

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	3	9	7	4.10	1006/1481	4.15	4.20	4.29	4.14	4.10	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	7	9	4.20	884/1481	4.06	4.21	4.23	4.18	4.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	5	8	4.00	893/1249	4.11	4.30	4.27	4.14	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	2	3	7	3	3.73	1197/1424	3.99	4.15	4.21	4.06	3.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	4	5	9	4.05	675/1396	3.83	3.96	3.98	3.89	4.05	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	626/1342	4.02	4.06	4.07	3.88	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	3	4	10	4.05	935/1459	4.18	4.30	4.16	4.17	4.05	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	421/1480	4.63	4.73	4.68	4.64	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	5	7	4	3.94	931/1450	3.83	4.01	4.09	3.97	3.94	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	8	11	4.50	762/1409	4.52	4.49	4.42	4.36	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	7	13	4.65	975/1407	4.72	4.70	4.69	4.57	4.65	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	3	5	9	4.11	966/1399	4.18	4.22	4.26	4.23	4.11	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	5	10	4.15	945/1400	4.38	4.27	4.27	4.19	4.15	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	0	0	3	1	7	4.36	365/1179	3.63	3.87	3.96	3.85	4.36	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	3	1	2	1	5	3.33	1059/1262	3.75	3.81	4.05	3.77	3.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	2	2	3	4	3.58	1082/1259	3.95	4.13	4.29	4.06	3.58	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	4	2	6	4.17	826/1256	4.14	4.21	4.30	4.08	4.17	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	1	2	1	3	2	3.33	671/ 788	3.12	3.67	4.00	3.80	3.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.33	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.20	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.04	4.02	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	6	C	7	General	2	Under-grad	20	Non-major	19
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 101 0201  
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS  
 Instructor: MCCONNELL, VIRG  
 Enrollment: 34  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 469  
 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	1	6	3	6	3.71	1283/1481	4.15	4.20	4.29	4.14	3.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	6	5	3.82	1166/1481	4.06	4.21	4.23	4.18	3.82	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	10	4.41	611/1249	4.11	4.30	4.27	4.14	4.41	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	0	6	5	4.25	740/1424	3.99	4.15	4.21	4.06	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	4	3	6	3.69	972/1396	3.83	3.96	3.98	3.89	3.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	11	0	2	0	1	2	3.60	1071/1342	4.02	4.06	4.07	3.88	3.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	5	7	4.00	961/1459	4.18	4.30	4.16	4.17	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1480	4.63	4.73	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	1	3	6	3	3.64	1170/1450	3.83	4.01	4.09	3.97	3.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	739/1409	4.52	4.49	4.42	4.36	4.53	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	1091/1407	4.72	4.70	4.69	4.57	4.53	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	2	8	5	3.94	1058/1399	4.18	4.22	4.26	4.23	3.94	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	8	7	4.12	977/1400	4.38	4.27	4.27	4.19	4.12	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	3	2	1	2	1	2.56	1125/1179	3.63	3.87	3.96	3.85	2.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	2	5	2	3.80	862/1262	3.75	3.81	4.05	3.77	3.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	3	1	5	3.90	978/1259	3.95	4.13	4.29	4.06	3.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	2	1	6	4.10	860/1256	4.14	4.21	4.30	4.08	4.10	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	1	2	4	2	3.78	526/ 788	3.12	3.67	4.00	3.80	3.78	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	3.95	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	4.75	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.42	4.53	4.18	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	5	
?	1			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	10	2	3.81	1218/1481	4.15	4.20	4.29	4.14	3.81	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	8	4	3.94	1082/1481	4.06	4.21	4.23	4.18	3.94	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	6	5	3.88	992/1249	4.11	4.30	4.27	4.14	3.88	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	3	5	5	4.00	959/1424	3.99	4.15	4.21	4.06	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	1	6	6	4.21	536/1396	3.83	3.96	3.98	3.89	4.21	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	0	1	8	3	3.71	1011/1342	4.02	4.06	4.07	3.88	3.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	3	6	4	3.63	1219/1459	4.18	4.30	4.16	4.17	3.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	14	2	4.13	1309/1480	4.63	4.73	4.68	4.64	4.13	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	4	5	1	3.45	1245/1450	3.83	4.01	4.09	3.97	3.45	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	727/1409	4.52	4.49	4.42	4.36	4.53	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	1031/1407	4.72	4.70	4.69	4.57	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	883/1399	4.18	4.22	4.26	4.23	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	3	8	4.13	961/1400	4.38	4.27	4.27	4.19	4.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	8	6	4.33	384/1179	3.63	3.87	3.96	3.85	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	645/1262	3.75	3.81	4.05	3.77	4.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	2	0	2	3	3.86	1002/1259	3.95	4.13	4.29	4.06	3.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	901/1256	4.14	4.21	4.30	4.08	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	4	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 788	3.12	3.67	4.00	3.80	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.33	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.75	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.42	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 63	****	4.25	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.42	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	3.75	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****	

Course-Section: ECON 101 0301  
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS  
 Instructor: COOMBER, WILLIA  
 Enrollment: 38  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 470  
 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	1	A	5	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 101 0401  
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS  
 Instructor: DASGUPTA, NANDI  
 Enrollment: 43  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 471  
 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	1	3	9	11	4.25	844/1481	4.15	4.20	4.29	4.14	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	5	10	7	4.00	1000/1481	4.06	4.21	4.23	4.18	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	15	4.50	498/1249	4.11	4.30	4.27	4.14	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	17	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	533/1424	3.99	4.15	4.21	4.06	4.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	2	0	3	6	4	3.67	985/1396	3.83	3.96	3.98	3.89	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	16	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	434/1342	4.02	4.06	4.07	3.88	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	7	13	4.33	695/1459	4.18	4.30	4.16	4.17	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	631/1480	4.63	4.73	4.68	4.64	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	2	2	0	6	11	2	3.52	1216/1450	3.83	4.01	4.09	3.97	3.52	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	3	3	17	4.50	762/1409	4.52	4.49	4.42	4.36	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	23	4.92	450/1407	4.72	4.70	4.69	4.57	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	6	10	7	3.92	1086/1399	4.18	4.22	4.26	4.23	3.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	4	18	4.74	336/1400	4.38	4.27	4.27	4.19	4.74	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	20	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1179	3.63	3.87	3.96	3.85	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	2	1	1	2	4	3.50	995/1262	3.75	3.81	4.05	3.77	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	0	1	1	7	4.30	751/1259	3.95	4.13	4.29	4.06	4.30	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	2	0	0	3	5	3.90	984/1256	4.14	4.21	4.30	4.08	3.90	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	8	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 788	3.12	3.67	4.00	3.80	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 10	Required for Majors	6
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	B 8		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	5
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 24
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	9
			? 1		

