

Course-Section: ECAC 300 01
 Title Special Topics in Acco
 Instructor: Stmartin,Jeanne
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 448
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	11	4.67	408/1447	4.67	4.09	4.31	4.32	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	426/1447	4.60	4.18	4.27	4.23	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	303/1241	4.73	4.23	4.33	4.33	4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	165/1402	4.80	4.35	4.24	4.24	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	325/1358	4.53	4.08	4.11	4.10	4.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	143/1316	4.79	4.23	4.14	4.13	4.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	113/1427	4.87	4.33	4.19	4.15	4.87
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.70	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	2	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	158/1434	4.75	3.90	4.10	4.09	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	160/1387	4.93	4.34	4.46	4.44	4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.68	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	278/1386	4.79	4.12	4.32	4.30	4.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	127/1380	4.93	4.06	4.32	4.32	4.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	11	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	652/1193	4.00	3.94	4.02	4.05	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	339/1172	4.57	3.56	4.15	4.24	4.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	508/1182	4.57	3.89	4.35	4.42	4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	538/1170	4.57	4.27	4.38	4.49	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	8	5	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 800	****	4.11	4.06	4.12	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ECAC 321 01
 Title Audit Theory & Practic
 Instructor: Broache,Michael
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 449
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	2	5	2	9	4.00	1058/1447	4.00	4.09	4.31	4.32	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	2	2	10	4.00	1053/1447	4.00	4.18	4.27	4.23	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	4	1	2	11	4.11	872/1241	4.11	4.23	4.33	4.33	4.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	3	4	1	9	3.94	1036/1402	3.94	4.35	4.24	4.24	3.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	5	3	6	3.56	1147/1358	3.56	4.08	4.11	4.10	3.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	4	3	8	4.00	812/1316	4.00	4.23	4.14	4.13	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	5	1	11	4.22	811/1427	4.22	4.33	4.19	4.15	4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	16	1	4.06	1346/1447	4.06	4.70	4.69	4.65	4.06
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	2	3	9	1	3.60	1188/1434	3.60	3.90	4.10	4.09	3.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	3	2	10	4.12	1137/1387	4.12	4.34	4.46	4.44	4.12
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	1006/1387	4.65	4.68	4.73	4.71	4.65
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	1	4	10	4.24	895/1386	4.24	4.12	4.32	4.30	4.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	4	3	9	4.12	990/1380	4.12	4.06	4.32	4.32	4.12
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	0	3	2	8	4.14	574/1193	4.14	3.94	4.02	4.05	4.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	0	3	1	0	2.50	1158/1172	2.50	3.56	4.15	4.24	2.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	1	1	2	1	3.17	1130/1182	3.17	3.89	4.35	4.42	3.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	965/1170	3.83	4.27	4.38	4.49	3.83

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	2	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	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECAC 330 01
 Title Taxation
 Instructor: Cole, Richard M
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 450
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	2	4	16	4.64	441/1447	4.64	4.09	4.31	4.32	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	14	4.55	489/1447	4.55	4.18	4.27	4.23	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	16	4.64	415/1241	4.64	4.23	4.33	4.33	4.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	207/1402	4.76	4.35	4.24	4.24	4.76
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	2	3	14	4.50	345/1358	4.50	4.08	4.11	4.10	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	4	1	11	4.44	465/1316	4.44	4.23	4.14	4.13	4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	2	17	4.64	310/1427	4.64	4.33	4.19	4.15	4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	803/1447	4.77	4.70	4.69	4.65	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	1	0	3	7	5	3.94	942/1434	3.94	3.90	4.10	4.09	3.94
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	5	14	4.57	698/1387	4.57	4.34	4.46	4.44	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	1	18	4.71	919/1387	4.71	4.68	4.73	4.71	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	3	15	4.57	539/1386	4.57	4.12	4.32	4.30	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	4	13	4.38	775/1380	4.38	4.06	4.32	4.32	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	1	1	4	1	6	3.77	837/1193	3.77	3.94	4.02	4.05	3.77
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	1	0	10	4.50	377/1172	4.50	3.56	4.15	4.24	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	2	2	1	8	4.15	796/1182	4.15	3.89	4.35	4.42	4.15
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	2	0	10	4.67	480/1170	4.67	4.27	4.38	4.49	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	10	3	1	0	2	0	6	4.11	402/ 800	4.11	4.11	4.06	4.12	4.11
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.36	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.02	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	2.87	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 65	****	****	4.42	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	3.38	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	4.46	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	5.00	****

