	3.72	4.00	3.91	4.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	1	0	3	4	3.89	940/1384	3.90	3.82	4.10	3.92	3.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	2	1	3	3	3.78	1103/1378	4.10	3.94	4.29	4.09	3.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	2	1	1	5	4.00	977/1378	4.13	4.07	4.31	4.08	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	19	4	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	****/ 904	3.43	3.83	4.03	3.94	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****

Course-Section: ECON 101 0401  
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS  
 Instructor: DASGUPTA, NANDI  
 Enrollment: 44  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 515  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	2	A	20	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	28	Non-major	28
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 101 0501  
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS  
 Instructor: DASGUPTA, NANDI  
 Enrollment: 40  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 516  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	1	1	0	4	16	4.50	665/1670	4.08	4.13	4.31	4.23	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	3	4	14	4.41	784/1666	4.07	4.16	4.27	4.30	4.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	4	16	4.64	459/1406	4.19	4.23	4.32	4.31	4.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	8	0	1	2	1	9	4.38	712/1615	3.96	4.02	4.24	4.17	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	2	7	11	4.33	559/1566	4.09	3.89	4.07	4.03	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	9	1	0	0	3	8	4.42	546/1528	3.90	3.90	4.12	4.00	4.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	3	5	12	4.23	938/1650	4.07	4.26	4.22	4.28	4.23
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	1	0	0	1	13	5	4.21	1395/1667	4.35	4.50	4.67	4.61	4.21
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	2	1	0	1	7	6	4.13	865/1626	3.88	4.04	4.11	4.07	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	772/1559	4.41	4.38	4.46	4.47	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	1	18	4.85	725/1560	4.68	4.60	4.72	4.68	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	622/1549	4.09	4.16	4.31	4.32	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	0	2	17	4.70	482/1546	4.16	4.23	4.32	4.32	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	13	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	692/1323	3.72	3.72	4.00	3.91	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	651/1384	3.90	3.82	4.10	3.92	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	842/1378	4.10	3.94	4.29	4.09	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	850/1378	4.13	4.07	4.31	4.08	4.29
4. Were special techniques successful	16	4	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/ 904	3.43	3.83	4.03	3.94	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.35	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ECON 101 0601  
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS  
 Instructor: KAIKAI, ALPHA  
 Enrollment: 40  
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 517  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	1	3	13	10	4.07	1178/1670	4.08	4.13	4.31	4.23	4.07
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	2	13	10	4.04	1180/1666	4.07	4.16	4.27	4.30	4.04
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	2	0	13	11	4.04	1039/1406	4.19	4.23	4.32	4.31	4.04
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	2	2	10	4	3.89	1246/1615	3.96	4.02	4.24	4.17	3.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	1	2	2	10	9	4.00	851/1566	4.09	3.89	4.07	4.03	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	15	0	3	3	1	6	3.77	1146/1528	3.90	3.90	4.12	4.00	3.77
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	4	3	10	11	4.00	1135/1650	4.07	4.26	4.22	4.28	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	0	23	3	4.04	1508/1667	4.35	4.50	4.67	4.61	4.04
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	6	11	3	3.85	1172/1626	3.88	4.04	4.11	4.07	3.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	3	5	18	4.58	809/1559	4.41	4.38	4.46	4.47	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	4	20	4.76	929/1560	4.68	4.60	4.72	4.68	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	7	16	4.56	610/1549	4.09	4.16	4.31	4.32	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	7	16	4.50	715/1546	4.16	4.23	4.32	4.32	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	16	1	1	1	2	4	3.78	908/1323	3.72	3.72	4.00	3.91	3.78
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	2	7	11	4.33	608/1384	3.90	3.82	4.10	3.92	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	3	4	12	4.35	774/1378	4.10	3.94	4.29	4.09	4.35
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	2	2	16	4.70	501/1378	4.13	4.07	4.31	4.08	4.70
4. Were special techniques successful	10	7	2	1	3	0	6	3.58	702/ 904	3.43	3.83	4.03	3.94	3.58

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 10			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 2	General 8	Under-grad 29	Non-major 29
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 7		
				? 0			



Course-Section: ECON 101 0701  
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS  
 Instructor: KAIKAI, ALPHA  
 Enrollment: 42  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 518  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR NA		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	12	9	4.21	1049/1670	4.08	4.13	4.31	4.23	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	8	8	3.92	1306/1666	4.07	4.16	4.27	4.30	3.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	7	10	4.04	1033/1406	4.19	4.23	4.32	4.31	4.04
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	1	3	2	6	4.08	1039/1615	3.96	4.02	4.24	4.17	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	5	7	8	4.00	851/1566	4.09	3.89	4.07	4.03	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	1	4	3	6	4.00	899/1528	3.90	3.90	4.12	4.00	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	9	10	4.17	1008/1650	4.07	4.26	4.22	4.28	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	1	18	4	4.13	1451/1667	4.35	4.50	4.67	4.61	4.13
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	5	7	5	4.00	953/1626	3.88	4.04	4.11	4.07	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	4	17	4.65	689/1559	4.41	4.38	4.46	4.47	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	4	1	17	4.59	1171/1560	4.68	4.60	4.72	4.68	4.59
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	4	4	14	4.35	888/1549	4.09	4.16	4.31	4.32	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	5	14	4.35	909/1546	4.16	4.23	4.32	4.32	4.35
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	12	2	1	3	0	5	3.45	1061/1323	3.72	3.72	4.00	3.91	3.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	2	3	2	10	4.18	730/1384	3.90	3.82	4.10	3.92	4.18
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	2	2	0	13	4.41	706/1378	4.10	3.94	4.29	4.09	4.41
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	2	1	14	4.71	492/1378	4.13	4.07	4.31	4.08	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	7	11	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	461/ 904	3.43	3.83	4.03	3.94	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.35	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	2	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	2	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.46	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****

Course-Section: ECON 101 0701  
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS  
 Instructor: KAIKAI, ALPHA  
 Enrollment: 42  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 518  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	24	Non-major	24
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ECON 101 0801  
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS  
 Instructor: CARROLL, KATHLE  
 Enrollment: 40  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 519  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	722/1670	4.08	4.13	4.31	4.23	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	8	5	4.20	1037/1666	4.07	4.16	4.27	4.30	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	423/1406	4.19	4.23	4.32	4.31	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	379/1615	3.96	4.02	4.24	4.17	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	5	3	6	3.87	1049/1566	4.09	3.89	4.07	4.03	3.87
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	12	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1528	3.90	3.90	4.12	4.00	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	527/1650	4.07	4.26	4.22	4.28	4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1667	4.35	4.50	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	8	4	4.14	854/1626	3.88	4.04	4.11	4.07	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	555/1559	4.41	4.38	4.46	4.47	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	417/1560	4.68	4.60	4.72	4.68	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	646/1549	4.09	4.16	4.31	4.32	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	370/1546	4.16	4.23	4.32	4.32	4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	11	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1323	3.72	3.72	4.00	3.91	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	940/1384	3.90	3.82	4.10	3.92	3.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	970/1378	4.10	3.94	4.29	4.09	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	1061/1378	4.13	4.07	4.31	4.08	3.89
4. Were special techniques successful	7	7	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 904	3.43	3.83	4.03	3.94	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	4	1	2	5	7	3.53	1531/1670	4.08	4.13	4.31	4.23	3.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	0	2	6	8	3.84	1357/1666	4.07	4.16	4.27	4.30	3.84
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	4	5	7	3.79	1194/1406	4.19	4.23	4.32	4.31	3.79
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	2	0	4	5	3	3.50	1448/1615	3.96	4.02	4.24	4.17	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	2	4	9	3.84	1068/1566	4.09	3.89	4.07	4.03	3.84
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	2	2	1	2	4	3.36	1351/1528	3.90	3.90	4.12	4.00	3.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	3	5	7	3.74	1370/1650	4.07	4.26	4.22	4.28	3.74
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	18	1	4.05	1498/1667	4.35	4.50	4.67	4.61	4.05
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	1	2	1	5	3	3.58	1354/1626	3.88	4.04	4.11	4.07	3.58
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	3	0	6	10	4.21	1185/1559	4.41	4.38	4.46	4.47	4.21
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	5	12	4.47	1271/1560	4.68	4.60	4.72	4.68	4.47
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	3	1	6	6	3.61	1361/1549	4.09	4.16	4.31	4.32	3.61
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	2	6	8	3.89	1236/1546	4.16	4.23	4.32	4.32	3.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	1	1	5	8	4.13	641/1323	3.72	3.72	4.00	3.91	4.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	2	1	3	3	3.50	1103/1384	3.90	3.82	4.10	3.92	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	894/1378	4.10	3.94	4.29	4.09	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	1055/1378	4.13	4.07	4.31	4.08	3.90
4. Were special techniques successful	9	6	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	****/ 904	3.43	3.83	4.03	3.94	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.35	****
Seminar														
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ECON 101 1001  
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS  
 Instructor: FALCON, HAROLD  
 Enrollment: 45  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 521  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	11	13	4.32	916/1670	4.08	4.13	4.31	4.23	4.32
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	11	12	4.30	919/1666	4.07	4.16	4.27	4.30	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	11	13	4.32	811/1406	4.19	4.23	4.32	4.31	4.32
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	5	7	11	4.26	861/1615	3.96	4.02	4.24	4.17	4.26
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	11	13	4.37	520/1566	4.09	3.89	4.07	4.03	4.37
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	0	4	6	10	4.30	662/1528	3.90	3.90	4.12	4.00	4.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	13	12	4.33	806/1650	4.07	4.26	4.22	4.28	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/1667	4.35	4.50	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	9	13	4.59	331/1626	3.88	4.04	4.11	4.07	4.59
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	2	6	17	4.50	896/1559	4.41	4.38	4.46	4.47	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	5	20	4.73	985/1560	4.68	4.60	4.72	4.68	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	11	13	4.42	789/1549	4.09	4.16	4.31	4.32	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	9	14	4.42	822/1546	4.16	4.23	4.32	4.32	4.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	14	1	2	1	4	4	3.67	960/1323	3.72	3.72	4.00	3.91	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	638/1384	3.90	3.82	4.10	3.92	4.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	894/1378	4.10	3.94	4.29	4.09	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	840/1378	4.13	4.07	4.31	4.08	4.30
4. Were special techniques successful	18	6	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 904	3.43	3.83	4.03	3.94	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A 13	Required for Majors 6	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 8			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C 4	General 2	Under-grad 28	Non-major 28
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 14		
				? 2			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	5	9	6	3.95	1280/1670	4.08	4.13	4.31	4.23	3.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	3	10	5	3.81	1383/1666	4.07	4.16	4.27	4.30	3.81
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	5	8	6	3.95	1094/1406	4.19	4.23	4.32	4.31	3.95
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	1	8	4	4	3.50	1448/1615	3.96	4.02	4.24	4.17	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	3	7	8	4.28	621/1566	4.09	3.89	4.07	4.03	4.28
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	2	0	4	6	4	3.63	1222/1528	3.90	3.90	4.12	4.00	3.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	5	8	6	3.86	1304/1650	4.07	4.26	4.22	4.28	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13	8	4.38	1271/1667	4.35	4.50	4.67	4.61	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	2	6	8	1	3.33	1462/1626	3.88	4.04	4.11	4.07	3.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	6	6	7	3.86	1374/1559	4.41	4.38	4.46	4.47	3.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	2	3	5	11	4.19	1427/1560	4.68	4.60	4.72	4.68	4.19
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	4	7	3	5	3.35	1440/1549	4.09	4.16	4.31	4.32	3.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	2	3	5	7	3.43	1404/1546	4.16	4.23	4.32	4.32	3.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	2	1	6	5	3	3.35	1094/1323	3.72	3.72	4.00	3.91	3.35
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	2	2	1	3	3	3.27	1194/1384	3.90	3.82	4.10	3.92	3.27
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	935/1378	4.10	3.94	4.29	4.09	4.09
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	4	2	2	3	3.36	1244/1378	4.13	4.07	4.31	4.08	3.36
4. Were special techniques successful	10	8	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 904	3.43	3.83	4.03	3.94	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.35	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.72	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.59	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	21	Non-major	20
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						



Course-Section: ECON 102 0101  
 Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS  
 Instructor: GINDLING, THOMA  
 Enrollment: 80  
 Questionnaires: 48