Course-Section: ECON 101 0501  
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS  
 Instructor: COBB, VINCENT  
 Enrollment: 32  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 472  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	1	3	5	6	4.07	1031/1481	4.15	4.20	4.29	4.14	4.07	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	2	5	4	3.53	1309/1481	4.06	4.21	4.23	4.18	3.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	6	4	3.73	1056/1249	4.11	4.30	4.27	4.14	3.73	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	1275/1424	3.99	4.15	4.21	4.06	3.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	5	4	3	3.57	1042/1396	3.83	3.96	3.98	3.89	3.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	934/1342	4.02	4.06	4.07	3.88	3.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	2	5	3	4	3.64	1210/1459	4.18	4.30	4.16	4.17	3.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	0	13	4.79	855/1480	4.63	4.73	4.68	4.64	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	6	2	3	3.58	1195/1450	3.83	4.01	4.09	3.97	3.58	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	4	3	6	4.15	1092/1409	4.52	4.49	4.42	4.36	4.15	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	986/1407	4.72	4.70	4.69	4.57	4.64	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	1002/1399	4.18	4.22	4.26	4.23	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	729/1400	4.38	4.27	4.27	4.19	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	1	0	4	2	1	3.25	997/1179	3.63	3.87	3.96	3.85	3.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	4	0	3	3.86	829/1262	3.75	3.81	4.05	3.77	3.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	6	1	0	3.14	1154/1259	3.95	4.13	4.29	4.06	3.14	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	3	1	2	3.57	1090/1256	4.14	4.21	4.30	4.08	3.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	4	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 788	3.12	3.67	4.00	3.80	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.33	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.20	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.04	4.02	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.75	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 69	****	4.42	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 63	****	4.25	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 69	****	4.42	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	3.75	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****	

Course-Section: ECON 101 0501  
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS  
 Instructor: COBB, VINCENT  
 Enrollment: 32  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 472  
 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	3	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	15	Non-major	14
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
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	4				
				?	1						



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	1	0	0	0	1	10	15	4.54	522/1481	4.15	4.20	4.29	4.14	4.54	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	10	13	4.38	682/1481	4.06	4.21	4.23	4.18	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	8	13	4.27	734/1249	4.11	4.30	4.27	4.14	4.27	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	13	0	1	2	2	8	4.31	684/1424	3.99	4.15	4.21	4.06	4.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	1	2	10	10	4.13	623/1396	3.83	3.96	3.98	3.89	4.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	19	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	384/1342	4.02	4.06	4.07	3.88	4.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	5	19	4.65	287/1459	4.18	4.30	4.16	4.17	4.65	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	21	5	4.19	1260/1480	4.63	4.73	4.68	4.64	4.19	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	6	10	6	4.00	836/1450	3.83	4.01	4.09	3.97	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	5	20	4.80	334/1409	4.52	4.49	4.42	4.36	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	4	20	4.76	804/1407	4.72	4.70	4.69	4.57	4.76	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	8	16	4.60	459/1399	4.18	4.22	4.26	4.23	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	6	19	4.76	299/1400	4.38	4.27	4.27	4.19	4.76	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	15	1	1	1	1	6	4.00	590/1179	3.63	3.87	3.96	3.85	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	2	4	8	4.20	610/1262	3.75	3.81	4.05	3.77	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	509/1259	3.95	4.13	4.29	4.06	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	457/1256	4.14	4.21	4.30	4.08	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	11	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/ 788	3.12	3.67	4.00	3.80	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.33	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.20	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.04	4.02	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.75	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.42	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	4.25	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.42	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	3.75	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****	

Course-Section: ECON 101 0601  
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS  
 Instructor: KAIKAI, ALPHA  
 Enrollment: 40  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 473  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	5	Under-grad	27	Non-major	26
84-150	0	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	9				
				?	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	8	8	8	3.92	1143/1481	4.15	4.20	4.29	4.14	3.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	10	7	8	3.92	1094/1481	4.06	4.21	4.23	4.18	3.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	8	3	10	3.72	1061/1249	4.11	4.30	4.27	4.14	3.72	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	5	4	2	3.73	1202/1424	3.99	4.15	4.21	4.06	3.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	9	5	7	3.70	965/1396	3.83	3.96	3.98	3.89	3.70	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	19	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	****/1342	4.02	4.06	4.07	3.88	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	5	4	15	4.42	595/1459	4.18	4.30	4.16	4.17	4.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	18	5	4.22	1245/1480	4.63	4.73	4.68	4.64	4.22	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	5	10	3	3.89	989/1450	3.83	4.01	4.09	3.97	3.89	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	10	12	4.48	800/1409	4.52	4.49	4.42	4.36	4.48	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	766/1407	4.72	4.70	4.69	4.57	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	3	10	9	4.17	901/1399	4.18	4.22	4.26	4.23	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	12	7	4.13	961/1400	4.38	4.27	4.27	4.19	4.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	17	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	726/1179	3.63	3.87	3.96	3.85	3.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	4	6	3	3.71	907/1262	3.75	3.81	4.05	3.77	3.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	5	3	6	4.07	875/1259	3.95	4.13	4.29	4.06	4.07	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	658/1256	4.14	4.21	4.30	4.08	4.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	9	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	****/ 788	3.12	3.67	4.00	3.80	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	2	1	1	0	1	2.40	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.33	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.20	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.04	4.02	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.75	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.42	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	4.25	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.42	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	3.75	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****	

Course-Section: ECON 101 0701  
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS  
 Instructor: KAIKAI, ALPHA  
 Enrollment: 45  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 474  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	1	Under-grad	25	Non-major	25
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

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	2	14	4.67	395/1481	4.15	4.20	4.29	4.14	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	3	11	4.33	736/1481	4.06	4.21	4.23	4.18	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	3	14	4.61	393/1249	4.11	4.30	4.27	4.14	4.61	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	818/1424	3.99	4.15	4.21	4.06	4.18	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	3	5	2	4	3.19	1228/1396	3.83	3.96	3.98	3.89	3.19	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	2	0	3	3	3.88	905/1342	4.02	4.06	4.07	3.88	3.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	276/1459	4.18	4.30	4.16	4.17	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1480	4.63	4.73	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	9	4	4.13	751/1450	3.83	4.01	4.09	3.97	4.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	290/1409	4.52	4.49	4.42	4.36	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	682/1407	4.72	4.70	4.69	4.57	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	4	9	4.29	792/1399	4.18	4.22	4.26	4.23	4.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	1	14	4.50	591/1400	4.38	4.27	4.27	4.19	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	14	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/1179	3.63	3.87	3.96	3.85	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	2	0	4	3	3.60	958/1262	3.75	3.81	4.05	3.77	3.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	4	0	6	4.20	821/1259	3.95	4.13	4.29	4.06	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	2	1	6	4.20	809/1256	4.14	4.21	4.30	4.08	4.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	8	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 788	3.12	3.67	4.00	3.80	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.33	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 5	
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C 5	General 4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0	Under-grad 18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Non-major 18
				P 0	
				I 0	Electives 0
				? 0	Other 9

