

Course Section: ECAD 210 0101
 Title PRACTICE OF MANAGEMENT
 Instructor: ARMOR, VIVIAN
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 472
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	5	19	4.52	578/1669	4.47	4.37	4.23	4.34	4.52	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	21	4.74	256/1666	4.59	4.45	4.19	4.29	4.74	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	21	4.70	344/1421	4.65	4.47	4.24	4.35	4.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	9	15	4.37	673/1617	4.38	4.33	4.15	4.24	4.37	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	4	5	16	4.35	484/1555	4.44	4.29	4.00	3.96	4.35	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	6	16	4.38	534/1543	4.33	4.13	4.06	4.10	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	0	4	21	4.69	270/1647	4.68	4.52	4.12	4.19	4.69	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	23	4.88	750/1668	4.83	4.70	4.67	4.59	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	151/1605	4.59	4.16	4.07	4.15	4.78	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	25	4.93	151/1514	4.91	4.61	4.39	4.39	4.93	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/1551	4.94	4.84	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	25	4.93	101/1503	4.84	4.48	4.24	4.29	4.93	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	23	4.81	273/1506	4.66	4.34	4.26	4.33	4.81	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	2	1	7	7	5	3.55	919/1311	4.06	4.06	3.85	3.96	3.55	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	9	12	4.38	585/1490	4.18	4.40	4.05	4.11	4.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	5	18	4.71	450/1502	4.47	4.62	4.26	4.31	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	5	18	4.71	490/1489	4.51	4.58	4.29	4.36	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	1	5	10	8	4.04	471/1006	4.02	4.16	4.00	3.99	4.04	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	2	0	0	1	1	2.75	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.36	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.59	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	5.00	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	5.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.67	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	2	Under-grad	27	Non-major	27
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	6	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	22
?	0		

Course Section: ECAD 210 0201
 Title PRACTICE OF MANAGEMENT
 Instructor: ARMOR, VIVIAN
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 473
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	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	9	27	4.75	269/1669	4.47	4.37	4.23	4.34	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	27	4.69	319/1666	4.59	4.45	4.19	4.29	4.69	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	11	24	4.64	429/1421	4.65	4.47	4.24	4.35	4.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	9	25	4.74	242/1617	4.38	4.33	4.15	4.24	4.74	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	5	27	4.61	255/1555	4.44	4.29	4.00	3.96	4.61	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	11	22	4.53	371/1543	4.33	4.13	4.06	4.10	4.53	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	8	26	4.64	334/1647	4.68	4.52	4.12	4.19	4.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	31	4.89	750/1668	4.83	4.70	4.67	4.59	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	6	23	4.79	145/1605	4.59	4.16	4.07	4.15	4.79	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	6	30	4.83	308/1514	4.91	4.61	4.39	4.39	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	34	4.97	154/1551	4.94	4.84	4.66	4.72	4.97	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	8	28	4.78	254/1503	4.84	4.48	4.24	4.29	4.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	7	29	4.81	286/1506	4.66	4.34	4.26	4.33	4.81	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	11	3	1	5	7	9	3.72	807/1311	4.06	4.06	3.85	3.96	3.72	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	1	7	17	4.54	428/1490	4.18	4.40	4.05	4.11	4.54	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	1	2	22	4.73	415/1502	4.47	4.62	4.26	4.31	4.73	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	0	3	22	4.77	422/1489	4.51	4.58	4.29	4.36	4.77	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	4	0	1	4	10	6	4.00	479/1006	4.02	4.16	4.00	3.99	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	4	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.42	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.74	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	30	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.71	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	30	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.59	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.59	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	29	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	4.50	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	4.63	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	30	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	4.20	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	5.00	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	30	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	30	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	30	2	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	5.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.67	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	30	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	30	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	30	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	30	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	5.00	****	

Course Section: ECAD 210 0201
 Title PRACTICE OF MANAGEMENT
 Instructor: ARMOR, VIVIAN
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 473
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	25						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	5	C	2	General	5	Under-grad	36	Non-major	36
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	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	25				
				?	0						