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 523  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	4	16	26	4.43	780/1670	3.92	4.13	4.31	4.23	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	15	28	4.49	654/1666	3.98	4.16	4.27	4.30	4.49
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	14	31	4.57	525/1406	4.01	4.23	4.32	4.31	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	12	1	0	6	7	21	4.34	762/1615	4.02	4.02	4.24	4.17	4.34
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	0	9	10	24	4.20	706/1566	4.14	3.89	4.07	4.03	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	10	1	2	4	8	22	4.30	670/1528	4.03	3.90	4.12	4.00	4.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	3	13	29	4.45	660/1650	4.04	4.26	4.22	4.28	4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	0	37	9	4.13	1458/1667	4.29	4.50	4.67	4.61	4.13
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	0	5	21	11	4.16	831/1626	3.56	4.04	4.11	4.07	4.16
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	1	7	36	4.67	656/1559	4.10	4.38	4.46	4.47	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	2	0	8	36	4.70	1054/1560	4.53	4.60	4.72	4.68	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	0	14	31	4.61	562/1549	3.97	4.16	4.31	4.32	4.61
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	2	7	35	4.69	495/1546	3.88	4.23	4.32	4.32	4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	22	3	3	3	8	7	3.54	1020/1323	3.55	3.72	4.00	3.91	3.54
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	712/1384	3.71	3.82	4.10	3.92	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	33	0	2	0	2	4	7	3.93	1030/1378	3.92	3.94	4.29	4.09	3.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	33	0	1	1	2	3	8	4.07	959/1378	4.04	4.07	4.31	4.08	4.07
4. Were special techniques successful	33	11	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 904	****	3.83	4.03	3.94	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	9	0.00-0.99 0	A 16	Required for Majors 11	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99 0	B 20		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 5	C 3	General 3	Under-grad 48 Non-major 48
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 7	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 1		
			I 0	Other 22	
			? 0		



Course-Section: ECON 102 0501  
 Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS  
 Instructor: PAPANANTONAKIS,  
 Enrollment: 35  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 524  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	3	0	2	5	9	3.89	1351/1670	3.92	4.13	4.31	4.23	3.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	1	4	5	7	3.74	1419/1666	3.98	4.16	4.27	4.30	3.74
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	2	4	11	4.21	908/1406	4.01	4.23	4.32	4.31	4.21
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	2	7	8	4.11	1028/1615	4.02	4.02	4.24	4.17	4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	8	8	4.21	686/1566	4.14	3.89	4.07	4.03	4.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	8	8	4.16	796/1528	4.03	3.90	4.12	4.00	4.16
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	3	4	10	4.16	1020/1650	4.04	4.26	4.22	4.28	4.16
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1667	4.29	4.50	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	1	1	3	6	4	3.73	1268/1626	3.56	4.04	4.11	4.07	3.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	4	0	6	7	3.63	1439/1559	4.10	4.38	4.46	4.47	3.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	1	16	4.68	1066/1560	4.53	4.60	4.72	4.68	4.68
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	2	1	6	7	3.63	1355/1549	3.97	4.16	4.31	4.32	3.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	3	3	2	8	3.47	1388/1546	3.88	4.23	4.32	4.32	3.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	2	1	3	3	4	3.46	1056/1323	3.55	3.72	4.00	3.91	3.46
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	2	2	1	4	3.50	1103/1384	3.71	3.82	4.10	3.92	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	4	1	4	3.80	1092/1378	3.92	3.94	4.29	4.09	3.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	3	2	4	3.80	1086/1378	4.04	4.07	4.31	4.08	3.80
4. Were special techniques successful	11	6	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 904	****	3.83	4.03	3.94	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0 Major 2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 1	B 9		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 1	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 20 Non-major 18
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 responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 12	
			? 0		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	2	3	15	10	4.00	1216/1670	3.92	4.13	4.31	4.23	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	6	12	12	4.13	1114/1666	3.98	4.16	4.27	4.30	4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	5	4	14	9	3.84	1164/1406	4.01	4.23	4.32	4.31	3.84
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	2	0	5	6	8	3.86	1264/1615	4.02	4.02	4.24	4.17	3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	2	6	7	14	4.14	762/1566	4.14	3.89	4.07	4.03	4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	15	0	0	7	3	6	3.94	997/1528	4.03	3.90	4.12	4.00	3.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	5	9	14	4.06	1101/1650	4.04	4.26	4.22	4.28	4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	22	8	4.27	1361/1667	4.29	4.50	4.67	4.61	4.27
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	2	0	0	8	12	5	3.88	1143/1626	3.56	4.04	4.11	4.07	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	3	11	17	4.38	1052/1559	4.10	4.38	4.46	4.47	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	27	4.81	829/1560	4.53	4.60	4.72	4.68	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	3	1	12	15	4.16	1061/1549	3.97	4.16	4.31	4.32	4.16
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	6	8	15	4.03	1128/1546	3.88	4.23	4.32	4.32	4.03
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	23	1	1	2	0	4	3.63	980/1323	3.55	3.72	4.00	3.91	3.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	2	1	6	3	7	3.63	1045/1384	3.71	3.82	4.10	3.92	3.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	2	2	4	3	7	3.61	1153/1378	3.92	3.94	4.29	4.09	3.61
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	4	1	4	10	4.05	962/1378	4.04	4.07	4.31	4.08	4.05
4. Were special techniques successful	14	14	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/ 904	****	3.83	4.03	3.94	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.35	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	30	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	30	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.72	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	30	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.59	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 1	A 7	Required for Majors	9
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 12		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 5	C 6	General	32
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		Non-major 27
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 2	Other	14
#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant					

Course-Section: ECON 102 0801  
 Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS  
 Instructor: COOMBER, WILLIA  
 Enrollment: 45  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 526  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	3	2	6	1	7	3.37	1576/1670	3.92	4.13	4.31	4.23	3.37
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	3	3	2	9	3.55	1493/1666	3.98	4.16	4.27	4.30	3.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	2	4	4	2	7	3.42	1301/1406	4.01	4.23	4.32	4.31	3.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	2	2	3	1	9	3.76	1318/1615	4.02	4.02	4.24	4.17	3.76
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	4	4	9	4.00	851/1566	4.14	3.89	4.07	4.03	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	4	2	1	3	2	7	3.73	1164/1528	4.03	3.90	4.12	4.00	3.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	3	2	3	3	7	3.50	1460/1650	4.04	4.26	4.22	4.28	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	7	8	3	3.78	1629/1667	4.29	4.50	4.67	4.61	3.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	4	1	6	2	0	2.46	1597/1626	3.56	4.04	4.11	4.07	2.46

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	1	1	5	2	6	3.73	1413/1559	4.10	4.38	4.46	4.47	3.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	1	1	3	4	7	3.94	1485/1560	4.53	4.60	4.72	4.68	3.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	3	1	5	1	7	3.47	1401/1549	3.97	4.16	4.31	4.32	3.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	4	1	4	0	7	3.31	1429/1546	3.88	4.23	4.32	4.32	3.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	3	1	2	1	7	3.57	1005/1323	3.55	3.72	4.00	3.91	3.57

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	2	1	0	4	3.50	1103/1384	3.71	3.82	4.10	3.92	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	3	0	6	4.33	797/1378	3.92	3.94	4.29	4.09	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	883/1378	4.04	4.07	4.31	4.08	4.22
4. Were special techniques successful	13	3	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	****/ 904	****	3.83	4.03	3.94	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A 3	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0	Major 2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 21	Non-major 19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 8		
				? 2			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	3	1	4	17	4.40	809/1670	4.41	4.13	4.31	4.23	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	18	4.60	490/1666	4.52	4.16	4.27	4.30	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	9	14	4.48	620/1406	4.52	4.23	4.32	4.31	4.48
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	3	2	5	12	4.04	1061/1615	4.17	4.02	4.24	4.17	4.04
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	2	5	6	8	3.82	1098/1566	4.14	3.89	4.07	4.03	3.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	4	0	1	6	8	3.74	1164/1528	4.06	3.90	4.12	4.00	3.74
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	6	18	4.68	349/1650	4.64	4.26	4.22	4.28	4.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	270/1667	4.97	4.50	4.67	4.61	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	8	12	4.52	387/1626	4.39	4.04	4.11	4.07	4.52
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	138/1559	4.79	4.38	4.46	4.47	4.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	855/1560	4.66	4.60	4.72	4.68	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	5	14	4.57	598/1549	4.58	4.16	4.31	4.32	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	482/1546	4.59	4.23	4.32	4.32	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	13	1	0	4	1	1	3.14	1161/1323	3.72	3.72	4.00	3.91	3.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	3	2	9	4.20	712/1384	4.00	3.82	4.10	3.92	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	0	4	1	8	4.07	943/1378	4.06	3.94	4.29	4.09	4.07
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	2	1	0	2	9	4.07	956/1378	4.16	4.07	4.31	4.08	4.07
4. Were special techniques successful	11	9	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/ 904	4.07	3.83	4.03	3.94	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.35	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.72	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B 8	Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 8	Major 1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	6	D 1	General 1
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Under-grad 25
					Non-major 24
					Electives 1
					#### - Means there are not enough

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	21	
?	1			

Course-Section: ECON 121 0201  
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I  
 Instructor: ST MARTIN, JEAN  
 Enrollment: 43  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 528  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	2	3	20	4.72	414/1670	4.41	4.13	4.31	4.23	4.72
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	1	4	19	4.64	440/1666	4.52	4.16	4.27	4.30	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	2	4	19	4.68	411/1406	4.52	4.23	4.32	4.31	4.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	4	0	2	1	5	13	4.38	712/1615	4.17	4.02	4.24	4.17	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	1	6	5	11	4.13	762/1566	4.14	3.89	4.07	4.03	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	6	1	0	3	2	12	4.33	631/1528	4.06	3.90	4.12	4.00	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	1	2	2	19	4.63	406/1650	4.64	4.26	4.22	4.28	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1667	4.97	4.50	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	1	0	0	4	13	4.56	363/1626	4.39	4.04	4.11	4.07	4.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	2	1	20	4.78	469/1559	4.79	4.38	4.46	4.47	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	1	1	1	20	4.74	985/1560	4.66	4.60	4.72	4.68	4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	1	1	20	4.74	395/1549	4.58	4.16	4.31	4.32	4.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	2	1	19	4.65	532/1546	4.59	4.23	4.32	4.32	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	14	1	0	3	1	3	3.63	980/1323	3.72	3.72	4.00	3.91	3.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	1	2	2	8	4.07	803/1384	4.00	3.82	4.10	3.92	4.07
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	0	1	4	8	4.29	842/1378	4.06	3.94	4.29	4.09	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	2	0	2	3	7	3.93	1039/1378	4.16	4.07	4.31	4.08	3.93
4. Were special techniques successful	14	10	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/ 904	4.07	3.83	4.03	3.94	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.35	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.45	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 4
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 7			
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C 3	General 4	Under-grad 28	Non-major 24
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D 1			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 17		
				? 1			