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

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	7	5	4.07	1024/1481	4.15	4.20	4.29	4.14	4.07	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	6	4	3.93	1094/1481	4.06	4.21	4.23	4.18	3.93	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	2	5	3	3.36	1144/1249	4.11	4.30	4.27	4.14	3.36	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	2	7	3.93	1061/1424	3.99	4.15	4.21	4.06	3.93	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	5	7	4.29	476/1396	3.83	3.96	3.98	3.89	4.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	424/1342	4.02	4.06	4.07	3.88	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3	2	7	3.93	1030/1459	4.18	4.30	4.16	4.17	3.93	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	11	2	4.15	1288/1480	4.63	4.73	4.68	4.64	4.15	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	973/1450	3.83	4.01	4.09	3.97	3.90	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	1013/1409	4.52	4.49	4.42	4.36	4.29	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	986/1407	4.72	4.70	4.69	4.57	4.64	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	5	3	5	4.00	1002/1399	4.18	4.22	4.26	4.23	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	681/1400	4.38	4.27	4.27	4.19	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	2	1	4	1	4	3.33	972/1179	3.63	3.87	3.96	3.85	3.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	1	3	1	1	3.00	1146/1262	3.75	3.81	4.05	3.77	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	3	1	2	3.43	1120/1259	3.95	4.13	4.29	4.06	3.43	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	1004/1256	4.14	4.21	4.30	4.08	3.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	1	1	2	0	0	2.25	777/ 788	3.12	3.67	4.00	3.80	2.25	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	3.95	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.42	4.53	4.18	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 14
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	9
			? 0		

Course-Section: ECON 101 1001  
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS  
 Instructor: FALCON, JAIME  
 Enrollment: 35  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 477  
 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	1	1	7	10	4.37	718/1481	4.15	4.20	4.29	4.14	4.37	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	14	4.58	434/1481	4.06	4.21	4.23	4.18	4.58	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	369/1249	4.11	4.30	4.27	4.14	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	4	5	7	3.89	1101/1424	3.99	4.15	4.21	4.06	3.89	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	1	8	7	3.84	846/1396	3.83	3.96	3.98	3.89	3.84	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	2	7	7	3.84	927/1342	4.02	4.06	4.07	3.88	3.84	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	10	9	4.47	505/1459	4.18	4.30	4.16	4.17	4.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	421/1480	4.63	4.73	4.68	4.64	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	11	6	4.28	609/1450	3.83	4.01	4.09	3.97	4.28	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	603/1409	4.52	4.49	4.42	4.36	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	636/1407	4.72	4.70	4.69	4.57	4.84	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	545/1399	4.18	4.22	4.26	4.23	4.53	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	4	13	4.47	624/1400	4.38	4.27	4.27	4.19	4.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	8	1	1	3	0	3	3.38	956/1179	3.63	3.87	3.96	3.85	3.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	537/1262	3.75	3.81	4.05	3.77	4.31	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	624/1259	3.95	4.13	4.29	4.06	4.46	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	554/1256	4.14	4.21	4.30	4.08	4.54	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	9	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 788	3.12	3.67	4.00	3.80	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 2	A 7	Required for Majors	5
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 1	B 6	Graduate	0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 2	C 4	General	2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 1	D 0	Under-grad	19
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives	4
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other	6
			? 0		

Course-Section: ECON 102 0101  
 Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS  
 Instructor: PRERO, AARON  
 Enrollment: 38  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 478  
 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	2	1	7	6	2	3.28	1419/1481	4.00	4.20	4.29	4.14	3.28	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	3	9	1	3.28	1380/1481	4.10	4.21	4.23	4.18	3.28	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	8	4	3.78	1036/1249	4.23	4.30	4.27	4.14	3.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	14	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	****/1424	3.97	4.15	4.21	4.06	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	4	4	5	4	3.39	1145/1396	3.78	3.96	3.98	3.89	3.39	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	13	2	1	1	1	0	2.20	1337/1342	3.65	4.06	4.07	3.88	2.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	5	5	5	3.71	1183/1459	4.07	4.30	4.16	4.17	3.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	989/1480	4.48	4.73	4.68	4.64	4.61	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	3	2	8	5	0	2.83	1394/1450	3.88	4.01	4.09	3.97	2.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	2	4	7	3	3.39	1315/1409	4.36	4.49	4.42	4.36	3.39	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	5	5	8	4.17	1283/1407	4.68	4.70	4.69	4.57	4.17	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	4	4	6	2	3.11	1314/1399	4.12	4.22	4.26	4.23	3.11	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	2	6	3	3	2.94	1325/1400	4.17	4.27	4.27	4.19	2.94	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	12	1	1	2	0	2	3.17	1021/1179	3.70	3.87	3.96	3.85	3.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	3	2	2	1	2	2.70	1202/1262	3.63	3.81	4.05	3.77	2.70	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	2	3	0	4	3.40	1127/1259	4.06	4.13	4.29	4.06	3.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	3	0	3	1	3	3.10	1165/1256	4.07	4.21	4.30	4.08	3.10	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	8	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 788	3.63	3.67	4.00	3.80	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.33	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.20	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.04	4.02	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	4.75	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.42	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 63	****	4.25	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.42	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	3.75	3.92	3.80	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B 9	
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 3	General 0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D 0	Under-grad 18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Non-major 13
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 1	Electives 1
					Other 11