Course Section: ECAD 210 0301
 Title PRACTICE OF MANAGEMENT
 Instructor: SKLAMM, STEWART
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 474
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	4	7	8	4.05	1138/1669	4.47	4.37	4.23	4.34	4.05	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	12	4.40	691/1666	4.59	4.45	4.19	4.29	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	356/1421	4.65	4.47	4.24	4.35	4.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	6	10	4.32	739/1617	4.38	4.33	4.15	4.24	4.32	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	6	10	4.20	611/1555	4.44	4.29	4.00	3.96	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	7	9	4.20	723/1543	4.33	4.13	4.06	4.10	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	313/1647	4.68	4.52	4.12	4.19	4.65	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	428/1668	4.83	4.70	4.67	4.59	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	631/1605	4.59	4.16	4.07	4.15	4.31	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1514	4.91	4.61	4.39	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1551	4.94	4.84	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	182/1503	4.84	4.48	4.24	4.29	4.84	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	3	13	4.37	809/1506	4.66	4.34	4.26	4.33	4.37	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	241/1311	4.06	4.06	3.85	3.96	4.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	1	2	4	3	3.64	1102/1490	4.18	4.40	4.05	4.11	3.64	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	1	1	3	5	3.91	1117/1502	4.47	4.62	4.26	4.31	3.91	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	2	1	7	4.18	960/1489	4.51	4.58	4.29	4.36	4.18	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	1	2	0	2	3	3.50	759/1006	4.02	4.16	4.00	3.99	3.50	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.36	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	13	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	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	16				
				?	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	1	0	0	0	2	10	20	4.56	522/1669	4.47	4.37	4.23	4.34	4.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	0	1	5	24	4.53	516/1666	4.59	4.45	4.19	4.29	4.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	1	0	7	22	4.55	520/1421	4.65	4.47	4.24	4.35	4.55	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	7	1	1	3	10	10	4.08	981/1617	4.38	4.33	4.15	4.24	4.08	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	1	1	6	20	4.61	262/1555	4.44	4.29	4.00	3.96	4.61	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	8	1	1	3	5	13	4.22	700/1543	4.33	4.13	4.06	4.10	4.22	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	1	0	5	25	4.74	222/1647	4.68	4.52	4.12	4.19	4.74	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	1	0	9	21	4.61	1115/1668	4.83	4.70	4.67	4.59	4.61	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	0	0	1	9	11	4.48	410/1605	4.59	4.16	4.07	4.15	4.48	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	27	4.90	189/1514	4.91	4.61	4.39	4.39	4.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	4	24	4.79	806/1551	4.94	4.84	4.66	4.72	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	3	26	4.83	191/1503	4.84	4.48	4.24	4.29	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	7	22	4.67	471/1506	4.66	4.34	4.26	4.33	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	0	0	2	11	12	4.40	333/1311	4.06	4.06	3.85	3.96	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	1	3	6	12	4.17	756/1490	4.18	4.40	4.05	4.11	4.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	0	1	5	16	4.52	613/1502	4.47	4.62	4.26	4.31	4.52	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	1	3	1	17	4.39	809/1489	4.51	4.58	4.29	4.36	4.39	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	3	4	15	4.55	220/1006	4.02	4.16	4.00	3.99	4.55	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	29	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.42	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.74	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.71	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.59	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.59	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	30	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	30	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	4.50	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	30	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	4.63	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	30	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	4.20	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	30	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	5.00	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	30	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	30	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	30	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	5.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.67	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	30	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	30	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	31	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	5.00	****	

Course Section: ECAD 210 0401
 Title PRACTICE OF MANAGEMENT
 Instructor: SUGAR, STEVE
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 475
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	6	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	6	General	1	Under-grad	33	Non-major	33
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	23				
				?	0						