Course-Section: ECON 121 0301  
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I  
 Instructor: ST MARTIN, JEAN  
 Enrollment: 42  
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 529  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	7	23	4.71	427/1670	4.41	4.13	4.31	4.23	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	27	4.87	198/1666	4.52	4.16	4.27	4.30	4.87
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	28	4.84	240/1406	4.52	4.23	4.32	4.31	4.84
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	0	6	19	4.65	390/1615	4.17	4.02	4.24	4.17	4.65
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	0	6	7	14	4.07	814/1566	4.14	3.89	4.07	4.03	4.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	1	3	4	16	4.46	490/1528	4.06	3.90	4.12	4.00	4.46
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	5	26	4.84	208/1650	4.64	4.26	4.22	4.28	4.84
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	30	4.97	270/1667	4.97	4.50	4.67	4.61	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	6	18	4.75	207/1626	4.39	4.04	4.11	4.07	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	28	4.93	193/1559	4.79	4.38	4.46	4.47	4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	28	4.93	417/1560	4.66	4.60	4.72	4.68	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	26	4.87	238/1549	4.58	4.16	4.31	4.32	4.87
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	26	4.87	276/1546	4.59	4.23	4.32	4.32	4.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	19	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	456/1323	3.72	3.72	4.00	3.91	4.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	0	1	3	14	4.35	589/1384	4.00	3.82	4.10	3.92	4.35
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	459/1378	4.06	3.94	4.29	4.09	4.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	3	5	12	4.45	711/1378	4.16	4.07	4.31	4.08	4.45
4. Were special techniques successful	11	13	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	****/ 904	4.07	3.83	4.03	3.94	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 15	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 4
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B 9			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C 4	General 3	Under-grad 31	Non-major 27
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	6	D 1			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 25		
				? 0			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	5	9	13	4.21	1038/1670	4.41	4.13	4.31	4.23	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	8	15	4.32	883/1666	4.52	4.16	4.27	4.30	4.32
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	7	16	4.39	727/1406	4.52	4.23	4.32	4.31	4.39
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	2	4	3	9	4.06	1055/1615	4.17	4.02	4.24	4.17	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	8	15	4.33	559/1566	4.14	3.89	4.07	4.03	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	1	2	11	8	4.04	876/1528	4.06	3.90	4.12	4.00	4.04
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	7	19	4.67	361/1650	4.64	4.26	4.22	4.28	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/1667	4.97	4.50	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	12	8	4.27	704/1626	4.39	4.04	4.11	4.07	4.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	4	21	4.70	607/1559	4.79	4.38	4.46	4.47	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	2	2	7	15	4.35	1369/1560	4.66	4.60	4.72	4.68	4.35
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	6	17	4.48	709/1549	4.58	4.16	4.31	4.32	4.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	9	15	4.37	879/1546	4.59	4.23	4.32	4.32	4.37
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	11	2	1	5	3	5	3.50	1040/1323	3.72	3.72	4.00	3.91	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	3	7	5	3.94	898/1384	4.00	3.82	4.10	3.92	3.94
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	1	2	10	3	3.76	1106/1378	4.06	3.94	4.29	4.09	3.76
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	2	8	6	4.12	942/1378	4.16	4.07	4.31	4.08	4.12
4. Were special techniques successful	11	12	1	0	1	3	0	3.20	****/ 904	4.07	3.83	4.03	3.94	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.58	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.72	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****

Frequency Distribution

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



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	4	9	11	4.16	1094/1670	4.41	4.13	4.31	4.23	4.16
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	7	15	4.36	833/1666	4.52	4.16	4.27	4.30	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	6	15	4.40	715/1406	4.52	4.23	4.32	4.31	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	2	2	6	12	4.27	849/1615	4.17	4.02	4.24	4.17	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	9	13	4.52	379/1566	4.14	3.89	4.07	4.03	4.52
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	2	2	5	8	4.12	832/1528	4.06	3.90	4.12	4.00	4.12
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	19	4.68	349/1650	4.64	4.26	4.22	4.28	4.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1667	4.97	4.50	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	1	2	15	4	4.00	953/1626	4.39	4.04	4.11	4.07	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	6	18	4.64	706/1559	4.79	4.38	4.46	4.47	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	2	2	6	15	4.36	1354/1560	4.66	4.60	4.72	4.68	4.36
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	10	12	4.38	852/1549	4.58	4.16	4.31	4.32	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	2	6	15	4.42	835/1546	4.59	4.23	4.32	4.32	4.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	3	2	5	3	5	3.28	1117/1323	3.72	3.72	4.00	3.91	3.28
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	3	2	1	3	7	3.56	1075/1384	4.00	3.82	4.10	3.92	3.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	3	4	2	6	3.56	1170/1378	4.06	3.94	4.29	4.09	3.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	2	3	3	8	4.06	959/1378	4.16	4.07	4.31	4.08	4.06
4. Were special techniques successful	9	12	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 904	4.07	3.83	4.03	3.94	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.35	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 7	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 8			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 6	General 2	Under-grad 25	Non-major 25
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	7	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 16		
				? 1			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	0	11	10	4.26	985/1670	4.41	4.13	4.31	4.23	4.26
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	8	12	4.35	858/1666	4.52	4.16	4.27	4.30	4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	7	12	4.35	787/1406	4.52	4.23	4.32	4.31	4.35
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	2	2	2	6	5	3.59	1424/1615	4.17	4.02	4.24	4.17	3.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	2	12	5	3.95	930/1566	4.14	3.89	4.07	4.03	3.95
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	1	1	3	3	4	3.67	1202/1528	4.06	3.90	4.12	4.00	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	7	12	4.36	769/1650	4.64	4.26	4.22	4.28	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	749/1667	4.97	4.50	4.67	4.61	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	2	0	0	1	9	5	4.27	716/1626	4.39	4.04	4.11	4.07	4.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	18	4.74	555/1559	4.79	4.38	4.46	4.47	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	19	4.78	892/1560	4.66	4.60	4.72	4.68	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	2	5	15	4.43	776/1549	4.58	4.16	4.31	4.32	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	4	16	4.55	667/1546	4.59	4.23	4.32	4.32	4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	0	1	8	8	4.41	413/1323	3.72	3.72	4.00	3.91	4.41
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	2	3	3	8	3.88	940/1384	4.00	3.82	4.10	3.92	3.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	7	3	7	4.00	970/1378	4.06	3.94	4.29	4.09	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	9	7	4.35	795/1378	4.16	4.07	4.31	4.08	4.35
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	1	3	4	6	4.07	447/ 904	4.07	3.83	4.03	3.94	4.07
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****

Course-Section: ECON 121 0601  
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I  
 Instructor: MEDICUS, SUZANN  
 Enrollment: 47  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 532  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	2	Under-grad	23	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 122 0101  
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING II  
 Instructor: HARDY, TIMOTHY  
 Enrollment: 33  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 533  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	505/1670	4.25	4.13	4.31	4.23	4.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	516/1666	4.44	4.16	4.27	4.30	4.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	3	10	4.29	844/1406	4.35	4.23	4.32	4.31	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	5	7	4.06	1055/1615	4.09	4.02	4.24	4.17	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	11	4.47	419/1566	4.22	3.89	4.07	4.03	4.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	3	6	2	4	3.47	1295/1528	3.61	3.90	4.12	4.00	3.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	485/1650	4.58	4.26	4.22	4.28	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	17	0	4.00	1524/1667	4.37	4.50	4.67	4.61	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	2	7	5	4.21	774/1626	4.00	4.04	4.11	4.07	4.21
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	796/1559	4.41	4.38	4.46	4.47	4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	358/1560	4.80	4.60	4.72	4.68	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	586/1549	4.16	4.16	4.31	4.32	4.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	7	8	4.29	956/1546	3.96	4.23	4.32	4.32	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	2	5	4	6	3.82	879/1323	3.57	3.72	4.00	3.91	3.82
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	579/1384	3.90	3.82	4.10	3.92	4.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	3	1	7	4.36	763/1378	4.25	3.94	4.29	4.09	4.36
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	375/1378	4.40	4.07	4.31	4.08	4.82
4. Were special techniques successful	6	5	1	0	2	0	3	3.67	671/ 904	3.53	3.83	4.03	3.94	3.67

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 11		Graduate
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 17
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	13
			? 0		

Course-Section: ECON 122 0201  
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING II  
 Instructor: MCBRIDE, CHUCK  
 Enrollment: 41  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 534  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	5	14	4.57	589/1670	4.25	4.13	4.31	4.23	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	355/1666	4.44	4.16	4.27	4.30	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	14	4.67	423/1406	4.35	4.23	4.32	4.31	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	446/1615	4.09	4.02	4.24	4.17	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	4	6	10	4.30	589/1566	4.22	3.89	4.07	4.03	4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	0	2	4	5	4.00	899/1528	3.61	3.90	4.12	4.00	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	229/1650	4.58	4.26	4.22	4.28	4.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	10	4.48	1186/1667	4.37	4.50	4.67	4.61	4.48
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	9	5	4.12	888/1626	4.00	4.04	4.11	4.07	4.12
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	5	12	4.47	933/1559	4.41	4.38	4.46	4.47	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	911/1560	4.80	4.60	4.72	4.68	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	7	10	4.37	864/1549	4.16	4.16	4.31	4.32	4.37
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	3	6	9	4.16	1064/1546	3.96	4.23	4.32	4.32	4.16
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	3	2	1	3	7	3.56	1010/1323	3.57	3.72	4.00	3.91	3.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	2	0	0	1	4	3.71	1013/1384	3.90	3.82	4.10	3.92	3.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	441/1378	4.25	3.94	4.29	4.09	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	813/1378	4.40	4.07	4.31	4.08	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	14	4	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 904	3.53	3.83	4.03	3.94	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 3	General 0	Under-grad 21	Non-major 21
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	4	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 13		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ECON 122 0301  
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING II  
 Instructor: MCBRIDE, CHUCK  
 Enrollment: 36  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 535  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	6	7	5	3.84	1386/1670	4.25	4.13	4.31	4.23	3.84
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	9	8	4.32	895/1666	4.44	4.16	4.27	4.30	4.32
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	4	11	4.44	667/1406	4.35	4.23	4.32	4.31	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	1083/1615	4.09	4.02	4.24	4.17	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	7	3	7	3.83	1078/1566	4.22	3.89	4.07	4.03	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	11	0	2	2	1	2	3.43	1317/1528	3.61	3.90	4.12	4.00	3.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	7	8	4.21	950/1650	4.58	4.26	4.22	4.28	4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	946/1667	4.37	4.50	4.67	4.61	4.74
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	2	3	9	3	3.76	1247/1626	4.00	4.04	4.11	4.07	3.76
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	7	5	5	3.88	1360/1559	4.41	4.38	4.46	4.47	3.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	929/1560	4.80	4.60	4.72	4.68	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	3	4	5	4	3.47	1401/1549	4.16	4.16	4.31	4.32	3.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	1	2	3	7	3.47	1388/1546	3.96	4.23	4.32	4.32	3.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	0	6	0	2	4	3.33	1099/1323	3.57	3.72	4.00	3.91	3.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	2	1	1	3	3.71	1013/1384	3.90	3.82	4.10	3.92	3.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	970/1378	4.25	3.94	4.29	4.09	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	731/1378	4.40	4.07	4.31	4.08	4.43
4. Were special techniques successful	12	3	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	****/ 904	3.53	3.83	4.03	3.94	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	B 9		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 19
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	18
			? 2		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	1	5	7	3.94	1305/1670	4.25	4.13	4.31	4.23	3.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	4	8	4.13	1114/1666	4.44	4.16	4.27	4.30	4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	4	8	4.00	1057/1406	4.35	4.23	4.32	4.31	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	1	4	3	5	3.71	1349/1615	4.09	4.02	4.24	4.17	3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	0	4	9	4.27	632/1566	4.22	3.89	4.07	4.03	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	4	4	4	3.53	1261/1528	3.61	3.90	4.12	4.00	3.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	1	14	4.75	272/1650	4.58	4.26	4.22	4.28	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	4	4.25	1368/1667	4.37	4.50	4.67	4.61	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	1143/1626	4.00	4.04	4.11	4.07	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	589/1559	4.41	4.38	4.46	4.47	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	985/1560	4.80	4.60	4.72	4.68	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	3	1	9	4.21	1010/1549	4.16	4.16	4.31	4.32	4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	5	0	7	3.92	1213/1546	3.96	4.23	4.32	4.32	3.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	1	1	3	3	3	3.55	1020/1323	3.57	3.72	4.00	3.91	3.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	3	4	3	3.82	970/1384	3.90	3.82	4.10	3.92	3.82
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	2	2	2	5	3.91	1057/1378	4.25	3.94	4.29	4.09	3.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	2	2	5	4.00	977/1378	4.40	4.07	4.31	4.08	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	6	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	761/ 904	3.53	3.83	4.03	3.94	3.40
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.35	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.72	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 2	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 8			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C 5	General 0	Under-grad 16	Non-major 14
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 12		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ECON 122 0501  
 Title Prin. Of Accounting II  
 Instructor: Coakley, Donald  
 Enrollment: 0  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 18  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	1116/1670	****	4.51	4.31	4.23	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	1199/1666	****	4.52	4.27	4.30	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1057/1406	****	4.52	4.32	4.31	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	1565/1615	****	4.45	4.24	4.17	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	470/1566	****	4.39	4.07	4.03	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	1233/1528	****	4.40	4.12	4.00	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1135/1650	****	4.51	4.22	4.28	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	1236/1667	****	4.86	4.67	4.61	4.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	1438/1626	****	4.34	4.11	4.07	3.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	1230/1559	****	4.65	4.46	4.47	4.14
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1188/1560	****	4.87	4.72	4.68	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	1327/1549	****	4.48	4.31	4.32	3.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	5	1	3.86	1252/1546	****	4.51	4.32	4.32	3.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	1295/1323	****	4.13	4.00	3.91	2.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	670/1384	****	4.63	4.10	3.92	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	603/1378	****	4.75	4.29	4.09	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1378	****	4.89	4.31	4.08	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 904	****	4.22	4.03	3.94	****