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



Course-Section: ECON 102 0201  
 Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS  
 Instructor: PRERO, AARON  
 Enrollment: 34  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 479  
 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	1	0	6	10	8	3.96	1106/1481	4.00	4.20	4.29	4.14	3.96	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	8	7	8	3.80	1179/1481	4.10	4.21	4.23	4.18	3.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	7	4	11	3.88	988/1249	4.23	4.30	4.27	4.14	3.88	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	9	3	1	3	3	5	3.40	1298/1424	3.97	4.15	4.21	4.06	3.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	2	0	5	6	9	3.91	801/1396	3.78	3.96	3.98	3.89	3.91	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	13	0	0	4	4	4	4.00	755/1342	3.65	4.06	4.07	3.88	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	4	6	12	4.04	940/1459	4.07	4.30	4.16	4.17	4.04	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	14	11	4.44	1086/1480	4.48	4.73	4.68	4.64	4.44	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	3	4	7	2	3.50	1223/1450	3.88	4.01	4.09	3.97	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	4	5	13	4.26	1025/1409	4.36	4.49	4.42	4.36	4.26	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	0	1	5	16	4.52	1091/1407	4.68	4.70	4.69	4.57	4.52	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	1	3	8	9	4.05	987/1399	4.12	4.22	4.26	4.23	4.05	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	5	7	11	4.17	937/1400	4.17	4.27	4.27	4.19	4.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	16	0	2	3	1	1	3.14	1027/1179	3.70	3.87	3.96	3.85	3.14	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	3	4	6	4.07	684/1262	3.63	3.81	4.05	3.77	4.07	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	777/1259	4.06	4.13	4.29	4.06	4.27	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	4	0	11	4.47	614/1256	4.07	4.21	4.30	4.08	4.47	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	12	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 788	3.63	3.67	4.00	3.80	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0 Major 2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 3	C 7	General 4	Under-grad 26 Non-major 24
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 1	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 1		
			I 0	Other 14	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ECON 102 0301  
 Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS  
 Instructor: THOMAS, MARK S  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 480  
 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	3	1	3	5	3.83	1206/1481	4.00	4.20	4.29	4.14	3.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	2	1	6	3.75	1205/1481	4.10	4.21	4.23	4.18	3.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	742/1249	4.23	4.30	4.27	4.14	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	5	3	2	3.55	1261/1424	3.97	4.15	4.21	4.06	3.55	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	1250/1396	3.78	3.96	3.98	3.89	3.14	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	405/1342	3.65	4.06	4.07	3.88	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	919/1459	4.07	4.30	4.16	4.17	4.08	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	702/1480	4.48	4.73	4.68	4.64	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	836/1450	3.88	4.01	4.09	3.97	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	1019/1409	4.36	4.49	4.42	4.36	4.27	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	880/1407	4.68	4.70	4.69	4.57	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	892/1399	4.12	4.22	4.26	4.23	4.18	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	647/1400	4.17	4.27	4.27	4.19	4.45	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	2	3	1	2	0	2.38	1142/1179	3.70	3.87	3.96	3.85	2.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	931/1262	3.63	3.81	4.05	3.77	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1067/1259	4.06	4.13	4.29	4.06	3.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1069/1256	4.07	4.21	4.30	4.08	3.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 788	3.63	3.67	4.00	3.80	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 4	C 1	General 1	Under-grad 12 Non-major 12
84-150	5	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 6	
			? 0		

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	1	2	5	9	8	3.84	1199/1481	4.00	4.20	4.29	4.14	3.84	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	9	11	4.12	942/1481	4.10	4.21	4.23	4.18	4.12	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	1	9	11	4.04	877/1249	4.23	4.30	4.27	4.14	4.04	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	0	8	6	7	3.82	1152/1424	3.97	4.15	4.21	4.06	3.82	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	2	1	3	5	9	3.90	801/1396	3.78	3.96	3.98	3.89	3.90	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	4	4	6	7	3.42	1160/1342	3.65	4.06	4.07	3.88	3.42	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	6	2	5	3	9	3.28	1331/1459	4.07	4.30	4.16	4.17	3.28	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	1	1	1	16	4	3.91	1412/1480	4.48	4.73	4.68	4.64	3.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	5	9	4	3.84	1022/1450	3.88	4.01	4.09	3.97	3.84	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	5	6	13	4.33	968/1409	4.36	4.49	4.42	4.36	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	3	19	4.71	919/1407	4.68	4.70	4.69	4.57	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	9	5	8	3.95	1049/1399	4.12	4.22	4.26	4.23	3.95	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	3	3	5	12	4.13	961/1400	4.17	4.27	4.27	4.19	4.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	2	1	2	4	11	4.05	573/1179	3.70	3.87	3.96	3.85	4.05	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	3	0	3	5	7	3.72	902/1262	3.63	3.81	4.05	3.77	3.72	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	4	2	11	4.22	803/1259	4.06	4.13	4.29	4.06	4.22	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	3	4	10	4.28	760/1256	4.07	4.21	4.30	4.08	4.28	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	13	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	****/ 788	3.63	3.67	4.00	3.80	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.33	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.20	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.04	4.02	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	4.75	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.42	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 63	****	4.25	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 69	****	4.42	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 68	****	3.75	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****	

Course-Section: ECON 102 0401  
 Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS  
 Instructor: COOMBER, WILLIA  
 Enrollment: 40  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 481  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	13	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	25	Non-major	25
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 102 0501  
 Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS  
 Instructor: COOMBER, WILLIA  
 Enrollment: 48  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 482  
 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	4	5	9	8	3.81	1225/1481	4.00	4.20	4.29	4.14	3.81	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	8	11	4.12	950/1481	4.10	4.21	4.23	4.18	4.12	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	10	12	4.23	757/1249	4.23	4.30	4.27	4.14	4.23	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	6	10	7	3.88	1101/1424	3.97	4.15	4.21	4.06	3.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	1	4	7	10	4.04	681/1396	3.78	3.96	3.98	3.89	4.04	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	5	7	4	8	3.52	1106/1342	3.65	4.06	4.07	3.88	3.52	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	0	5	5	13	3.96	995/1459	4.07	4.30	4.16	4.17	3.96	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	1	20	4	4.12	1309/1480	4.48	4.73	4.68	4.64	4.12	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	2	5	9	5	3.81	1055/1450	3.88	4.01	4.09	3.97	3.81	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	7	14	4.52	739/1409	4.36	4.49	4.42	4.36	4.52	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	0	21	4.83	682/1407	4.68	4.70	4.69	4.57	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	4	4	7	8	3.83	1135/1399	4.12	4.22	4.26	4.23	3.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	3	3	4	12	4.00	1017/1400	4.17	4.27	4.27	4.19	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	2	2	6	10	4.20	487/1179	3.70	3.87	3.96	3.85	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	3	1	3	2	3	3.08	1136/1262	3.63	3.81	4.05	3.77	3.08	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	1	3	2	6	4.08	872/1259	4.06	4.13	4.29	4.06	4.08	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	0	2	2	7	4.17	826/1256	4.07	4.21	4.30	4.08	4.17	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	6	1	1	1	2	1	3.17	****/ 788	3.63	3.67	4.00	3.80	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	11	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 10		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 5	C 0	General 2	Under-grad 26 Non-major 25
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 11	
			? 1		

