

Course-Section: ECAD 210 0101
 Title PRACTICE OF MANAGEMENT
 Instructor: ARMOR, VIVIAN
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 458
 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	2	21	4.91	143/1481	4.55	4.26	4.29	4.40	4.91	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	169/1481	4.66	4.26	4.23	4.29	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	190/1249	4.60	4.37	4.27	4.36	4.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	18	4.74	232/1424	4.43	4.27	4.21	4.28	4.74	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	17	4.74	146/1396	4.32	4.07	3.98	3.94	4.74	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	8	14	4.57	264/1342	4.16	4.12	4.07	4.05	4.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	7	16	4.70	242/1459	4.54	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.70	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	351/1480	4.93	4.64	4.68	4.68	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	107/1450	4.45	4.10	4.09	4.15	4.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1409	4.80	4.46	4.42	4.47	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1407	4.88	4.77	4.69	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	203/1399	4.69	4.30	4.26	4.29	4.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	73/1400	4.70	4.35	4.27	4.34	4.96	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	2	0	1	5	6	3.93	671/1179	4.15	3.94	3.96	4.05	3.93	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	1	0	14	4.63	284/1262	4.11	4.18	4.05	4.11	4.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	238/1259	4.47	4.40	4.29	4.34	4.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	288/1256	4.50	4.34	4.30	4.28	4.81	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	0	1	0	5	7	4.38	228/ 788	4.28	4.03	4.00	3.98	4.38	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 249	****	4.08	4.11	4.32	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	5.00	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.26	4.53	4.83	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	4.24	4.44	4.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.19	4.35	4.72	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	3.98	3.92	3.55	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	5	C	2	General	4	Under-grad	22	Non-major	3
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ECAD 210 0201
 Title PRACTICE OF MANAGEMENT
 Instructor: ARMOR, VIVIAN
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 459
 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	1	0	0	0	0	7	22	4.76	292/1481	4.55	4.26	4.29	4.40	4.76	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	26	4.80	183/1481	4.66	4.26	4.23	4.29	4.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	20	4.53	470/1249	4.60	4.37	4.27	4.36	4.53	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	10	16	4.40	557/1424	4.43	4.27	4.21	4.28	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	3	6	18	4.38	403/1396	4.32	4.07	3.98	3.94	4.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	3	9	14	4.21	573/1342	4.16	4.12	4.07	4.05	4.21	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	10	16	4.45	550/1459	4.54	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	4	24	4.86	770/1480	4.93	4.64	4.68	4.68	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	2	0	0	7	16	4.40	473/1450	4.45	4.10	4.09	4.15	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	2	26	4.80	334/1409	4.80	4.46	4.42	4.47	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	29	4.93	350/1407	4.88	4.77	4.69	4.78	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	5	23	4.70	335/1399	4.69	4.30	4.26	4.29	4.70	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	3	24	4.63	456/1400	4.70	4.35	4.27	4.34	4.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	12	2	1	4	6	5	3.61	856/1179	4.15	3.94	3.96	4.05	3.61	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	2	2	5	7	4.06	687/1262	4.11	4.18	4.05	4.11	4.06	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	652/1259	4.47	4.40	4.29	4.34	4.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	571/1256	4.50	4.34	4.30	4.28	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	3	0	0	2	8	3	4.08	377/ 788	4.28	4.03	4.00	3.98	4.08	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	28	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	4.26	4.20	4.51	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	4.08	4.11	4.32	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	5.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	4.24	4.44	4.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.19	4.35	4.72	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	3.98	3.92	3.55	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.67	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	4.07	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	4.64	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	3.68	4.26	4.69	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	3.50	4.42	4.80	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	3.90	4.55	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.28	4.75	4.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.42	4.65	4.66	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.83	4.43	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.82	5.00	****	

Title PRACTICE OF MANAGEMENT
 Instructor: ARMOR, VIVIAN
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 30

Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

JUN 13, 2006
 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	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	12	2.00-2.99	6	C	3	General	3	Under-grad	30	Non-major	4
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	11	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	20				
				?	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	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	5	7	11	4.17	947/1481	4.55	4.26	4.29	4.40	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	16	4.58	422/1481	4.66	4.26	4.23	4.29	4.58	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	20	4.75	245/1249	4.60	4.37	4.27	4.36	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	2	2	8	10	4.18	818/1424	4.43	4.27	4.21	4.28	4.18	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	3	4	4	9	3.81	877/1396	4.32	4.07	3.98	3.94	3.81	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	2	8	10	4.04	731/1342	4.16	4.12	4.07	4.05	4.04	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	8	13	4.48	505/1459	4.54	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.48	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	351/1480	4.93	4.64	4.68	4.68	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	0	15	4	4.10	781/1450	4.45	4.10	4.09	4.15	4.10	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	383/1409	4.80	4.46	4.42	4.47	4.77	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	1	20	4.86	591/1407	4.88	4.77	4.69	4.78	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	1	18	4.76	256/1399	4.69	4.30	4.26	4.29	4.76	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	0	3	17	4.59	501/1400	4.70	4.35	4.27	4.34	4.59	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	0	1	3	15	4.55	233/1179	4.15	3.94	3.96	4.05	4.55	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	2	4	4	3.91	797/1262	4.11	4.18	4.05	4.11	3.91	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	770/1259	4.47	4.40	4.29	4.34	4.27	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	571/1256	4.50	4.34	4.30	4.28	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	6	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/ 788	4.28	4.03	4.00	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 249	****	4.08	4.11	4.32	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	5.00	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.26	4.53	4.83	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 63	****	4.24	4.44	4.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.19	4.35	4.72	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	3.98	3.92	3.55	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.67	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 55	****	3.90	4.55	4.44	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	4.42	4.65	4.66	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 12	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 8			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C 0	General 2	Under-grad 24	Non-major 4
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 10		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ECAD 210 0501
 Title PRACTICE OF MANAGEMENT
 Instructor: SUGAR, STEVE
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 461
 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	2	12	16	4.35	729/1481	4.55	4.26	4.29	4.40	4.35	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	12	17	4.42	646/1481	4.66	4.26	4.23	4.29	4.42	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	11	16	4.29	710/1249	4.60	4.37	4.27	4.36	4.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	9	18	4.39	582/1424	4.43	4.27	4.21	4.28	4.39	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	9	17	4.37	411/1396	4.32	4.07	3.98	3.94	4.37	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	3	4	9	11	3.83	941/1342	4.16	4.12	4.07	4.05	3.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	4	2	23	4.53	425/1459	4.54	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	29	4.97	281/1480	4.93	4.64	4.68	4.68	4.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	1	0	11	12	4.42	459/1450	4.45	4.10	4.09	4.15	4.42	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	1	5	24	4.65	588/1409	4.80	4.46	4.42	4.47	4.65	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	0	4	26	4.74	842/1407	4.88	4.77	4.69	4.78	4.74	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	0	12	18	4.48	590/1399	4.69	4.30	4.26	4.29	4.48	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	10	20	4.61	480/1400	4.70	4.35	4.27	4.34	4.61	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	1	0	1	6	17	4.52	248/1179	4.15	3.94	3.96	4.05	4.52	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	3	0	2	4	8	3.82	849/1262	4.11	4.18	4.05	4.11	3.82	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	2	1	0	13	4.29	757/1259	4.47	4.40	4.29	4.34	4.29	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	1	2	3	10	4.18	820/1256	4.50	4.34	4.30	4.28	4.18	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	1	1	1	0	3	11	4.38	233/ 788	4.28	4.03	4.00	3.98	4.38	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 1	A 13	Required for Majors	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 10		Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 4	C 2	General	3
84-150	7	3.00-3.49 10	D 0		Under-grad 31
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives	1
			P 1		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	20
			? 0		

Course-Section: ECAD 310 0101
 Title HUMAN RESOURCE MGT
 Instructor: GREGORY, DENISE
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 462
 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	6	0	0	0	4	7	9	4.25	844/1481	4.25	4.26	4.29	4.29	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	286/1481	4.70	4.26	4.23	4.23	4.70	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	0	0	9	11	4.55	451/1249	4.55	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.55	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	1	0	0	1	8	9	4.44	509/1424	4.44	4.27	4.21	4.27	4.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	257/1396	4.58	4.07	3.98	4.00	4.58	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	1	0	0	6	8	4	3.89	898/1342	3.89	4.12	4.07	4.12	3.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	310/1459	4.63	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	0	13	6	4.32	1171/1480	4.32	4.64	4.68	4.65	4.32	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	4	8	5	4.06	808/1450	4.06	4.10	4.09	4.10	4.06	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	2	9	9	4.35	946/1409	4.35	4.46	4.42	4.43	4.35	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	300/1407	4.95	4.77	4.69	4.67	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	4	4	12	4.40	683/1399	4.40	4.30	4.26	4.27	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	541/1400	4.55	4.35	4.27	4.28	4.55	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	10	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	557/1179	4.10	3.94	3.96	4.02	4.10	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	0	4	8	4.46	381/1262	4.46	4.18	4.05	4.14	4.46	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	422/1259	4.69	4.40	4.29	4.34	4.69	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	428/1256	4.69	4.34	4.30	4.34	4.69	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	4	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	254/ 788	4.33	4.03	4.00	4.07	4.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 246	****	4.26	4.20	4.20	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	4.08	4.11	4.23	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	4.45	4.40	4.36	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.37	4.20	3.96	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	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	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	4.70	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.26	4.53	4.66	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 63	****	4.24	4.44	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.19	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	3.98	3.92	4.43	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.48	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	4.13	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	4.33	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	3.68	4.26	3.90	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	3.50	4.42	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	3.90	4.55	4.88	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	4.28	4.75	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	4.42	4.65	4.88	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.82	4.67	****	