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: ECON 250 0101  
 Title GENDER ROLES: ECON LIF  
 Instructor: LORD, WILLIAM  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 537  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	4	3	8	4.06	1183/1670	4.06	4.13	4.31	4.32	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	5	7	4.00	1199/1666	4.00	4.16	4.27	4.27	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	1	2	10	4.33	799/1406	4.33	4.23	4.32	4.39	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	2	2	2	7	3.86	1264/1615	3.86	4.02	4.24	4.29	3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	2	2	8	3.75	1144/1566	3.75	3.89	4.07	4.00	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	1	2	4	4	3.54	1261/1528	3.54	3.90	4.12	4.11	3.54
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	5	3	7	4.00	1135/1650	4.00	4.26	4.22	4.20	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	6	4.38	1279/1667	4.38	4.50	4.67	4.64	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	1	5	5	1	3.31	1473/1626	3.31	4.04	4.11	4.06	3.31
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	3	3	9	4.19	1205/1559	4.19	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.19
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	4	1	11	4.44	1302/1560	4.44	4.60	4.72	4.73	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	3	3	7	3.81	1280/1549	3.81	4.16	4.31	4.25	3.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	2	9	4.00	1139/1546	4.00	4.23	4.32	4.30	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	1	2	2	2	1	3.00	1179/1323	3.00	3.72	4.00	4.08	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	3	0	2	0	2	2.71	1319/1384	2.71	3.82	4.10	4.07	2.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	3	1	1	0	3	2.88	1327/1378	2.88	3.94	4.29	4.25	2.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	3	1	3	3.63	1159/1378	3.63	4.07	4.31	4.26	3.63
4. Were special techniques successful	8	6	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 904	****	3.83	4.03	4.01	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C 2	General 7	Under-grad 16	Non-major 13
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 6		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ECON 301 0101  
 Title INTERMED ACCOUNTING I  
 Instructor: MCBRIDE, CHUCK  
 Enrollment: 42  
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 538  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	1	8	19	4.47	722/1670	4.47	4.13	4.31	4.24	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	10	19	4.60	490/1666	4.60	4.16	4.27	4.18	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	9	20	4.63	459/1406	4.63	4.23	4.32	4.22	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	11	16	4.48	579/1615	4.48	4.02	4.24	4.18	4.48
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	9	17	4.48	409/1566	4.48	3.89	4.07	4.04	4.48
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	11	15	4.37	600/1528	4.37	3.90	4.12	4.07	4.37
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	6	20	4.59	457/1650	4.59	4.26	4.22	4.12	4.59
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	26	4.93	540/1667	4.93	4.50	4.67	4.67	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	0	2	11	8	4.29	693/1626	4.29	4.04	4.11	4.06	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	5	21	4.68	656/1559	4.68	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	7	21	4.75	948/1560	4.75	4.60	4.72	4.67	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	9	16	4.46	736/1549	4.46	4.16	4.31	4.25	4.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	1	8	17	4.39	859/1546	4.39	4.23	4.32	4.24	4.39
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	1	2	8	15	4.30	514/1323	4.30	3.72	4.00	3.99	4.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	608/1384	4.33	3.82	4.10	4.12	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	939/1378	4.08	3.94	4.29	4.30	4.08
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	915/1378	4.17	4.07	4.31	4.33	4.17
4. Were special techniques successful	18	3	1	0	1	4	3	3.89	577/ 904	3.89	3.83	4.03	4.03	3.89
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	28	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.04	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	3.99	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.25	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	3.93	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.68	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	30	Non-major	30
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	24				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 302 0101  
 Title INTERMED ACCOUNTING II  
 Instructor: CROTEAU, MARCIA  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 539  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies						Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean	
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean						Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1670	4.79	4.13	4.31	4.24	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	233/1666	4.65	4.16	4.27	4.18	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1406	4.82	4.23	4.32	4.22	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1615	4.56	4.02	4.24	4.18	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	170/1566	4.53	3.89	4.07	4.04	4.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	421/1528	4.19	3.90	4.12	4.07	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	208/1650	4.89	4.26	4.22	4.12	4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.50	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	278/1626	4.44	4.04	4.11	4.06	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1559	4.88	4.38	4.46	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1560	4.94	4.60	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	488/1549	4.46	4.16	4.31	4.25	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	310/1546	4.54	4.23	4.32	4.24	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	144/1323	4.56	3.72	4.00	3.99	4.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	820/1384	4.00	3.82	4.10	4.12	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	603/1378	4.31	3.94	4.29	4.30	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	867/1378	4.25	4.07	4.31	4.33	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 904	4.50	3.83	4.03	4.03	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ECON 302 0201  
 Title INTERMED ACCOUNTING II  
 Instructor: CROTEAU, MARCIA  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 540  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	4	12	4.59	578/1670	4.79	4.13	4.31	4.24	4.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	12	4.47	670/1666	4.65	4.16	4.27	4.18	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	13	4.65	447/1406	4.82	4.23	4.32	4.22	4.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	4	9	4.12	1018/1615	4.56	4.02	4.24	4.18	4.12
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	3	10	4.24	664/1566	4.53	3.89	4.07	4.04	4.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	5	5	5	3.88	1063/1528	4.19	3.90	4.12	4.07	3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	95/1650	4.89	4.26	4.22	4.12	4.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.50	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	774/1626	4.44	4.04	4.11	4.06	4.21
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	521/1559	4.88	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	673/1560	4.94	4.60	4.72	4.67	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	5	8	4.25	977/1549	4.46	4.16	4.31	4.25	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	4	9	4.25	987/1546	4.54	4.23	4.32	4.24	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	1	1	5	7	4.29	522/1323	4.56	3.72	4.00	3.99	4.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	820/1384	4.00	3.82	4.10	4.12	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	923/1378	4.31	3.94	4.29	4.30	4.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	867/1378	4.25	4.07	4.31	4.33	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	461/ 904	4.50	3.83	4.03	4.03	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 311 0101  
 Title INTERM MICROECON ANALY  
 Instructor: BRADLEY, MICHAEL  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 541  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	363/1670	4.45	4.13	4.31	4.24	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	1	8	4.42	767/1666	4.30	4.16	4.27	4.18	4.42	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	597/1406	4.39	4.23	4.32	4.22	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	813/1615	4.10	4.02	4.24	4.18	4.30	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	295/1566	4.05	3.89	4.07	4.04	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	532/1528	4.11	3.90	4.12	4.07	4.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	457/1650	4.37	4.26	4.22	4.12	4.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	1246/1667	4.61	4.50	4.67	4.67	4.42	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	403/1626	4.27	4.04	4.11	4.06	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1559	4.65	4.38	4.46	4.40	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1560	4.78	4.60	4.72	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	683/1549	4.36	4.16	4.31	4.25	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	208/1546	4.47	4.23	4.32	4.24	4.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	326/1323	4.05	3.72	4.00	3.99	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	184/1384	4.48	3.82	4.10	4.12	4.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	400/1378	4.31	3.94	4.29	4.30	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	439/1378	4.39	4.07	4.31	4.33	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	202/ 904	3.80	3.83	4.03	4.03	4.60	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	10
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 311 0201  
 Title INTERM MICROECON ANALY  
 Instructor: BRADLEY, MICHAEL  
 Enrollment: 31  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 542  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	9	4	4.00	1216/1670	4.45	4.13	4.31	4.24	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	3	6	3.93	1282/1666	4.30	4.16	4.27	4.18	3.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	4	7	4.13	972/1406	4.39	4.23	4.32	4.22	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	1	4	3	2	3.60	1418/1615	4.10	4.02	4.24	4.18	3.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	5	3	3	3.27	1402/1566	4.05	3.89	4.07	4.04	3.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	1245/1528	4.11	3.90	4.12	4.07	3.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	3	7	4	3.87	1298/1650	4.37	4.26	4.22	4.12	3.87
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	472/1667	4.61	4.50	4.67	4.67	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	1	3	4	3	3.82	1210/1626	4.27	4.04	4.11	4.06	3.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	1	4	8	4.20	1199/1559	4.65	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	985/1560	4.78	4.60	4.72	4.67	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	4	2	7	3.87	1256/1549	4.36	4.16	4.31	4.25	3.87
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	6	3	5	3.73	1301/1546	4.47	4.23	4.32	4.24	3.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	857/1323	4.05	3.72	4.00	3.99	3.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	820/1384	4.48	3.82	4.10	4.12	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	860/1378	4.31	3.94	4.29	4.30	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	977/1378	4.39	4.07	4.31	4.33	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 904	3.80	3.83	4.03	4.03	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B 2	Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 3	General 0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D 1	Under-grad 15
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Non-major 11
				P 0	Electives 0
				I 0	Other 13
				? 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ECON 311 0301  
 Title INTERM MICROECON ANALY  
 Instructor: TAKACS, WENDY E  
 Enrollment: 42  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 543  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	2	6	15	4.46	737/1670	4.45	4.13	4.31	4.24	4.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	4	4	14	4.21	1027/1666	4.30	4.16	4.27	4.18	4.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	3	2	7	12	4.17	948/1406	4.39	4.23	4.32	4.22	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	2	3	3	10	4.17	972/1615	4.10	4.02	4.24	4.18	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	2	0	6	10	4.16	743/1566	4.05	3.89	4.07	4.04	4.16
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	12	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	706/1528	4.11	3.90	4.12	4.07	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	2	7	13	4.25	903/1650	4.37	4.26	4.22	4.12	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	607/1667	4.61	4.50	4.67	4.67	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	4	7	7	4.17	831/1626	4.27	4.04	4.11	4.06	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	7	16	4.63	739/1559	4.65	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	9	15	4.63	1138/1560	4.78	4.60	4.72	4.67	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	4	4	15	4.48	722/1549	4.36	4.16	4.31	4.25	4.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	6	15	4.46	782/1546	4.47	4.23	4.32	4.24	4.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	10	1	0	3	1	6	4.00	692/1323	4.05	3.72	4.00	3.99	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	285/1384	4.48	3.82	4.10	4.12	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	1	0	1	0	6	4.25	860/1378	4.31	3.94	4.29	4.30	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	481/1378	4.39	4.07	4.31	4.33	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	18	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/ 904	3.80	3.83	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	3.99	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	3.33	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	25	Non-major	20
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	589/1670	4.45	4.13	4.31	4.24	4.58	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	12	4.63	452/1666	4.30	4.16	4.27	4.18	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	295/1406	4.39	4.23	4.32	4.22	4.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	775/1615	4.10	4.02	4.24	4.18	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	790/1566	4.05	3.89	4.07	4.04	4.10	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	760/1528	4.11	3.90	4.12	4.07	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	246/1650	4.37	4.26	4.22	4.12	4.79	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	16	3	4.16	1437/1667	4.61	4.50	4.67	4.67	4.16	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	324/1626	4.27	4.04	4.11	4.06	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	486/1559	4.65	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	911/1560	4.78	4.60	4.72	4.67	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	586/1549	4.36	4.16	4.31	4.25	4.59	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	382/1546	4.47	4.23	4.32	4.24	4.78	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	10	1	0	0	4	2	3.86	857/1323	4.05	3.72	4.00	3.99	3.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	608/1384	4.48	3.82	4.10	4.12	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	970/1378	4.31	3.94	4.29	4.30	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	2	0	2	5	4.11	942/1378	4.39	4.07	4.31	4.33	4.11	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	4	1	0	3	0	1	3.00	820/ 904	3.80	3.83	4.03	4.03	3.00	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	3.99	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.68	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.38	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	3.33	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	2.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 7			
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 6	General	1	Under-grad 19 Non-major 18
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0			
			I 0	Other	14	
			? 0			