Course-Section: ECON 102 0601  
 Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS  
 Instructor: GINDLING, THOMA  
 Enrollment: 34  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 483  
 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	1	4	15	4.52	531/1481	4.00	4.20	4.29	4.14	4.52	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	264/1481	4.10	4.21	4.23	4.18	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	236/1249	4.23	4.30	4.27	4.14	4.76	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	354/1424	3.97	4.15	4.21	4.06	4.59	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	4	4	5	6	3.55	1054/1396	3.78	3.96	3.98	3.89	3.55	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	2	0	4	3	6	3.73	999/1342	3.65	4.06	4.07	3.88	3.73	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	5	12	4.40	611/1459	4.07	4.30	4.16	4.17	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	770/1480	4.48	4.73	4.68	4.64	4.85	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	0	6	10	4.47	375/1450	3.88	4.01	4.09	3.97	4.47	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	334/1409	4.36	4.49	4.42	4.36	4.81	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	19	4.86	614/1407	4.68	4.70	4.69	4.57	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	3	17	4.71	311/1399	4.12	4.22	4.26	4.23	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	361/1400	4.17	4.27	4.27	4.19	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	16	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	****/1179	3.70	3.87	3.96	3.85	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	4	2	2	3.56	976/1262	3.63	3.81	4.05	3.77	3.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	1	3	1	4	3.89	987/1259	4.06	4.13	4.29	4.06	3.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	636/1256	4.07	4.21	4.30	4.08	4.44	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	5	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	****/ 788	3.63	3.67	4.00	3.80	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	4.75	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 69	****	4.42	4.53	4.18	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors	4
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 10	Graduate	0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 3	C 1	Under-grad	21
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 7	D 0	Non-major	21
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other	12
			? 0		

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	3	9	16	4.46	600/1481	4.00	4.20	4.29	4.14	4.46	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	20	4.61	399/1481	4.10	4.21	4.23	4.18	4.61	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	21	4.68	322/1249	4.23	4.30	4.27	4.14	4.68	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	18	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	509/1424	3.97	4.15	4.21	4.06	4.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	5	5	14	4.07	662/1396	3.78	3.96	3.98	3.89	4.07	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	18	1	0	2	4	3	3.80	956/1342	3.65	4.06	4.07	3.88	3.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	3	3	21	4.67	276/1459	4.07	4.30	4.16	4.17	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	18	9	4.33	1158/1480	4.48	4.73	4.68	4.64	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	0	1	10	6	4.29	588/1450	3.88	4.01	4.09	3.97	4.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	2	1	20	4.67	559/1409	4.36	4.49	4.42	4.36	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	2	21	4.83	659/1407	4.68	4.70	4.69	4.57	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	4	2	18	4.58	480/1399	4.12	4.22	4.26	4.23	4.58	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	5	17	4.63	468/1400	4.17	4.27	4.27	4.19	4.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	13	1	0	0	0	9	4.60	208/1179	3.70	3.87	3.96	3.85	4.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	4	2	4	3.82	855/1262	3.63	3.81	4.05	3.77	3.82	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	556/1259	4.06	4.13	4.29	4.06	4.55	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	2	1	3	5	4.00	901/1256	4.07	4.21	4.30	4.08	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	8	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 788	3.63	3.67	4.00	3.80	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	26	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	26	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.33	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	26	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.20	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	26	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.04	4.02	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	4.75	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.42	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	4.25	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.42	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	3.75	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****	

Course-Section: ECON 102 0701  
 Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS  
 Instructor: GOLDFARB, MARSH  
 Enrollment: 45  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 484  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	9	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	5	C	5	General	2	Under-grad	28	Non-major	26
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	6	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	12				
				?	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	2	2	12	15	4.29	792/1481	4.00	4.20	4.29	4.14	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	9	18	4.42	646/1481	4.10	4.21	4.23	4.18	4.42	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	3	1	8	17	4.23	757/1249	4.23	4.30	4.27	4.14	4.23	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	2	1	2	8	12	4.08	918/1424	3.97	4.15	4.21	4.06	4.08	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	5	7	16	4.23	519/1396	3.78	3.96	3.98	3.89	4.23	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	3	2	7	10	4.09	701/1342	3.65	4.06	4.07	3.88	4.09	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	9	17	4.43	565/1459	4.07	4.30	4.16	4.17	4.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	7	21	4.69	936/1480	4.48	4.73	4.68	4.64	4.69	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	1	4	7	13	4.28	599/1450	3.88	4.01	4.09	3.97	4.28	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	4	23	4.63	603/1409	4.36	4.49	4.42	4.36	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	2	26	4.80	728/1407	4.68	4.70	4.69	4.57	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	6	20	4.55	513/1399	4.12	4.22	4.26	4.23	4.55	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	3	4	20	4.33	791/1400	4.17	4.27	4.27	4.19	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	1	3	7	18	4.33	384/1179	3.70	3.87	3.96	3.85	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	4	3	12	4.42	418/1262	3.63	3.81	4.05	3.77	4.42	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	1	3	3	12	4.37	708/1259	4.06	4.13	4.29	4.06	4.37	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	4	2	13	4.47	603/1256	4.07	4.21	4.30	4.08	4.47	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	11	2	0	1	1	4	3.63	577/ 788	3.63	3.67	4.00	3.80	3.63	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	3.95	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 68	****	4.75	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.42	4.53	4.18	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 69	****	4.42	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 68	****	3.75	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	29	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	29	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	29	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	29	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	29	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****	

Course-Section: ECON 102 0801  
 Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS  
 Instructor: KORNILOV, GUERM  
 Enrollment: 36  
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 485  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	15						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	6	C	6	General	1	Under-grad	31	Non-major	31
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 121 0101  
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I  
 Instructor: ST MARTIN, JEAN  
 Enrollment: 39  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 486  
 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	2	4	19	4.68	384/1481	4.48	4.20	4.29	4.14	4.68	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	19	4.76	219/1481	4.61	4.21	4.23	4.18	4.76	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	21	4.80	203/1249	4.60	4.30	4.27	4.14	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	533/1424	4.35	4.15	4.21	4.06	4.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	3	4	5	8	3.76	909/1396	4.08	3.96	3.98	3.89	3.76	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	5	4	8	4.18	615/1342	4.12	4.06	4.07	3.88	4.18	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	4	18	4.60	344/1459	4.72	4.30	4.16	4.17	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1480	4.93	4.73	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	259/1450	4.45	4.01	4.09	3.97	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	5	18	4.71	500/1409	4.70	4.49	4.42	4.36	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1407	4.68	4.70	4.69	4.57	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	6	18	4.75	267/1399	4.62	4.22	4.26	4.23	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	0	22	4.79	262/1400	4.66	4.27	4.27	4.19	4.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	17	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	223/1179	3.90	3.87	3.96	3.85	4.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	1	3	7	4.25	570/1262	3.97	3.81	4.05	3.77	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	841/1259	4.17	4.13	4.29	4.06	4.15	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	1	3	2	6	4.08	868/1256	4.19	4.21	4.30	4.08	4.08	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	8	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/ 788	4.00	3.67	4.00	3.80	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.33	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.20	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.04	4.02	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.75	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.42	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	4.25	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.42	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	3.75	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****	