Course-Section: ECAD 310 0101
 Title HUMAN RESOURCE MGT
 Instructor: GREGORY, DENISE
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 462
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	26	Non-major	14
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	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	10				
				?	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	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	7	10	4.23	883/1481	4.23	4.26	4.29	4.29	4.23	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	5	11	4.23	854/1481	4.23	4.26	4.23	4.23	4.23	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	6	11	4.27	726/1249	4.27	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.27	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	2	3	3	2	8	3.61	1239/1424	3.61	4.27	4.21	4.27	3.61	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	111/1396	4.81	4.07	3.98	4.00	4.81	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	4	2	2	4	7	3.42	1155/1342	3.42	4.12	4.07	4.12	3.42	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	0	5	15	4.45	535/1459	4.45	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	13	4.62	989/1480	4.62	4.64	4.68	4.65	4.62	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	4	8	4	4.00	836/1450	4.00	4.10	4.09	4.10	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	188/1409	4.90	4.46	4.42	4.43	4.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	614/1407	4.86	4.77	4.69	4.67	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	9	10	4.45	636/1399	4.45	4.30	4.26	4.27	4.45	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	6	12	4.43	681/1400	4.43	4.35	4.27	4.28	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	14	3	0	0	2	2	3.00	1041/1179	3.00	3.94	3.96	4.02	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	3	4	7	3.94	770/1262	3.94	4.18	4.05	4.14	3.94	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	148/1259	4.94	4.40	4.29	4.34	4.94	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	3	2	10	4.31	735/1256	4.31	4.34	4.30	4.34	4.31	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	13	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 788	****	4.03	4.00	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	4.37	4.20	3.96	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.26	4.53	4.66	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 63	****	4.24	4.44	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.19	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	3.98	3.92	4.43	****	
Field Work															
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	3.68	4.26	3.90	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	3.90	4.55	4.88	****	

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	2	1.00-1.99	B 10		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	5
84-150	9	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	12
			? 0		

Course-Section: ECAD 385 0101
 Title BUSINESS ETHICS & SOC
 Instructor: BRENNER, THOMAS
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 464
 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	4	5	11	4.35	729/1481	4.35	4.26	4.29	4.29	4.35	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	0	5	12	4.30	769/1481	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.23	4.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	6	10	4.25	742/1249	4.25	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	217/1424	4.75	4.27	4.21	4.27	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	4	14	4.50	297/1396	4.50	4.07	3.98	4.00	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	6	11	4.40	405/1342	4.40	4.12	4.07	4.12	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	4	14	4.55	402/1459	4.55	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.64	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	8	10	4.47	375/1450	4.47	4.10	4.09	4.10	4.47	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	1	16	4.68	529/1409	4.68	4.46	4.42	4.43	4.68	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	300/1407	4.95	4.77	4.69	4.67	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	6	10	4.32	773/1399	4.32	4.30	4.26	4.27	4.32	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	5	4	10	4.26	859/1400	4.26	4.35	4.27	4.28	4.26	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	15	3	0	0	0	1	2.00	****/1179	****	3.94	3.96	4.02	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	457/1262	4.38	4.18	4.05	4.14	4.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	169/1259	4.92	4.40	4.29	4.34	4.92	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	173/1256	4.92	4.34	4.30	4.34	4.92	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	394/ 788	4.00	4.03	4.00	4.07	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	4.70	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.26	4.53	4.66	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	4.24	4.44	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.19	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	3.98	3.92	4.43	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 14	Required for Majors	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	3
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 20
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	16
			? 0		