Course-Section: ECON 312 0101  
 Title INTERM MACROECON ANALY  
 Instructor: CINYABUGUMA, MA  
 Enrollment: 33  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 545  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	7	6	8	3.91	1344/1670	4.11	4.13	4.31	4.24	3.91	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	4	9	5	3.76	1403/1666	3.95	4.16	4.27	4.18	3.76	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	5	11	4.18	932/1406	4.09	4.23	4.32	4.22	4.18	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	1	1	3	5	4	3.71	1349/1615	3.87	4.02	4.24	4.18	3.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	6	6	6	3.62	1225/1566	3.78	3.89	4.07	4.04	3.62	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	1	5	4	5	3.87	1072/1528	3.80	3.90	4.12	4.07	3.87	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	5	5	2	10	3.77	1347/1650	4.18	4.26	4.22	4.12	3.77	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	17	5	4.23	1388/1667	4.10	4.50	4.67	4.67	4.23	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	6	6	2	3.71	1282/1626	3.80	4.04	4.11	4.06	3.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	4	7	7	4.17	1218/1559	4.29	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.17	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	4	3	11	4.39	1340/1560	4.56	4.60	4.72	4.67	4.39	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	8	2	8	4.00	1146/1549	4.02	4.16	4.31	4.25	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	5	5	8	4.17	1056/1546	4.22	4.23	4.32	4.24	4.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	11	2	1	1	0	3	3.14	1161/1323	3.64	3.72	4.00	3.99	3.14	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	6	2	3	3.50	1103/1384	3.55	3.82	4.10	4.12	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	2	2	3	4	3.58	1163/1378	3.73	3.94	4.29	4.30	3.58	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	1	4	4	2	3.42	1225/1378	3.82	4.07	4.31	4.33	3.42	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	8	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 904	****	3.83	4.03	4.03	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 7		Graduate
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 22
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	15
			? 0		

Course-Section: ECON 312 0201  
 Title INTERM MACROECON ANALY  
 Instructor: ROSE, MORGAN  
 Enrollment: 32  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 546  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	1	6	6	4.00	1216/1670	4.11	4.13	4.31	4.24	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	7	5	4.00	1199/1666	3.95	4.16	4.27	4.18	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	5	4	4	3.79	1194/1406	4.09	4.23	4.32	4.22	3.79
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	7	3	3.87	1258/1615	3.87	4.02	4.24	4.18	3.87
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	4	0	6	4	3.71	1173/1566	3.78	3.89	4.07	4.04	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	5	5	2	3.54	1261/1528	3.80	3.90	4.12	4.07	3.54
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	630/1650	4.18	4.26	4.22	4.12	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	5	4.33	1310/1667	4.10	4.50	4.67	4.67	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	3	6	1	3.64	1329/1626	3.80	4.04	4.11	4.06	3.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	1150/1559	4.29	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	1114/1560	4.56	4.60	4.72	4.67	4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	5	4	3	3.57	1372/1549	4.02	4.16	4.31	4.25	3.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	4	6	4.00	1139/1546	4.22	4.23	4.32	4.24	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	0	1	3	1	0	3.00	1179/1323	3.64	3.72	4.00	3.99	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1384	3.55	3.82	4.10	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1378	3.73	3.94	4.29	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1378	3.82	4.07	4.31	4.33	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	6	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	10
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 312 0301  
 Title INTERM MACROECON ANALY  
 Instructor: THOMAS, MARK S  
 Enrollment: 40  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 547  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	4	13	7	3.92	1318/1670	4.11	4.13	4.31	4.24	3.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	6	9	9	3.92	1294/1666	3.95	4.16	4.27	4.18	3.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	3	11	10	4.29	844/1406	4.09	4.23	4.32	4.22	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	18	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	1405/1615	3.87	4.02	4.24	4.18	3.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	13	0	2	4	3	3	3.58	1241/1566	3.78	3.89	4.07	4.04	3.58
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	20	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	****/1528	3.80	3.90	4.12	4.07	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	2	8	14	4.36	769/1650	4.18	4.26	4.22	4.12	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	0	20	4	4.04	1503/1667	4.10	4.50	4.67	4.67	4.04
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	1	0	7	7	2	3.53	1376/1626	3.80	4.04	4.11	4.06	3.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	5	5	13	4.12	1243/1559	4.29	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.12
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	4	8	12	4.20	1427/1560	4.56	4.60	4.72	4.67	4.20
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	4	13	7	4.00	1146/1549	4.02	4.16	4.31	4.25	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	4	9	10	4.04	1124/1546	4.22	4.23	4.32	4.24	4.04
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	2	4	5	10	3.95	756/1323	3.64	3.72	4.00	3.99	3.95
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	2	0	1	3	1	3.14	1239/1384	3.55	3.82	4.10	4.12	3.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	2	0	3	0	2	3.00	1297/1378	3.73	3.94	4.29	4.30	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	1	2	4	0	3.43	1221/1378	3.82	4.07	4.31	4.33	3.43
4. Were special techniques successful	19	5	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 904	****	3.83	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	3.99	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	26	Non-major	22
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 312 0401  
 Title INTERM MACROECON ANALY  
 Instructor: CARPENTER, ROBE  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 548  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	557/1670	4.11	4.13	4.31	4.24	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	1136/1666	3.95	4.16	4.27	4.18	4.10	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	2	4.10	997/1406	4.09	4.23	4.32	4.22	4.10	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	837/1615	3.87	4.02	4.24	4.18	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	706/1566	3.78	3.89	4.07	4.04	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	899/1528	3.80	3.90	4.12	4.07	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	1067/1650	4.18	4.26	4.22	4.12	4.11	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	8	0	3.80	1625/1667	4.10	4.50	4.67	4.67	3.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	637/1626	3.80	4.04	4.11	4.06	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	739/1559	4.29	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1560	4.56	4.60	4.72	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	683/1549	4.02	4.16	4.31	4.25	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	520/1546	4.22	4.23	4.32	4.24	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	384/1323	3.64	3.72	4.00	3.99	4.44	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	820/1384	3.55	3.82	4.10	4.12	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	525/1378	3.73	3.94	4.29	4.30	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	590/1378	3.82	4.07	4.31	4.33	4.60	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	3.99	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ECON 320 0101  
 Title QUANT MTHDS:MANAGEMENT  
 Instructor: PALMATEER, JASO  
 Enrollment: 81  
 Questionnaires: 44

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 549  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	0	7	13	22	4.20	1049/1670	4.20	4.13	4.31	4.24	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	7	15	21	4.25	967/1666	4.25	4.16	4.27	4.18	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	6	13	21	4.14	972/1406	4.14	4.23	4.32	4.22	4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	2	5	14	15	4.08	1039/1615	4.08	4.02	4.24	4.18	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	10	4	3	10	4	12	3.52	1279/1566	3.52	3.89	4.07	4.04	3.52
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	3	3	6	13	11	3.72	1170/1528	3.72	3.90	4.12	4.07	3.72
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	3	10	26	4.33	819/1650	4.33	4.26	4.22	4.12	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	1	30	11	4.19	1416/1667	4.19	4.50	4.67	4.67	4.19
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	1	1	7	21	5	3.80	1220/1626	3.80	4.04	4.11	4.06	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	6	11	22	4.41	1009/1559	4.41	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	1	3	12	23	4.46	1279/1560	4.46	4.60	4.72	4.67	4.46
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	4	14	20	4.36	876/1549	4.36	4.16	4.31	4.25	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	3	5	8	23	4.31	949/1546	4.31	4.23	4.32	4.24	4.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	3	0	7	6	7	12	3.75	917/1323	3.75	3.72	4.00	3.99	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	27	0	2	0	3	5	7	3.88	940/1384	3.88	3.82	4.10	4.12	3.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	27	0	1	0	3	5	8	4.12	927/1378	4.12	3.94	4.29	4.30	4.12
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	27	0	1	1	3	5	7	3.94	1023/1378	3.94	4.07	4.31	4.33	3.94
4. Were special techniques successful	27	5	1	1	1	3	6	4.00	461/ 904	4.00	3.83	4.03	4.03	4.00
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.68	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.51	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 17	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0	Major 11
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 15			
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	7	C 3	General 3	Under-grad 44	Non-major 33
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	9	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 31		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ECON 374 0101  
 Title FUND FINANCIAL MGMT  
 Instructor: THOMAS, MARK S  
 Enrollment: 34  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 550  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	4	7	5	3.94	1292/1670	4.27	4.13	4.31	4.24	3.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	6	6	5	3.94	1270/1666	4.47	4.16	4.27	4.18	3.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	775/1406	4.68	4.23	4.32	4.22	4.35
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	9	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1083/1615	3.90	4.02	4.24	4.18	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	5	1	0	3	3	4	3.82	1098/1566	3.63	3.89	4.07	4.04	3.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	11	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	1328/1528	3.90	3.90	4.12	4.07	3.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	831/1650	4.66	4.26	4.22	4.12	4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	842/1667	4.86	4.50	4.67	4.67	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	953/1626	4.33	4.04	4.11	4.06	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	858/1559	4.72	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	1163/1560	4.63	4.60	4.72	4.67	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	736/1549	4.58	4.16	4.31	4.25	4.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	919/1546	4.62	4.23	4.32	4.24	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	0	2	3	8	4.21	575/1323	4.41	3.72	4.00	3.99	4.21
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	2	3	3	3.78	987/1384	4.25	3.82	4.10	4.12	3.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	1064/1378	4.23	3.94	4.29	4.30	3.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	1	2	3	2	3.44	1213/1378	4.01	4.07	4.31	4.33	3.44
4. Were special techniques successful	9	5	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 904	****	3.83	4.03	4.03	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors					
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 0	Graduate	0	Major	1	
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 2	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P 0						
				I 0	Other	14				
				? 0						

Course-Section: ECON 374 0201  
 Title FUND FINANCIAL MGMT  
 Instructor: THOMAS, MARK S  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 551  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	557/1670	4.27	4.13	4.31	4.24	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1666	4.47	4.16	4.27	4.18	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1406	4.68	4.23	4.32	4.22	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	1294/1615	3.90	4.02	4.24	4.18	3.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	3	1	3	3.44	1322/1566	3.63	3.89	4.07	4.04	3.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	560/1528	3.90	3.90	4.12	4.07	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1650	4.66	4.26	4.22	4.12	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	675/1667	4.86	4.50	4.67	4.67	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	278/1626	4.33	4.04	4.11	4.06	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	276/1559	4.72	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	1090/1560	4.63	4.60	4.72	4.67	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	451/1549	4.58	4.16	4.31	4.25	4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	231/1546	4.62	4.23	4.32	4.24	4.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	273/1323	4.41	3.72	4.00	3.99	4.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	285/1384	4.25	3.82	4.10	4.12	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	548/1378	4.23	3.94	4.29	4.30	4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	608/1378	4.01	4.07	4.31	4.33	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 904	****	3.83	4.03	4.03	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3	Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C 0	General 0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D 0	Under-grad 10
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Non-major 10
				P 0	Electives 0
				I 0	Other 8
				? 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ECON 387 0101  
 Title ECON DEVEL LATIN AMER  
 Instructor: GINDLING, THOMA  
 Enrollment: 41  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 552  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	1	8	14	4.57	600/1670	4.57	4.13	4.31	4.24	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	8	14	4.57	542/1666	4.57	4.16	4.27	4.18	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	7	14	4.52	576/1406	4.52	4.23	4.32	4.22	4.52
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	3	4	15	4.55	509/1615	4.55	4.02	4.24	4.18	4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	4	7	11	4.32	579/1566	4.32	3.89	4.07	4.04	4.32
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	7	14	4.59	353/1528	4.59	3.90	4.12	4.07	4.59
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	9	12	4.43	675/1650	4.43	4.26	4.22	4.12	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	10	12	4.55	1127/1667	4.55	4.50	4.67	4.67	4.55
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	2	1	0	1	6	8	4.25	728/1626	4.25	4.04	4.11	4.06	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	521/1559	4.75	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	1054/1560	4.70	4.60	4.72	4.67	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	562/1549	4.60	4.16	4.31	4.25	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	595/1546	4.60	4.23	4.32	4.24	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	9	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	692/1323	4.00	3.72	4.00	3.99	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	589/1384	4.36	3.82	4.10	4.12	4.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	695/1378	4.43	3.94	4.29	4.30	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	795/1378	4.36	4.07	4.31	4.33	4.36
4. Were special techniques successful	12	6	1	2	1	0	3	3.29	790/ 904	3.29	3.83	4.03	4.03	3.29