Course-Section: ECON 121 0101  
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I  
 Instructor: ST MARTIN, JEAN  
 Enrollment: 39  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 486  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	25	Non-major	17
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	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	22				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 121 0201  
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I  
 Instructor: ST MARTIN, JEAN  
 Enrollment: 42  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 487  
 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	1	0	4	20	4.72	340/1481	4.48	4.20	4.29	4.14	4.72	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	20	4.76	219/1481	4.61	4.21	4.23	4.18	4.76	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	19	4.68	322/1249	4.60	4.30	4.27	4.14	4.68	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	318/1424	4.35	4.15	4.21	4.06	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	0	2	6	12	4.18	564/1396	4.08	3.96	3.98	3.89	4.18	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	343/1342	4.12	4.06	4.07	3.88	4.47	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	22	4.80	161/1459	4.72	4.30	4.16	4.17	4.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	24	4.92	561/1480	4.93	4.73	4.68	4.64	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	119/1450	4.45	4.01	4.09	3.97	4.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	169/1409	4.70	4.49	4.42	4.36	4.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1407	4.68	4.70	4.69	4.57	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	20	4.79	223/1399	4.62	4.22	4.26	4.23	4.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	73/1400	4.66	4.27	4.27	4.19	4.96	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	14	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	233/1179	3.90	3.87	3.96	3.85	4.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	3	11	4.60	295/1262	3.97	3.81	4.05	3.77	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	304/1259	4.17	4.13	4.29	4.06	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	248/1256	4.19	4.21	4.30	4.08	4.87	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	12	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 788	4.00	3.67	4.00	3.80	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 5	C 5	General 1	Under-grad 25 Non-major 25
84-150	5	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 21	
			? 0		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank						
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	0	0	10	12	4.39	688/1481	4.48	4.20	4.29	4.14	4.39	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	7	15	4.57	446/1481	4.61	4.21	4.23	4.18	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	8	14	4.52	479/1249	4.60	4.30	4.27	4.14	4.52	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	437/1424	4.35	4.15	4.21	4.06	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	3	3	7	5	3.78	901/1396	4.08	3.96	3.98	3.89	3.78	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	10	1	1	2	3	6	3.92	858/1342	4.12	4.06	4.07	3.88	3.92	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	1	0	5	16	4.64	310/1459	4.72	4.30	4.16	4.17	4.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	0	0	22	4.83	811/1480	4.93	4.73	4.68	4.64	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	1	0	0	5	8	4.36	525/1450	4.45	4.01	4.09	3.97	4.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	5	17	4.77	383/1409	4.70	4.49	4.42	4.36	4.77	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	705/1407	4.68	4.70	4.69	4.57	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	0	6	15	4.59	469/1399	4.62	4.22	4.26	4.23	4.59	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	4	15	4.52	571/1400	4.66	4.27	4.27	4.19	4.52	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	18	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1179	3.90	3.87	3.96	3.85	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	0	0	4	6	4.00	708/1262	3.97	3.81	4.05	3.77	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	1	1	2	7	4.08	872/1259	4.17	4.13	4.29	4.06	4.08	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	1	0	4	6	4.08	868/1256	4.19	4.21	4.30	4.08	4.08	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	10	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 788	4.00	3.67	4.00	3.80	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	3.95	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	5	C	2
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0
				P	1
				I	0
				?	0
			Required for Majors	2	Graduate
			General	1	Under-grad
			Electives	3	Non-major
			Other	16	

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

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	5	16	4.54	513/1481	4.48	4.20	4.29	4.14	4.54	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	20	4.79	192/1481	4.61	4.21	4.23	4.18	4.79	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	19	4.75	245/1249	4.60	4.30	4.27	4.14	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	1	2	6	9	4.28	717/1424	4.35	4.15	4.21	4.06	4.28	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	2	5	14	4.41	380/1396	4.08	3.96	3.98	3.89	4.41	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	1	4	5	5	3.93	845/1342	4.12	4.06	4.07	3.88	3.93	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	91/1459	4.72	4.30	4.16	4.17	4.92	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	631/1480	4.93	4.73	4.68	4.64	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	13	8	4.26	620/1450	4.45	4.01	4.09	3.97	4.26	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	383/1409	4.70	4.49	4.42	4.36	4.77	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	2	8	10	4.29	1245/1407	4.68	4.70	4.69	4.57	4.29	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	7	15	4.68	349/1399	4.62	4.22	4.26	4.23	4.68	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	4	17	4.68	397/1400	4.66	4.27	4.27	4.19	4.68	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	3	2	3	4	3	3.13	1029/1179	3.90	3.87	3.96	3.85	3.13	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	1	1	4	5	3.92	788/1262	3.97	3.81	4.05	3.77	3.92	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	1	0	3	7	4.17	836/1259	4.17	4.13	4.29	4.06	4.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	0	2	1	8	4.25	773/1256	4.19	4.21	4.30	4.08	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	6	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	394/ 788	4.00	3.67	4.00	3.80	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.33	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.20	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.04	4.02	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	3.75	3.92	3.80	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5	C	6	General	3	Under-grad	24	Non-major	23
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	1	Electives	1	#### - 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	3	0	1	1	4	6	10	4.05	1043/1481	4.48	4.20	4.29	4.14	4.05	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	4	10	8	4.18	892/1481	4.61	4.21	4.23	4.18	4.18	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	2	3	5	12	4.23	765/1249	4.60	4.30	4.27	4.14	4.23	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	8	0	0	5	5	4	3.93	1061/1424	4.35	4.15	4.21	4.06	3.93	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	1	1	0	4	3	12	4.25	502/1396	4.08	3.96	3.98	3.89	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	8	1	0	3	2	7	4.08	713/1342	4.12	4.06	4.07	3.88	4.08	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	3	1	17	4.67	276/1459	4.72	4.30	4.16	4.17	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1480	4.93	4.73	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	0	4	5	7	4.19	702/1450	4.45	4.01	4.09	3.97	4.19	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	4	4	13	4.32	990/1409	4.70	4.49	4.42	4.36	4.32	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	1	1	6	13	4.32	1232/1407	4.68	4.70	4.69	4.57	4.32	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	3	0	3	15	4.27	810/1399	4.62	4.22	4.26	4.23	4.27	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	1	5	14	4.36	754/1400	4.66	4.27	4.27	4.19	4.36	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	8	1	4	2	3	4	3.36	964/1179	3.90	3.87	3.96	3.85	3.36	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	4	2	2	5	3	3.06	1138/1262	3.97	3.81	4.05	3.77	3.06	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	1	7	1	6	3.63	1075/1259	4.17	4.13	4.29	4.06	3.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	2	5	1	7	3.69	1064/1256	4.19	4.21	4.30	4.08	3.69	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	12	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/ 788	4.00	3.67	4.00	3.80	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	3.95	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 68	****	4.75	4.49	4.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	25	Non-major	24
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
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	14				
				?	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	3	3	11	4.33	749/1481	4.01	4.20	4.29	4.14	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	11	6	4.28	801/1481	4.05	4.21	4.23	4.18	4.28	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	334/1249	4.33	4.30	4.27	4.14	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	8	6	4.18	829/1424	3.85	4.15	4.21	4.06	4.18	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	269/1396	4.10	3.96	3.98	3.89	4.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	4	6	4	3.87	912/1342	3.83	4.06	4.07	3.88	3.87	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	276/1459	4.37	4.30	4.16	4.17	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	7	4.39	1126/1480	4.33	4.73	4.68	4.64	4.39	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	2	8	4	4.00	836/1450	3.69	4.01	4.09	3.97	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	670/1409	4.18	4.49	4.42	4.36	4.59	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	545/1407	4.50	4.70	4.69	4.57	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	7	8	4.29	792/1399	3.97	4.22	4.26	4.23	4.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	5	8	4.18	929/1400	3.87	4.27	4.27	4.19	4.18	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	3	2	6	5	3.81	753/1179	3.56	3.87	3.96	3.85	3.81	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	4	5	5	3.93	770/1262	3.52	3.81	4.05	3.77	3.93	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	10	4	4.20	821/1259	4.12	4.13	4.29	4.06	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	614/1256	4.24	4.21	4.30	4.08	4.47	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	1	2	6	3	0	2.92	729/ 788	2.92	3.67	4.00	3.80	2.92	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	4.75	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.42	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 63	****	4.25	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.42	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	3.75	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 11	Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C 2	General 1
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D 0	Under-grad 18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Non-major 17
Electives 0					
#### - Means there are not enough					