Course Section: ECAD 310 0101
 Title HUMAN RESOURCE MGT
 Instructor: SADLER, PATRICI
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 476
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	2	3	7	4.42	719/1669	4.42	4.37	4.23	4.28	4.42	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	2	6	4.00	1094/1666	4.00	4.45	4.19	4.20	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	484/1421	4.58	4.47	4.24	4.25	4.58	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	4	4	3.92	1154/1617	3.92	4.33	4.15	4.22	3.92	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	3	7	4.25	558/1555	4.25	4.29	4.00	4.03	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	4	5	4.00	895/1543	4.00	4.13	4.06	4.14	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	5	4	3.92	1149/1647	3.92	4.52	4.12	4.14	3.92	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.70	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	0	6	1	3.88	1116/1605	3.88	4.16	4.07	4.09	3.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	4	2	4	3.58	1373/1514	3.58	4.61	4.39	4.46	3.58	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	1193/1551	4.50	4.84	4.66	4.70	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	0	1	4	5	3.83	1197/1503	3.83	4.48	4.24	4.28	3.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	3	4	3.83	1209/1506	3.83	4.34	4.26	4.30	3.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	1	3	3	4	3.67	846/1311	3.67	4.06	3.85	3.97	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	849/1490	4.00	4.40	4.05	4.11	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	286/1502	4.86	4.62	4.26	4.28	4.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	478/1489	4.71	4.58	4.29	4.35	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	479/1006	4.00	4.16	4.00	4.10	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	4.47	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	4.15	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ECAD 360 0101
 Title BUSINESS LAW
 Instructor: COHEN, HYMAN K.
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 477
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	3	10	6	4.16	1039/1669	4.16	4.37	4.23	4.28	4.16	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	7	8	4.21	935/1666	4.21	4.45	4.19	4.20	4.21	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	9	4	3.89	1066/1421	3.89	4.47	4.24	4.25	3.89	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	3	5	3	4	3.53	1360/1617	3.53	4.33	4.15	4.22	3.53	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	285/1555	4.58	4.29	4.00	4.03	4.58	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	4	5	3	5	3.26	1341/1543	3.26	4.13	4.06	4.14	3.26	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	6	11	4.42	617/1647	4.42	4.52	4.12	4.14	4.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	926/1668	4.79	4.70	4.67	4.68	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	8	5	1	3.40	1400/1605	3.40	4.16	4.07	4.09	3.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	8	10	4.42	923/1514	4.42	4.61	4.39	4.46	4.42	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	539/1551	4.89	4.84	4.66	4.70	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	5	5	8	4.05	1040/1503	4.05	4.48	4.24	4.28	4.05	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	7	3	6	3.47	1327/1506	3.47	4.34	4.26	4.30	3.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	15	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/1311	****	4.06	3.85	3.97	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	2	3	8	4.29	667/1490	4.29	4.40	4.05	4.11	4.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	504/1502	4.64	4.62	4.26	4.28	4.64	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	622/1489	4.57	4.58	4.29	4.35	4.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	12	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1006	****	4.16	4.00	4.10	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 9		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 6	General	3
84-150	7	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	16
			? 0		

Course Section: ECAD 385 0101
 Title BUSINESS ETHICS & SOC
 Instructor: BRENNER, THOMAS
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 478
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	8	13	4.50	590/1669	4.50	4.37	4.23	4.28	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	13	4.50	549/1666	4.50	4.45	4.19	4.20	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	11	11	4.50	557/1421	4.50	4.47	4.24	4.25	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	15	4.59	404/1617	4.59	4.33	4.15	4.22	4.59	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	4	15	4.45	389/1555	4.45	4.29	4.00	4.03	4.45	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	8	11	4.36	552/1543	4.36	4.13	4.06	4.14	4.36	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	281/1647	4.68	4.52	4.12	4.14	4.68	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	713/1668	4.91	4.70	4.67	4.68	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	9	8	4.47	410/1605	4.47	4.16	4.07	4.09	4.47	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	360/1514	4.81	4.61	4.39	4.46	4.81	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	256/1551	4.95	4.84	4.66	4.70	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	347/1503	4.70	4.48	4.24	4.28	4.70	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	407/1506	4.71	4.34	4.26	4.30	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	3	3	1	6	5	3.39	1004/1311	3.39	4.06	3.85	3.97	3.39	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	1	4	10	4.38	585/1490	4.38	4.40	4.05	4.11	4.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	326/1502	4.81	4.62	4.26	4.28	4.81	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.58	4.29	4.35	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	1	0	1	6	7	4.20	407/1006	4.20	4.16	4.00	4.10	4.20	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.17	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.13	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.27	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	B 10			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	5	C 1	General 4	Under-grad 22	Non-major 22
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	5	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 10		
				? 0			

Course Section: ECAD 425 0101
 Title: MARKETING
 Instructor: HOFHERR, WILLIA
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 479
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	1	9	14	4.40	734/1669	4.40	4.37	4.23	4.39	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	17	4.56	483/1666	4.56	4.45	4.19	4.22	4.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	10	14	4.58	484/1421	4.58	4.47	4.24	4.38	4.58	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	16	4.48	525/1617	4.48	4.33	4.15	4.22	4.48	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	3	0	3	4	12	4.00	773/1555	4.00	4.29	4.00	4.08	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	3	6	10	4.25	659/1543	4.25	4.13	4.06	4.18	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	2	6	15	4.42	634/1647	4.42	4.52	4.12	4.14	4.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	22	2	4.08	1487/1668	4.08	4.70	4.67	4.70	4.08	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	2	2	14	4	3.91	1092/1605	3.91	4.16	4.07	4.16	3.91	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	424/1514	4.76	4.61	4.39	4.45	4.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	788/1551	4.81	4.84	4.66	4.73	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	5	14	4.57	491/1503	4.57	4.48	4.24	4.27	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	407/1506	4.71	4.34	4.26	4.29	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	5	0	0	3	8	5	4.13	525/1311	4.13	4.06	3.85	3.88	4.13	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	2	1	9	4.38	576/1490	4.38	4.40	4.05	4.26	4.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	893/1502	4.23	4.62	4.26	4.46	4.23	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	684/1489	4.50	4.58	4.29	4.52	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	6	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	436/1006	4.14	4.16	4.00	4.21	4.14	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 13	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 8		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 25
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	21
			? 0		