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	4	Under-grad	25	Non-major	17
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						



Course-Section: ECON 408 0101  
 Title: MANAGERIAL ECONOMICS  
 Instructor: DICKSON, LISA  
 Enrollment: 42  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 553  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	1	2	5	13	4.43	780/1670	4.43	4.13	4.31	4.45	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	5	13	4.48	670/1666	4.48	4.16	4.27	4.35	4.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	0	1	6	13	4.43	691/1406	4.43	4.23	4.32	4.48	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	1	1	4	3	10	4.05	1055/1615	4.05	4.02	4.24	4.37	4.05
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	5	8	6	3.95	930/1566	3.95	3.89	4.07	4.17	3.95
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	6	7	6	3.90	1039/1528	3.90	3.90	4.12	4.26	3.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	2	7	11	4.45	660/1650	4.45	4.26	4.22	4.28	4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	17	4	4.19	1409/1667	4.19	4.50	4.67	4.73	4.19
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	6	11	4.40	563/1626	4.40	4.04	4.11	4.28	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	3	3	13	4.40	1022/1559	4.40	4.38	4.46	4.58	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	4	3	13	4.45	1294/1560	4.45	4.60	4.72	4.80	4.45
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	3	3	2	12	4.15	1061/1549	4.15	4.16	4.31	4.43	4.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	5	1	14	4.45	795/1546	4.45	4.23	4.32	4.43	4.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	16	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	****/1323	****	3.72	4.00	4.10	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	530/1384	4.42	3.82	4.10	4.32	4.42
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	540/1378	4.58	3.94	4.29	4.55	4.58
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	439/1378	4.75	4.07	4.31	4.60	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	1	3	1	5	4.00	461/ 904	4.00	3.83	4.03	4.22	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	A 11	Required for Majors	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 3
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 5	General	4
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 20
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	14
			? 0		

Course-Section: ECON 410 0101  
 Title TOPICS IN FIN ECON  
 Instructor: ROSE, MORGAN  
 Enrollment: 41  
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 554  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	5	10	14	4.16	1094/1670	4.16	4.13	4.31	4.45	4.16
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	4	7	17	4.23	1003/1666	4.23	4.16	4.27	4.35	4.23
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	11	16	4.39	739/1406	4.39	4.23	4.32	4.48	4.39
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	19	0	1	3	5	3	3.83	1276/1615	3.83	4.02	4.24	4.37	3.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	6	9	12	4.11	790/1566	4.11	3.89	4.07	4.17	4.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	27	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/1528	****	3.90	4.12	4.26	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	2	1	8	18	4.33	806/1650	4.33	4.26	4.22	4.28	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	18	13	4.42	1246/1667	4.42	4.50	4.67	4.73	4.42
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	4	16	5	3.96	1021/1626	3.96	4.04	4.11	4.28	3.96
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	8	22	4.68	656/1559	4.68	4.38	4.46	4.58	4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	1	10	19	4.48	1263/1560	4.48	4.60	4.72	4.80	4.48
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	7	6	17	4.26	977/1549	4.26	4.16	4.31	4.43	4.26
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	9	20	4.58	619/1546	4.58	4.23	4.32	4.43	4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	25	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	****/1323	****	3.72	4.00	4.10	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	2	2	2	2	3.50	1103/1384	3.50	3.82	4.10	4.32	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	0	2	0	4	2	3.75	1110/1378	3.75	3.94	4.29	4.55	3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	0	2	1	2	3	3.75	1110/1378	3.75	4.07	4.31	4.60	3.75
4. Were special techniques successful	22	8	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 904	****	3.83	4.03	4.22	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 16	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 1	B 9		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 1	C 2	General 5	Under-grad 31 Non-major 30
84-150	19	3.00-3.49 6	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 14	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 25	
			? 2		

Course-Section: ECON 414 0101  
 Title ECON OF ANTITRUST & RE  
 Instructor: CARROLL, KATHLE  
 Enrollment: 34  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 555  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	7	13	4.38	849/1670	4.38	4.13	4.31	4.45	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	6	5	12	4.26	955/1666	4.26	4.16	4.27	4.35	4.26
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	7	11	4.22	908/1406	4.22	4.23	4.32	4.48	4.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	2	3	10	5	3.90	1234/1615	3.90	4.02	4.24	4.37	3.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	8	4	4	4	3.10	1461/1566	3.10	3.89	4.07	4.17	3.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	5	8	7	3.91	1039/1528	3.91	3.90	4.12	4.26	3.91
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	9	10	4.22	950/1650	4.22	4.26	4.22	4.28	4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	338/1667	4.96	4.50	4.67	4.73	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	1	12	6	4.15	843/1626	4.15	4.04	4.11	4.28	4.15
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	19	4.78	469/1559	4.78	4.38	4.46	4.58	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	298/1560	4.96	4.60	4.72	4.80	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	5	15	4.48	722/1549	4.48	4.16	4.31	4.43	4.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	5	14	4.35	909/1546	4.35	4.23	4.32	4.43	4.35
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	16	3	0	0	1	2	2.83	1236/1323	2.83	3.72	4.00	4.10	2.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	740/1384	4.17	3.82	4.10	4.32	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	316/1378	4.83	3.94	4.29	4.55	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	653/1378	4.50	4.07	4.31	4.60	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	1	0	0	5	6	4.25	373/ 904	4.25	3.83	4.03	4.22	4.25
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.26	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	6	General	6	Under-grad	24	Non-major	16
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	3	8	7	4.11	1162/1670	4.11	4.13	4.31	4.45	4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	1	8	8	4.16	1081/1666	4.16	4.16	4.27	4.35	4.16
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	1	5	11	4.44	667/1406	4.44	4.23	4.32	4.48	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	3	0	3	3	4	5	3.73	1337/1615	3.73	4.02	4.24	4.37	3.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	0	1	3	6	4	3.93	978/1566	3.93	3.89	4.07	4.17	3.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	1	1	4	4	5	3.73	1164/1528	3.73	3.90	4.12	4.26	3.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	2	7	8	4.22	938/1650	4.22	4.26	4.22	4.28	4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	11	7	4.39	1271/1667	4.39	4.50	4.67	4.73	4.39
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	2	1	4	8	4.20	797/1626	4.20	4.04	4.11	4.28	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	739/1559	4.63	4.38	4.46	4.58	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	1066/1560	4.69	4.60	4.72	4.80	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	3	1	2	10	4.19	1036/1549	4.19	4.16	4.31	4.43	4.19
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	0	1	2	11	4.25	987/1546	4.25	4.23	4.32	4.43	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	10	0	2	1	2	1	3.33	1099/1323	3.33	3.72	4.00	4.10	3.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	820/1384	4.00	3.82	4.10	4.32	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	481/1378	4.67	3.94	4.29	4.55	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	813/1378	4.33	4.07	4.31	4.60	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	14	3	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 904	****	3.83	4.03	4.22	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.26	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.30	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.24	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	4.09	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.80	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.60	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.56	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.67	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.98	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.36	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.58	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.02	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.49	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.80	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: ECON 421 0101  
 Title INTRO TO ECONOMETRICS  
 Instructor: DASGUPTA, NANDI  
 Enrollment: 39  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 556  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	3	Under-grad	20	Non-major	17
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 439 0101  
 Title ENVIRONMENTAL ECONOMIC  
 Instructor: MCCONNELL, VIRG  
 Enrollment: 43  
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 557  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies						Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean	
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean						Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	4	10	10	8	3.53	1531/1670	3.53	4.13	4.31	4.45	3.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	6	10	11	5	3.32	1567/1666	3.32	4.16	4.27	4.35	3.32
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	4	9	13	6	3.50	1275/1406	3.50	4.23	4.32	4.48	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	2	13	10	6	3.56	1430/1615	3.56	4.02	4.24	4.37	3.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	6	10	9	7	3.38	1355/1566	3.38	3.89	4.07	4.17	3.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	0	13	9	5	3.61	1233/1528	3.61	3.90	4.12	4.26	3.61
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	9	12	12	4.03	1123/1650	4.03	4.26	4.22	4.28	4.03
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	30	4.88	712/1667	4.88	4.50	4.67	4.73	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	2	2	13	7	5	3.38	1448/1626	3.38	4.04	4.11	4.28	3.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	3	10	7	12	3.71	1421/1559	3.71	4.38	4.46	4.58	3.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	30	4.88	647/1560	4.88	4.60	4.72	4.80	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	8	12	4	9	3.35	1440/1549	3.35	4.16	4.31	4.43	3.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	3	11	8	9	3.50	1379/1546	3.50	4.23	4.32	4.43	3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	21	4	3	1	2	2	2.58	1265/1323	2.58	3.72	4.00	4.10	2.58
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	2	6	3	5	3.53	1093/1384	3.53	3.82	4.10	4.32	3.53
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	8	0	9	4.06	951/1378	4.06	3.94	4.29	4.55	4.06
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	1	5	2	9	4.12	942/1378	4.12	4.07	4.31	4.60	4.12
4. Were special techniques successful	17	3	0	2	8	1	3	3.36	774/ 904	3.36	3.83	4.03	4.22	3.36

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 1 Major 16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 22		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 5	C 4	General 8	Under-grad 33 Non-major 18
84-150	12	3.00-3.49 9	D 0		
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 20	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ECON 451 0101  
 Title LABOR ECONOMICS  
 Instructor: DICKSON, LISA  
 Enrollment: 40  
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 558  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies						Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean	
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean						Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	3	3	10	12	4.00	1216/1670	4.00	4.13	4.31	4.45	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	3	6	7	11	3.76	1409/1666	3.76	4.16	4.27	4.35	3.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	2	5	7	12	3.79	1190/1406	3.79	4.23	4.32	4.48	3.79
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	8	2	4	2	5	7	3.55	1433/1615	3.55	4.02	4.24	4.37	3.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	5	3	9	6	6	3.17	1437/1566	3.17	3.89	4.07	4.17	3.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	2	2	4	5	5	3.50	1274/1528	3.50	3.90	4.12	4.26	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	4	10	11	3.93	1235/1650	3.93	4.26	4.22	4.28	3.93
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	29	0	4.00	1524/1667	4.00	4.50	4.67	4.73	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	4	7	7	5	3.46	1411/1626	3.46	4.04	4.11	4.28	3.46
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	7	6	15	4.17	1211/1559	4.17	4.38	4.46	4.58	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	7	21	4.69	1066/1560	4.69	4.60	4.72	4.80	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	4	8	7	10	3.79	1289/1549	3.79	4.16	4.31	4.43	3.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	4	7	15	4.18	1048/1546	4.18	4.23	4.32	4.43	4.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	22	2	2	2	0	1	2.43	****/1323	****	3.72	4.00	4.10	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	3	3	7	3	3.33	1171/1384	3.33	3.82	4.10	4.32	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	2	0	5	11	4.39	740/1378	4.39	3.94	4.29	4.55	4.39
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	711/1378	4.44	4.07	4.31	4.60	4.44
4. Were special techniques successful	11	6	2	1	6	3	0	2.83	850/ 904	2.83	3.83	4.03	4.22	2.83

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 4 Major 14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 10		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 6	C 8	General 6	Under-grad 25 Non-major 15
84-150	16	3.00-3.49 6	D 1		
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 22	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ECON 463 0101  
 Title THEORY OF PUBLIC FINAN  
 Instructor: COATES, DENNIS  
 Enrollment: 40  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 559  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	388/1670	4.74	4.13	4.31	4.45	4.74	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	11	4.47	670/1666	4.47	4.16	4.27	4.35	4.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	10	4.37	763/1406	4.37	4.23	4.32	4.48	4.37	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	7	8	4.28	849/1615	4.28	4.02	4.24	4.37	4.28	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	3	1	4	5	3	3.25	1406/1566	3.25	3.89	4.07	4.17	3.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	8	3	6	3.72	1170/1528	3.72	3.90	4.12	4.26	3.72	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	17	4.84	201/1650	4.84	4.26	4.22	4.28	4.84	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	405/1667	4.95	4.50	4.67	4.73	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	10	5	4.25	728/1626	4.25	4.04	4.11	4.28	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	291/1559	4.89	4.38	4.46	4.58	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	621/1560	4.89	4.60	4.72	4.80	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	323/1549	4.79	4.16	4.31	4.43	4.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	370/1546	4.79	4.23	4.32	4.43	4.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	11	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	545/1323	4.25	3.72	4.00	4.10	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	2	3	2	2	3.20	1216/1384	3.20	3.82	4.10	4.32	3.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	932/1378	4.10	3.94	4.29	4.55	4.10	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	840/1378	4.30	4.07	4.31	4.60	4.30	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	7	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 904	****	3.83	4.03	4.22	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 7		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	3
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 19
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	11
			? 2		