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	14	
?	0			

Course-Section: ECON 122 0201  
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING II  
 Instructor: DAVIS, MARY B  
 Enrollment: 36  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 492  
 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	6	8	12	4.23	870/1481	4.01	4.20	4.29	4.14	4.23	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	7	18	4.65	336/1481	4.05	4.21	4.23	4.18	4.65	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	6	18	4.62	393/1249	4.33	4.30	4.27	4.14	4.62	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	4	6	6	4.13	885/1424	3.85	4.15	4.21	4.06	4.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	5	8	9	4.18	564/1396	4.10	3.96	3.98	3.89	4.18	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	0	5	2	10	4.29	511/1342	3.83	4.06	4.07	3.88	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	3	23	4.88	113/1459	4.37	4.30	4.16	4.17	4.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	17	9	4.35	1152/1480	4.33	4.73	4.68	4.64	4.35	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	3	6	10	4.37	515/1450	3.69	4.01	4.09	3.97	4.37	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	3	21	4.69	514/1409	4.18	4.49	4.42	4.36	4.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	6	20	4.77	804/1407	4.50	4.70	4.69	4.57	4.77	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	3	4	17	4.35	743/1399	3.97	4.22	4.26	4.23	4.35	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	4	19	4.54	561/1400	3.87	4.27	4.27	4.19	4.54	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	11	0	1	3	6	4	3.93	671/1179	3.56	3.87	3.96	3.85	3.93	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	1	2	4	4	3.75	887/1262	3.52	3.81	4.05	3.77	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	836/1259	4.12	4.13	4.29	4.06	4.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	864/1256	4.24	4.21	4.30	4.08	4.09	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	8	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 788	2.92	3.67	4.00	3.80	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 6	C 8	General	1
84-150	8	3.00-3.49 8	D 0		Under-grad 27
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	23
			? 0		

Course-Section: ECON 122 0301  
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING II  
 Instructor: DAVIS, MARY B  
 Enrollment: 40  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 493  
 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	1	7	11	4.53	531/1481	4.01	4.20	4.29	4.14	4.53	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	8	10	4.42	632/1481	4.05	4.21	4.23	4.18	4.42	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	15	4.63	369/1249	4.33	4.30	4.27	4.14	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	740/1424	3.85	4.15	4.21	4.06	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	380/1396	4.10	3.96	3.98	3.89	4.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	454/1342	3.83	4.06	4.07	3.88	4.36	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	175/1459	4.37	4.30	4.16	4.17	4.79	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	9	4.47	1065/1480	4.33	4.73	4.68	4.64	4.47	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	567/1450	3.69	4.01	4.09	3.97	4.31	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	762/1409	4.18	4.49	4.42	4.36	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	1019/1407	4.50	4.70	4.69	4.57	4.61	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	513/1399	3.97	4.22	4.26	4.23	4.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	4	11	4.44	658/1400	3.87	4.27	4.27	4.19	4.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	1	1	2	3	5	3.83	739/1179	3.56	3.87	3.96	3.85	3.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	842/1262	3.52	3.81	4.05	3.77	3.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	895/1259	4.12	4.13	4.29	4.06	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	826/1256	4.24	4.21	4.30	4.08	4.17	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 788	2.92	3.67	4.00	3.80	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 10	Required for Majors	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 4	General	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 19
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	17
			? 0		

Course-Section: ECON 122 0401  
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING II  
 Instructor: GERKIN, ELIZABE  
 Enrollment: 48  
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 494  
 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	5	3	16	3	4	2.94	1464/1481	4.01	4.20	4.29	4.14	2.94	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	6	5	11	6	3	2.84	1450/1481	4.05	4.21	4.23	4.18	2.84	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	2	12	6	7	3.40	1136/1249	4.33	4.30	4.27	4.14	3.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	12	4	5	4	0	5	2.83	1393/1424	3.85	4.15	4.21	4.06	2.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	4	2	7	4	6	3.26	1195/1396	4.10	3.96	3.98	3.89	3.26	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	14	4	3	5	0	4	2.81	1316/1342	3.83	4.06	4.07	3.88	2.81	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	4	3	14	1	7	3.14	1362/1459	4.37	4.30	4.16	4.17	3.14	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	23	5	4.10	1324/1480	4.33	4.73	4.68	4.64	4.10	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	10	5	8	2	0	2.08	1442/1450	3.69	4.01	4.09	3.97	2.08	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	6	6	6	8	4	2.93	1370/1409	4.18	4.49	4.42	4.36	2.93	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	2	3	5	11	9	3.73	1346/1407	4.50	4.70	4.69	4.57	3.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	5	9	8	6	2	2.70	1369/1399	3.97	4.22	4.26	4.23	2.70	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	14	4	4	4	4	2.33	1383/1400	3.87	4.27	4.27	4.19	2.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	5	5	9	5	1	2.68	1111/1179	3.56	3.87	3.96	3.85	2.68	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	4	1	0	3	1	2.56	1218/1262	3.52	3.81	4.05	3.77	2.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	2	0	2	3	0	2.86	****/1259	4.12	4.13	4.29	4.06	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	25	0	1	1	1	3	0	3.00	****/1256	4.24	4.21	4.30	4.08	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	25	5	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 788	2.92	3.67	4.00	3.80	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	2	A	12	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	6	C	7	General	1	Under-grad	31	Non-major	29
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	25				
				?	4						