Course Section: ECAD 489 0301
 Title MGMT & ADMIN SEMINAR
 Instructor: BOULAY, WILLIAM (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 480
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	1	1	0	8	4.18	1001/1669	4.18	4.37	4.23	4.39	4.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	3	7	4.36	740/1666	4.36	4.45	4.19	4.22	4.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	0	9	4.45	620/1421	4.45	4.47	4.24	4.38	4.45	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	9	4.64	358/1617	4.64	4.33	4.15	4.22	4.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	0	6	4.20	611/1555	4.20	4.29	4.00	4.08	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	2	4	3.90	1019/1543	3.90	4.13	4.06	4.18	3.90	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	806/1647	4.30	4.52	4.12	4.14	4.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	713/1668	4.90	4.70	4.67	4.70	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	538/1605	3.81	4.16	4.07	4.16	3.81	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	0	0	9	4.60	679/1514	4.58	4.61	4.39	4.45	4.58	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	788/1551	4.79	4.84	4.66	4.73	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	0	1	8	4.50	556/1503	4.42	4.48	4.24	4.27	4.42	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	0	7	4.20	958/1506	4.04	4.34	4.26	4.29	4.04	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	86/1311	4.72	4.06	3.85	3.88	4.72	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	340/1490	4.67	4.40	4.05	4.26	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	306/1502	4.83	4.62	4.26	4.46	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	684/1489	4.50	4.58	4.29	4.52	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	479/1006	4.00	4.16	4.00	4.21	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.61	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.40	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.39	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.56	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.20	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.74	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	4.48	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	4.27	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.86	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	3.94	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.80	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.78	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.81	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.50	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.92	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	2.00	****	

Course Section: ECAD 489 0301
 Title MGMT & ADMIN SEMINAR
 Instructor: BOULAY, WILLIAM (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 480
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	5	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	0	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	11	Non-major	11
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	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	3				
				?	0						

Course Section: ECAD 489 0301
 Title MGMT & ADMIN SEMINAR
 Instructor: RAUDENBUSH, LIN (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 481
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	1	1	0	8	4.18	1001/1669	4.18	4.37	4.23	4.39	4.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	3	7	4.36	740/1666	4.36	4.45	4.19	4.22	4.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	0	9	4.45	620/1421	4.45	4.47	4.24	4.38	4.45	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	9	4.64	358/1617	4.64	4.33	4.15	4.22	4.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	0	6	4.20	611/1555	4.20	4.29	4.00	4.08	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	2	4	3.90	1019/1543	3.90	4.13	4.06	4.18	3.90	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	806/1647	4.30	4.52	4.12	4.14	4.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	713/1668	4.90	4.70	4.67	4.70	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	2	3	2	1	3.25	1455/1605	3.81	4.16	4.07	4.16	3.81	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	0	0	8	4.56	739/1514	4.58	4.61	4.39	4.45	4.58	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	843/1551	4.79	4.84	4.66	4.73	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	800/1503	4.42	4.48	4.24	4.27	4.42	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	3	0	5	3.89	1184/1506	4.04	4.34	4.26	4.29	4.04	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	241/1311	4.72	4.06	3.85	3.88	4.72	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	340/1490	4.67	4.40	4.05	4.26	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	306/1502	4.83	4.62	4.26	4.46	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	684/1489	4.50	4.58	4.29	4.52	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	479/1006	4.00	4.16	4.00	4.21	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.61	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.40	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.39	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.56	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.20	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.74	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	4.48	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	4.27	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.86	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	3.94	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.80	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.78	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.81	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.50	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.92	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	2.00	****	

Course Section: ECAD 489 0301
 Title MGMT & ADMIN SEMINAR
 Instructor: RAUDENBUSH, LIN (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 481
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	5	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	0	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	11	Non-major	11
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	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	3				
				?	0						