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant



Course-Section: ECON 467 0101  
 Title HEALTH ECONOMICS  
 Instructor: MA, BING  
 Enrollment: 36  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 560  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	0	2	6	11	4.14	1116/1670	4.14	4.13	4.31	4.45	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	4	12	4.19	1037/1666	4.19	4.16	4.27	4.35	4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	1	3	15	4.38	739/1406	4.38	4.23	4.32	4.48	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	1	4	2	6	3.79	1306/1615	3.79	4.02	4.24	4.37	3.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	0	4	4	9	3.95	946/1566	3.95	3.89	4.07	4.17	3.95
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	760/1528	4.20	3.90	4.12	4.26	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	5	13	4.33	806/1650	4.33	4.26	4.22	4.28	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	17	3	4.10	1477/1667	4.10	4.50	4.67	4.73	4.10
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	0	8	7	4.25	728/1626	4.25	4.04	4.11	4.28	4.25
-----														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	0	1	6	12	4.24	1171/1559	4.24	4.38	4.46	4.58	4.24
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	1	1	5	13	4.33	1376/1560	4.33	4.60	4.72	4.80	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	0	2	3	14	4.29	952/1549	4.29	4.16	4.31	4.43	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	1	4	14	4.33	919/1546	4.33	4.23	4.32	4.43	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	12	2	1	2	1	2	3.00	1179/1323	3.00	3.72	4.00	4.10	3.00
-----														
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	1	2	6	4.20	712/1384	4.20	3.82	4.10	4.32	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	0	3	2	4	3.80	1092/1378	3.80	3.94	4.29	4.55	3.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	1	1	7	4.30	840/1378	4.30	4.07	4.31	4.60	4.30
4. Were special techniques successful	11	6	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/ 904	****	3.83	4.03	4.22	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 1	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 11					
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	5	C 1	General	5	Under-grad	21	Non-major 17
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	4	D 0					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		
				P 0					
				I 0	Other	12			
				? 0					

Course-Section: ECON 471 0101  
 Title MONEY & CAPITAL MARKET  
 Instructor: CARPENTER, ROBE  
 Enrollment: 36  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 561  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	206/1670	4.91	4.13	4.31	4.45	4.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	10	10	4.27	943/1666	4.27	4.16	4.27	4.35	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	14	4.59	505/1406	4.59	4.23	4.32	4.48	4.59
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	17	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/1615	****	4.02	4.24	4.37	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	3	5	12	4.29	610/1566	4.29	3.89	4.07	4.17	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	3	16	4.55	513/1650	4.55	4.26	4.22	4.28	4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	18	3	4.09	1477/1667	4.09	4.50	4.67	4.73	4.09
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	10	7	4.41	547/1626	4.41	4.04	4.11	4.28	4.41
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	623/1559	4.70	4.38	4.46	4.58	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.60	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	683/1549	4.50	4.16	4.31	4.43	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	2	16	4.60	595/1546	4.60	4.23	4.32	4.43	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	1	5	4	9	4.11	656/1323	4.11	3.72	4.00	4.10	4.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	2	1	1	3	3.71	1013/1384	3.71	3.82	4.10	4.32	3.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	295/1378	4.86	3.94	4.29	4.55	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	333/1378	4.86	4.07	4.31	4.60	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	15	6	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 904	****	3.83	4.03	4.22	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.80	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors					
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 4						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C 2	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	21
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	5	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P 0						
				I 0	Other	20				
				? 2						

Course-Section: ECON 475 0101  
 Title FINANCIAL INVSTMT ANA  
 Instructor: COATES, DENNIS  
 Enrollment: 40  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 562  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	1	1	9	12	4.12	1139/1670	4.12	4.13	4.31	4.45	4.12
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	7	14	4.24	991/1666	4.24	4.16	4.27	4.35	4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	2	4	16	4.28	852/1406	4.28	4.23	4.32	4.48	4.28
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	2	2	10	7	3.91	1234/1615	3.91	4.02	4.24	4.37	3.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	1	3	7	10	4.24	664/1566	4.24	3.89	4.07	4.17	4.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	2	13	6	3.91	1025/1528	3.91	3.90	4.12	4.26	3.91
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	0	0	5	17	4.61	429/1650	4.61	4.26	4.22	4.28	4.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	338/1667	4.95	4.50	4.67	4.73	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	1	3	10	4	3.94	1055/1626	3.94	4.04	4.11	4.28	3.94
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	3	5	14	4.50	896/1559	4.50	4.38	4.46	4.58	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	0	2	5	14	4.41	1326/1560	4.41	4.60	4.72	4.80	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	2	1	9	9	4.19	1027/1549	4.19	4.16	4.31	4.43	4.19
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	1	6	13	4.32	939/1546	4.32	4.23	4.32	4.43	4.32
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	19	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/1323	****	3.72	4.00	4.10	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	1049/1384	3.63	3.82	4.10	4.32	3.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	1	0	3	1	3	3.63	1150/1378	3.63	3.94	4.29	4.55	3.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	1	3	1	3	3.75	1110/1378	3.75	4.07	4.31	4.60	3.75
4. Were special techniques successful	17	5	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 904	****	3.83	4.03	4.22	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 2	Major 3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 10			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C 3	General 1	Under-grad 23	Non-major 22
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	5	D 0			
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 22		
				? 3			

Course-Section: ECON 478 0101  
 Title REAL ESTATE ECON AND F  
 Instructor: GETTER, DARYL  
 Enrollment: 60  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 563  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	1	3	22	4.57	589/1670	4.57	4.13	4.31	4.45	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	3	5	18	4.32	883/1666	4.32	4.16	4.27	4.35	4.32
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	2	4	2	17	4.11	988/1406	4.11	4.23	4.32	4.48	4.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	2	0	2	5	17	4.35	762/1615	4.35	4.02	4.24	4.37	4.35
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	15	1	0	0	2	9	4.50	389/1566	4.50	3.89	4.07	4.17	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	346/1528	4.60	3.90	4.12	4.26	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	2	2	20	4.41	720/1650	4.41	4.26	4.22	4.28	4.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.50	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	1	2	6	12	4.23	762/1626	4.23	4.04	4.11	4.28	4.23
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	2	3	19	4.71	607/1559	4.71	4.38	4.46	4.58	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	536/1560	4.92	4.60	4.72	4.80	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	0	0	5	18	4.63	537/1549	4.63	4.16	4.31	4.43	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	0	3	19	4.58	619/1546	4.58	4.23	4.32	4.43	4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	13	1	0	1	1	7	4.30	507/1323	4.30	3.72	4.00	4.10	4.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	0	3	2	9	4.00	820/1384	4.00	3.82	4.10	4.32	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	1	0	0	15	4.81	337/1378	4.81	3.94	4.29	4.55	4.81
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	197/1378	4.94	4.07	4.31	4.60	4.94
4. Were special techniques successful	12	5	2	1	1	1	6	3.73	643/ 904	3.73	3.83	4.03	4.22	3.73
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.26	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.30	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.24	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	4.09	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.80	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.60	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.56	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.67	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.98	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.36	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.58	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.02	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.49	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.80	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: ECON 478 0101  
 Title REAL ESTATE ECON AND F  
 Instructor: GETTER, DARYL  
 Enrollment: 60  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 563  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	4	Under-grad	28	Non-major	26
84-150	15	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	3						

Course-Section: ECON 482 0101  
 Title INTERNATIONAL FINANCE  
 Instructor: MCINTYRE, KEVIN  
 Enrollment: 38  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 564  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	24	4.82	281/1670	4.82	4.13	4.31	4.45	4.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	25	4.86	216/1666	4.86	4.16	4.27	4.35	4.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	24	4.86	226/1406	4.86	4.23	4.32	4.48	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	2	1	2	2	15	4.23	910/1615	4.23	4.02	4.24	4.37	4.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	2	1	3	4	13	4.09	802/1566	4.09	3.89	4.07	4.17	4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	3	0	4	3	9	3.79	1134/1528	3.79	3.90	4.12	4.26	3.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	4	22	4.78	255/1650	4.78	4.26	4.22	4.28	4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	27	4.96	270/1667	4.96	4.50	4.67	4.73	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	8	13	4.48	451/1626	4.48	4.04	4.11	4.28	4.48
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	26	4.96	111/1559	4.96	4.38	4.46	4.58	4.96
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	25	4.96	239/1560	4.96	4.60	4.72	4.80	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	25	4.93	161/1549	4.93	4.16	4.31	4.43	4.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	25	4.93	185/1546	4.93	4.23	4.32	4.43	4.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	14	3	0	1	0	7	3.73	931/1323	3.73	3.72	4.00	4.10	3.73
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	2	1	1	9	4.31	638/1384	4.31	3.82	4.10	4.32	4.31
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	3	0	10	4.54	579/1378	4.54	3.94	4.29	4.55	4.54
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	580/1378	4.62	4.07	4.31	4.60	4.62
4. Were special techniques successful	17	6	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	****/ 904	****	3.83	4.03	4.22	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.26	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.30	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.24	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	4.09	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.80	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.60	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.56	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.67	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.98	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.36	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.58	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.02	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.49	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.80	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: ECON 482 0101  
 Title INTERNATIONAL FINANCE  
 Instructor: MCINTYRE, KEVIN  
 Enrollment: 38  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 564  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General	2	Under-grad	28	Non-major	19
84-150	16	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	22				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 490 0101  
 Title ANALYTIC METHODS IN EC  
 Instructor: THOMAS, MARK S  
 Enrollment: 44  
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 565  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	2	9	5	10	3.59	1516/1670	3.59	4.13	4.31	4.45	3.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	6	7	13	4.00	1199/1666	4.00	4.16	4.27	4.35	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	3	5	11	8	3.89	1142/1406	3.89	4.23	4.32	4.48	3.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	1	1	7	3	6	3.67	1380/1615	3.67	4.02	4.24	4.37	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	13	3	2	1	4	5	3.40	1348/1566	3.40	3.89	4.07	4.17	3.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	6	1	4	5	7	3.26	1396/1528	3.26	3.90	4.12	4.26	3.26
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	4	8	14	4.18	997/1650	4.18	4.26	4.22	4.28	4.18
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	1	0	0	20	4	4.04	1503/1667	4.04	4.50	4.67	4.73	4.04
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	1	3	7	10	2	3.39	1441/1626	3.39	4.04	4.11	4.28	3.39
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	3	3	19	4.50	896/1559	4.50	4.38	4.46	4.58	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	5	4	16	4.35	1369/1560	4.35	4.60	4.72	4.80	4.35
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	0	7	7	10	4.00	1146/1549	4.00	4.16	4.31	4.43	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	4	3	8	10	3.85	1256/1546	3.85	4.23	4.32	4.43	3.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	6	2	0	1	6	10	4.16	619/1323	4.16	3.72	4.00	4.10	4.16
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	1	4	2	3	3.45	1122/1384	3.45	3.82	4.10	4.32	3.45
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	1	0	4	2	4	3.73	1121/1378	3.73	3.94	4.29	4.55	3.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	1	2	3	2	3	3.36	1244/1378	3.36	4.07	4.31	4.60	3.36
4. Were special techniques successful	18	8	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 904	****	3.83	4.03	4.22	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.26	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	27	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.30	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	27	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.24	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	4.09	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.80	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.60	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.56	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.67	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.98	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.36	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.58	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.02	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.49	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.80	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****



