

Course-Section: ECAC 321 0101
 Title AUDIT THEORY & PRACTIC
 Instructor: CROTEAU, MARCIA
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 456
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	3	4	11	4.26	831/1481	4.26	4.26	4.29	4.29	4.26	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	3	12	4.37	704/1481	4.37	4.26	4.23	4.23	4.37	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	5	9	4.05	873/1249	4.05	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.05	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	10	4.37	607/1424	4.37	4.27	4.21	4.27	4.37	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	4	5	8	4.06	675/1396	4.06	4.07	3.98	4.00	4.06	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	2	1	1	12	4.44	374/1342	4.44	4.12	4.07	4.12	4.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	182/1459	4.78	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.78	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	11	4.58	1011/1480	4.58	4.64	4.68	4.65	4.58	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	630/1450	4.25	4.10	4.09	4.10	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	3	15	4.68	529/1409	4.68	4.46	4.42	4.43	4.68	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	636/1407	4.84	4.77	4.69	4.67	4.84	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	2	14	4.58	491/1399	4.58	4.30	4.26	4.27	4.58	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	2	13	4.37	754/1400	4.37	4.35	4.27	4.28	4.37	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	323/1179	4.43	3.94	3.96	4.02	4.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	2	2	3	6	4.00	708/1262	4.00	4.18	4.05	4.14	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	751/1259	4.31	4.40	4.29	4.34	4.31	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	1	2	1	8	4.08	872/1256	4.08	4.34	4.30	4.34	4.08	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	364/ 788	4.11	4.03	4.00	4.07	4.11	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 9		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	2
84-150	8	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	14
			? 1		

Course-Section: ECAC 351 0101
 Title ADVANCED COST ACCT
 Instructor: DAVIS, MARY B
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 457
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	4	10	4.71	340/1481	4.71	4.26	4.29	4.29	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	349/1481	4.64	4.26	4.23	4.23	4.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	172/1249	4.86	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	364/1424	4.57	4.27	4.21	4.27	4.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	0	5	6	4.33	435/1396	4.33	4.07	3.98	4.00	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	384/1342	4.43	4.12	4.07	4.12	4.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	332/1459	4.62	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.62	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	770/1480	4.86	4.64	4.68	4.65	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	179/1450	4.73	4.10	4.09	4.10	4.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	169/1409	4.92	4.46	4.42	4.43	4.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	400/1407	4.92	4.77	4.69	4.67	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	256/1399	4.77	4.30	4.26	4.27	4.77	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	421/1400	4.67	4.35	4.27	4.28	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	238/1179	4.55	3.94	3.96	4.02	4.55	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	236/1262	4.71	4.18	4.05	4.14	4.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	701/1259	4.38	4.40	4.29	4.34	4.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	406/1256	4.71	4.34	4.30	4.34	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	117/ 788	4.71	4.03	4.00	4.07	4.71	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	4.26	4.20	4.20	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.37	4.20	3.96	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.42	4.04	4.11	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	4.70	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.26	4.53	4.66	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	4.24	4.44	4.56	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.48	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	4.13	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	4.33	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	3.68	4.26	3.90	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	3.90	4.55	4.88	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.28	4.75	4.67	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.83	4.67	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	14	Non-major	1
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	12	
?	0			