Course-Section: ECAD 410 0101
 Title PRODUCTION MANAGEMENT
 Instructor: ROE, DAVID
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 465
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	4	5	5	7	2	2.91	1468/1481	2.91	4.26	4.29	4.45	2.91	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	3	8	9	0	3.00	1420/1481	3.00	4.26	4.23	4.32	3.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	4	8	6	3	3.17	1176/1249	3.17	4.37	4.27	4.44	3.17	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	17	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1138/1424	3.83	4.27	4.21	4.35	3.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	3	4	5	4	3.47	1098/1396	3.47	4.07	3.98	4.09	3.47	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	13	0	0	4	1	4	4.00	755/1342	4.00	4.12	4.07	4.21	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	6	4	6	5	1	2.59	1424/1459	2.59	4.19	4.16	4.25	2.59	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	22	0	4.00	1349/1480	4.00	4.64	4.68	4.74	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	5	3	8	1	1	2.44	1431/1450	2.44	4.10	4.09	4.28	2.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	3	5	6	8	1	2.96	1366/1409	2.96	4.46	4.42	4.51	2.96	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	3	5	11	3	3.52	1370/1407	3.52	4.77	4.69	4.79	3.52	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	4	8	4	7	0	2.61	1375/1399	2.61	4.30	4.26	4.36	2.61	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	6	6	2	6	3	2.74	1350/1400	2.74	4.35	4.27	4.38	2.74	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	19	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/1179	****	3.94	3.96	4.07	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	4	3	3	2	3.25	1081/1262	3.25	4.18	4.05	4.33	3.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	2	2	2	5	3.67	1067/1259	3.67	4.40	4.29	4.57	3.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	3	0	3	6	4.00	901/1256	4.00	4.34	4.30	4.60	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0.00-0.99	A 11	Required for Majors	0	Major 0
28-55	1.00-1.99	B 8			
56-83	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	4	Non-major 23
84-150	3.00-3.49	D 0			
Grad.	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0	
		P 0			
		I 0	Other	16	
		? 0			

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ECAD 489 0201
 Title MGMT & ADMIN SEMINAR
 Instructor: Boulay, William (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 466
 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	4	5	3	3.92	1152/1481	3.92	4.26	4.29	4.45	3.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	7	4.42	646/1481	4.42	4.26	4.23	4.32	4.42	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	334/1249	4.67	4.37	4.27	4.44	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	437/1424	4.50	4.27	4.21	4.35	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	0	2	8	4.17	584/1396	4.17	4.07	3.98	4.09	4.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	1	3	5	4.00	755/1342	4.00	4.12	4.07	4.21	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	276/1459	4.67	4.19	4.16	4.25	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.64	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	662/1450	3.97	4.10	4.09	4.28	3.97	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	762/1409	4.58	4.46	4.42	4.51	4.58	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	963/1407	4.67	4.77	4.69	4.79	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	567/1399	4.42	4.30	4.26	4.36	4.42	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	2	3	5	3.75	1145/1400	3.88	4.35	4.27	4.38	3.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	3	1	7	4.36	365/1179	4.36	3.94	3.96	4.07	4.36	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	205/1262	4.75	4.18	4.05	4.33	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	238/1259	4.88	4.40	4.29	4.57	4.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	357/1256	4.75	4.34	4.30	4.60	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	394/ 788	4.00	4.03	4.00	4.26	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	4.68	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.26	4.53	4.64	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 63	****	4.24	4.44	4.49	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.19	4.35	4.53	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 68	****	3.98	3.92	4.10	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 12	Non-major 0
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	1	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 9		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ECAD 489 0201
 Title MGMT & ADMIN SEMINAR
 Instructor: RAUDENBUSH, LIN (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 467
 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	4	5	3	3.92	1152/1481	3.92	4.26	4.29	4.45	3.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	7	4.42	646/1481	4.42	4.26	4.23	4.32	4.42	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	334/1249	4.67	4.37	4.27	4.44	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	437/1424	4.50	4.27	4.21	4.35	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	0	2	8	4.17	584/1396	4.17	4.07	3.98	4.09	4.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	1	3	5	4.00	755/1342	4.00	4.12	4.07	4.21	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	276/1459	4.67	4.19	4.16	4.25	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.64	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	1133/1450	3.97	4.10	4.09	4.28	3.97	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	559/1409	4.58	4.46	4.42	4.51	4.58	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	963/1407	4.67	4.77	4.69	4.79	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	753/1399	4.42	4.30	4.26	4.36	4.42	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	1017/1400	3.88	4.35	4.27	4.38	3.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1179	4.36	3.94	3.96	4.07	4.36	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	205/1262	4.75	4.18	4.05	4.33	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	238/1259	4.88	4.40	4.29	4.57	4.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	357/1256	4.75	4.34	4.30	4.60	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	394/ 788	4.00	4.03	4.00	4.26	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	4.68	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.26	4.53	4.64	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 63	****	4.24	4.44	4.49	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.19	4.35	4.53	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 68	****	3.98	3.92	4.10	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 12	Non-major 0
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	1	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 9		
				? 0			