Course-Section: ECON 490 0101  
 Title ANALYTIC METHODS IN EC  
 Instructor: THOMAS, MARK S  
 Enrollment: 44  
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 565  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	3	Under-grad	28	Non-major	25
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	20				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 600 0101  
 Title POLICY CONSQ:ECON ANAL  
 Instructor: BRENNAN, TIMOTH  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 566  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies						Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	262/1670	4.85	4.13	4.31	4.46	4.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	908/1666	4.31	4.16	4.27	4.34	4.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	1015/1406	4.08	4.23	4.32	4.36	4.08
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	775/1615	4.33	4.02	4.24	4.33	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	664/1566	4.23	3.89	4.07	4.20	4.23
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	787/1528	4.17	3.90	4.12	4.33	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	6	3	4	3.85	1309/1650	3.85	4.26	4.22	4.30	3.85
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.50	4.67	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	808/1626	4.18	4.04	4.11	4.20	4.18
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	858/1559	4.54	4.38	4.46	4.49	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.60	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	8	4	4.23	994/1549	4.23	4.16	4.31	4.37	4.23
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	9	4.46	768/1546	4.46	4.23	4.32	4.40	4.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	1143/1323	3.20	3.72	4.00	4.03	3.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	5	3	3	3.82	970/1384	3.82	3.82	4.10	4.21	3.82
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	3	2	5	4.00	970/1378	4.00	3.94	4.29	4.42	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	950/1378	4.09	4.07	4.31	4.51	4.09
4. Were special techniques successful	2	9	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 904	****	3.83	4.03	4.04	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
-----											
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	11	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	2	Non-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	11	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					5	Instructor Mean Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3								4	
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	2	2	7	3	3.79	1425/1670	3.79	4.13	4.31	4.46	3.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	1	5	3	3	3.46	1522/1666	3.46	4.16	4.27	4.34	3.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	932/1406	4.18	4.23	4.32	4.36	4.18
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	673/1615	4.42	4.02	4.24	4.33	4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	0	2	4	3	3.15	1444/1566	3.15	3.89	4.07	4.20	3.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	3	1	7	4.36	600/1528	4.36	3.90	4.12	4.33	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	0	3	2	2	4	3.64	1417/1650	3.64	4.26	4.22	4.30	3.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	1246/1667	4.42	4.50	4.67	4.74	4.42
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	4	5	0	3.56	1365/1626	3.56	4.04	4.11	4.20	3.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	2	4	5	4.00	1280/1559	4.00	4.38	4.46	4.49	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	1180/1560	4.58	4.60	4.72	4.81	4.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	3	5	3	3.75	1308/1549	3.75	4.16	4.31	4.37	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	2	5	3	3.75	1293/1546	3.75	4.23	4.32	4.40	3.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	936/1323	3.71	3.72	4.00	4.03	3.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	434/1384	4.50	3.82	4.10	4.21	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	603/1378	4.50	3.94	4.29	4.42	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	531/1378	4.67	4.07	4.31	4.51	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	289/ 904	4.40	3.83	4.03	4.04	4.40
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.30	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.53	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.69	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.58	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.61	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.66	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.58	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	4.32	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.65	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.58	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.65	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.59	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.59	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.60	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.67	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.90	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	5.00	****

Course-Section: ECON 602 0101  
 Title MACROECONOMIC ANALYSIS  
 Instructor: CINYABUGUMA, MA  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 567  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	15
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 612 0101  
 Title ECONOMETRICS II  
 Instructor: MARCOTTE, DAVID  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 568  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	589/1670	4.57	4.13	4.31	4.46	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	0	6	6	4.14	1092/1666	4.14	4.16	4.27	4.34	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	775/1406	4.36	4.23	4.32	4.36	4.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	837/1615	4.29	4.02	4.24	4.33	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	7	5	4.21	686/1566	4.21	3.89	4.07	4.20	4.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	421/1528	4.50	3.90	4.12	4.33	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	690/1650	4.43	4.26	4.22	4.30	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	992/1667	4.69	4.50	4.67	4.74	4.69
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	7	3	4.18	808/1626	4.18	4.04	4.11	4.20	4.18
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	996/1559	4.43	4.38	4.46	4.49	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	1023/1560	4.71	4.60	4.72	4.81	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	7	5	4.14	1070/1549	4.14	4.16	4.31	4.37	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	964/1546	4.29	4.23	4.32	4.40	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	456/1323	4.36	3.72	4.00	4.03	4.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	498/1384	4.44	3.82	4.10	4.21	4.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	564/1378	4.56	3.94	4.29	4.42	4.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	570/1378	4.63	4.07	4.31	4.51	4.63
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	461/ 904	4.00	3.83	4.03	4.04	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.30	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.53	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.69	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.58	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	4.47	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ECON 652 0101  
 Title ECONOMICS OF HEALTH  
 Instructor: MA, BING  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 569  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1216/1670	4.00	4.13	4.31	4.46	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1452/1666	3.67	4.16	4.27	4.34	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	799/1406	4.33	4.23	4.32	4.36	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	379/1615	4.67	4.02	4.24	4.33	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	851/1566	4.00	3.89	4.07	4.20	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	899/1528	4.00	3.90	4.12	4.33	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	1135/1650	4.00	4.26	4.22	4.30	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1524/1667	4.00	4.50	4.67	4.74	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1312/1626	3.67	4.04	4.11	4.20	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1280/1559	4.00	4.38	4.46	4.49	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1090/1560	4.67	4.60	4.72	4.81	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	1146/1549	4.00	4.16	4.31	4.37	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	520/1546	4.67	4.23	4.32	4.40	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1179/1323	3.00	3.72	4.00	4.03	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1260/1384	3.00	3.82	4.10	4.21	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1297/1378	3.00	3.94	4.29	4.42	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1189/1378	3.50	4.07	4.31	4.51	3.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ECON 691 0101  
 Title SEL TOPICS:ECON POLICY  
 Instructor: FARROW, ROBERT (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 1  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 570  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1663/1670	2.00	4.13	4.31	4.46	2.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1603/1666	3.00	4.16	4.27	4.34	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1343/1406	3.00	4.23	4.32	4.36	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1565/1615	3.00	4.02	4.24	4.33	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1551/1566	2.00	3.89	4.07	4.20	2.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1447/1528	3.00	3.90	4.12	4.33	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1580/1650	3.00	4.26	4.22	4.30	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1524/1667	4.00	4.50	4.67	4.74	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	953/1626	4.00	4.04	4.11	4.20	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1549/1559	2.50	4.38	4.46	4.49	2.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1467/1560	3.25	4.60	4.72	4.81	3.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1489/1549	2.75	4.16	4.31	4.37	2.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1473/1546	3.00	4.23	4.32	4.40	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1362/1384	2.00	3.82	4.10	4.21	2.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1373/1378	1.00	3.94	4.29	4.42	1.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1363/1378	2.00	4.07	4.31	4.51	2.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ECON 691 0101  
 Title SEL TOPICS:ECON POLICY  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 1  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 571  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1663/1670	2.00	4.13	4.31	4.46	2.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1603/1666	3.00	4.16	4.27	4.34	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1343/1406	3.00	4.23	4.32	4.36	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1565/1615	3.00	4.02	4.24	4.33	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1551/1566	2.00	3.89	4.07	4.20	2.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1447/1528	3.00	3.90	4.12	4.33	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1580/1650	3.00	4.26	4.22	4.30	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1524/1667	4.00	4.50	4.67	4.74	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	953/1626	4.00	4.04	4.11	4.20	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1549/1559	2.50	4.38	4.46	4.49	2.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1546/1560	3.25	4.60	4.72	4.81	3.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1534/1549	2.75	4.16	4.31	4.37	2.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1473/1546	3.00	4.23	4.32	4.40	3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1179/1323	3.00	3.72	4.00	4.03	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1362/1384	2.00	3.82	4.10	4.21	2.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1373/1378	1.00	3.94	4.29	4.42	1.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1363/1378	2.00	4.07	4.31	4.51	2.00

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: ECON 691 0101  
 Title SEL TOPICS:ECON POLICY  
 Instructor: (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 1  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 572  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1663/1670	2.00	4.13	4.31	4.46	2.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1603/1666	3.00	4.16	4.27	4.34	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1343/1406	3.00	4.23	4.32	4.36	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1565/1615	3.00	4.02	4.24	4.33	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1551/1566	2.00	3.89	4.07	4.20	2.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1447/1528	3.00	3.90	4.12	4.33	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1580/1650	3.00	4.26	4.22	4.30	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1524/1667	4.00	4.50	4.67	4.74	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	953/1626	4.00	4.04	4.11	4.20	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1518/1559	2.50	4.38	4.46	4.49	2.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1546/1560	3.25	4.60	4.72	4.81	3.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1489/1549	2.75	4.16	4.31	4.37	2.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1473/1546	3.00	4.23	4.32	4.40	3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1179/1323	3.00	3.72	4.00	4.03	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1362/1384	2.00	3.82	4.10	4.21	2.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1373/1378	1.00	3.94	4.29	4.42	1.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1363/1378	2.00	4.07	4.31	4.51	2.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ECON 691 0101  
 Title SEL TOPICS:ECON POLICY  
 Instructor: (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 1  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 573  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1663/1670	2.00	4.13	4.31	4.46	2.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1603/1666	3.00	4.16	4.27	4.34	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1343/1406	3.00	4.23	4.32	4.36	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1565/1615	3.00	4.02	4.24	4.33	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1551/1566	2.00	3.89	4.07	4.20	2.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1447/1528	3.00	3.90	4.12	4.33	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1580/1650	3.00	4.26	4.22	4.30	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1524/1667	4.00	4.50	4.67	4.74	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	953/1626	4.00	4.04	4.11	4.20	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1518/1559	2.50	4.38	4.46	4.49	2.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1546/1560	3.25	4.60	4.72	4.81	3.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1489/1549	2.75	4.16	4.31	4.37	2.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1473/1546	3.00	4.23	4.32	4.40	3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1179/1323	3.00	3.72	4.00	4.03	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1362/1384	2.00	3.82	4.10	4.21	2.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1373/1378	1.00	3.94	4.29	4.42	1.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1363/1378	2.00	4.07	4.31	4.51	2.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ECON 699 0101  
 Title Capstone Sem for MA in EPA  
 Instructor: Mitch, D.  
 Enrollment: 0  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 16  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	902/1670	****	4.51	4.31	4.23	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1666	****	4.52	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1057/1406	****	4.52	4.32	4.31	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1615	****	4.45	4.24	4.17	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	851/1566	****	4.39	4.07	4.03	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	300/1528	****	4.40	4.12	4.00	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1135/1650	****	4.51	4.22	4.28	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1667	****	4.86	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	953/1626	****	4.34	4.11	4.07	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1559	****	4.65	4.46	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1560	****	4.87	4.72	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1549	****	4.48	4.31	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	919/1546	****	4.51	4.32	4.32	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1384	****	4.63	4.10	3.92	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1378	****	4.75	4.29	4.09	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1378	****	4.89	4.31	4.08	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 904	****	4.22	4.03	3.94	5.00
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 79	****	5.00	4.64	4.72	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 75	****	4.97	4.57	4.46	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	62/ 79	****	4.72	4.45	4.59	4.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	76/ 80	****	4.22	3.97	3.99	2.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ECON 701 0401  
 Title INDIVIDUAL STUDY IN EC  
 Instructor: CARROLL, KATHLE  
 Enrollment: 1  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 574  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.13	4.31	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.16	4.27	4.34	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.23	4.32	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.02	4.24	4.33	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	851/1566	4.00	3.89	4.07	4.20	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	899/1528	4.00	3.90	4.12	4.33	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.26	4.22	4.30	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.50	4.67	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1626	5.00	4.04	4.11	4.20	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.38	4.46	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.60	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.16	4.31	4.37	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.23	4.32	4.40	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1323	5.00	3.72	4.00	4.03	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	3.82	4.10	4.21	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	3.94	4.29	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.07	4.31	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	3.83	4.03	4.04	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ECON 801 0301  
 Title INDIVIDUAL STUDY IN EC  
 Instructor: GOLDFARB, MARSH  
 Enrollment: 2  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 575  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies							Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.13	4.31	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.16	4.27	4.34	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.02	4.24	4.33	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1566	5.00	3.89	4.07	4.20	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1528	5.00	3.90	4.12	4.33	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.26	4.22	4.30	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.50	4.67	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1626	5.00	4.04	4.11	4.20	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.38	4.46	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.60	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.16	4.31	4.37	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.23	4.32	4.40	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	3.82	4.10	4.21	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.07	4.31	4.51	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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