Course-Section: ECAC 330 01
 Title Taxation
 Instructor: Cole, Richard M
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 450
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	10	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	B	6						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	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	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECAC 351 01
 Title Advanced Cost Acct
 Instructor: Hardy, Timothy W
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 451
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	2	4	1	2	3.10	1402/1447	3.10	4.09	4.31	4.32	3.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	2	3	3.60	1286/1447	3.60	4.18	4.27	4.23	3.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	3	2	2	3.44	1156/1241	3.44	4.23	4.33	4.33	3.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	1088/1402	3.89	4.35	4.24	4.24	3.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	2	3	3	3.78	1008/1358	3.78	4.08	4.11	4.10	3.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	3	3	3.70	1026/1316	3.70	4.23	4.14	4.13	3.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	1	1	3	1	2	3.25	1331/1427	3.25	4.33	4.19	4.15	3.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	485/1447	4.90	4.70	4.69	4.65	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	5	1	3	3.60	1188/1434	3.60	3.90	4.10	4.09	3.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	4	3	2	3.50	1304/1387	3.50	4.34	4.46	4.44	3.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	1143/1387	4.50	4.68	4.73	4.71	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	4	3	1	3.20	1306/1386	3.20	4.12	4.32	4.30	3.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	4	1	2	3.00	1317/1380	3.00	4.06	4.32	4.32	3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	593/1193	4.13	3.94	4.02	4.05	4.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	1150/1172	2.67	3.56	4.15	4.24	2.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1037/1182	3.67	3.89	4.35	4.42	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	864/1170	4.00	4.27	4.38	4.49	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 800	****	4.11	4.06	4.12	****

Frequency Distribution

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

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	5	11	8	4.04	1037/1447	4.04	4.09	4.31	4.43	4.04
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	9	10	4.16	938/1447	4.16	4.18	4.27	4.31	4.16
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	7	6	12	4.20	827/1241	4.20	4.23	4.33	4.41	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	19	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/1402	****	4.35	4.24	4.34	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	5	8	8	4.05	777/1358	4.05	4.08	4.11	4.15	4.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	19	1	0	0	4	1	3.67	****/1316	****	4.23	4.14	4.27	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	6	18	4.68	274/1427	4.68	4.33	4.19	4.20	4.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	18	4.75	836/1447	4.75	4.70	4.69	4.72	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	7	11	1	3.60	1188/1434	3.60	3.90	4.10	4.17	3.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	2	5	14	4.57	698/1387	4.57	4.34	4.46	4.48	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	2	3	15	4.52	1125/1387	4.52	4.68	4.73	4.76	4.52
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	3	5	2	10	3.81	1174/1386	3.81	4.12	4.32	4.34	3.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	2	5	4	9	3.86	1128/1380	3.86	4.06	4.32	4.34	3.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	6	2	0	3	5	4	3.64	905/1193	3.64	3.94	4.02	4.00	3.64
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	3	1	1	1	0	2.00	****/1172	****	3.56	4.15	4.25	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	2	2	1	1	0	2.17	****/1182	****	3.89	4.35	4.49	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	2	1	2	1	0	2.33	****/1170	****	4.27	4.38	4.51	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.61	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.72	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.59	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.53	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.80	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	10	General	0	Under-grad	25	Non-major	25
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	7	D	1						
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	0				
				?	0						