Course-Section: ECON 301 0101  
 Title INTERMED ACCOUNTING I  
 Instructor: GERKIN, ELIZABE  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 495  
 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	3	5	6	4.21	896/1481	4.21	4.20	4.29	4.29	4.21	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	4	5	3	3.92	1106/1481	3.92	4.21	4.23	4.23	3.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	5	4.14	824/1249	4.14	4.30	4.27	4.28	4.14	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	706/1424	4.29	4.15	4.21	4.27	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	395/1396	4.38	3.96	3.98	4.00	4.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	251/1342	4.58	4.06	4.07	4.12	4.58	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	1	4	6	3.93	1030/1459	3.93	4.30	4.16	4.17	3.93	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	561/1480	4.93	4.73	4.68	4.65	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	2	7	1	3.90	973/1450	3.90	4.01	4.09	4.10	3.90	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	6	3	4.00	1152/1409	4.00	4.49	4.42	4.43	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	1076/1407	4.55	4.70	4.69	4.67	4.55	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	4	5	3	3.92	1086/1399	3.92	4.22	4.26	4.27	3.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	2	5	3	3.75	1145/1400	3.75	4.27	4.27	4.28	3.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	705/1179	3.89	3.87	3.96	4.02	3.89	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	907/1262	3.71	3.81	4.05	4.14	3.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	402/1259	4.71	4.13	4.29	4.34	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	658/1256	4.43	4.21	4.30	4.34	4.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	335/ 788	4.17	3.67	4.00	4.07	4.17	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	13
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 302 0101  
 Title INTERMED ACCOUNTING II  
 Instructor: CROTEAU, MARCIA  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 496  
 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	3	10	9	4.27	818/1481	4.27	4.20	4.29	4.29	4.27	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	13	4.50	517/1481	4.50	4.21	4.23	4.23	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	7	13	4.45	561/1249	4.45	4.30	4.27	4.28	4.45	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	9	11	4.36	607/1424	4.36	4.15	4.21	4.27	4.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	285/1396	4.53	3.96	3.98	4.00	4.53	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	2	7	9	4.15	638/1342	4.15	4.06	4.07	4.12	4.15	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	2	17	4.64	310/1459	4.64	4.30	4.16	4.17	4.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	351/1480	4.95	4.73	4.68	4.65	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	3	8	5	4.00	836/1450	4.00	4.01	4.09	4.10	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	6	14	4.55	716/1409	4.55	4.49	4.42	4.43	4.55	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	705/1407	4.82	4.70	4.69	4.67	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	5	13	4.36	723/1399	4.36	4.22	4.26	4.27	4.36	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	6	13	4.45	647/1400	4.45	4.27	4.27	4.28	4.45	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	291/1179	4.47	3.87	3.96	4.02	4.47	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	666/1262	4.11	3.81	4.05	4.14	4.11	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	729/1259	4.33	4.13	4.29	4.34	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	992/1256	3.89	4.21	4.30	4.34	3.89	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	5	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/ 788	****	3.67	4.00	4.07	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 1	B 9		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 1	C 4	General 1	Under-grad 22 Non-major 21
84-150	10	3.00-3.49 11	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 20	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ECON 311 0101  
 Title INTERM MICROECON ANALY  
 Instructor: BRADLEY, MICHAEL  
 Enrollment: 33  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 497  
 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	1	7	7	4.40	678/1481	4.27	4.20	4.29	4.29	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	481/1481	4.38	4.21	4.23	4.23	4.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	3	8	4.27	734/1249	4.32	4.30	4.27	4.28	4.27	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	645/1424	4.20	4.15	4.21	4.27	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	5	6	4.13	613/1396	4.23	3.96	3.98	4.00	4.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	1	0	1	3	2	3.71	1011/1342	3.97	4.06	4.07	4.12	3.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	5	7	4.27	766/1459	4.38	4.30	4.16	4.17	4.27	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.73	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	515/1450	4.17	4.01	4.09	4.10	4.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	450/1409	4.76	4.49	4.42	4.43	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	591/1407	4.82	4.70	4.69	4.67	4.87	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	6	6	4.13	938/1399	4.21	4.22	4.26	4.27	4.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	561/1400	4.43	4.27	4.27	4.28	4.53	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	590/1179	3.89	3.87	3.96	4.02	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	4	2	1	3.57	969/1262	3.73	3.81	4.05	4.14	3.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	1002/1259	4.08	4.13	4.29	4.34	3.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	754/1256	4.28	4.21	4.30	4.34	4.29	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	533/ 788	3.82	3.67	4.00	4.07	3.75	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 4	General	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 15
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	14
			? 1		



Course-Section: ECON 311 0201  
 Title INTERM MICROECON ANALY  
 Instructor: BRADLEY, MICHAEL  
 Enrollment: 35  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 498  
 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	1	9	7	4.35	729/1481	4.27	4.20	4.29	4.29	4.35	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	8	7	4.29	779/1481	4.38	4.21	4.23	4.23	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	10	6	4.29	710/1249	4.32	4.30	4.27	4.28	4.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	12	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	557/1424	4.20	4.15	4.21	4.27	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	4	9	4.29	467/1396	4.23	3.96	3.98	4.00	4.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	11	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	592/1342	3.97	4.06	4.07	4.12	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	671/1459	4.38	4.30	4.16	4.17	4.35	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.73	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	9	3	4.15	732/1450	4.17	4.01	4.09	4.10	4.15	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	400/1409	4.76	4.49	4.42	4.43	4.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	682/1407	4.82	4.70	4.69	4.67	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	4	9	4.29	792/1399	4.21	4.22	4.26	4.27	4.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	511/1400	4.43	4.27	4.27	4.28	4.59	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	12	1	1	0	0	3	3.60	860/1179	3.89	3.87	3.96	4.02	3.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	0	1	3	4	3.70	913/1262	3.73	3.81	4.05	4.14	3.70	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	2	1	6	4.10	867/1259	4.08	4.13	4.29	4.34	4.10	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	860/1256	4.28	4.21	4.30	4.34	4.10	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	7	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 788	3.82	3.67	4.00	4.07	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	4
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	11
			? 1		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	8	11	14	4.06	1037/1481	4.27	4.20	4.29	4.29	4.06	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	15	16	4.31	758/1481	4.38	4.21	4.23	4.23	4.31	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	11	20	4.40	624/1249	4.32	4.30	4.27	4.28	4.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	19	1	1	3	5	6	3.88	1108/1424	4.20	4.15	4.21	4.27	3.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	1	5	8	14	4.25	502/1396	4.23	3.96	3.98	4.00	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	24	1	0	2	1	5	4.00	755/1342	3.97	4.06	4.07	4.12	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	11	21	4.53	436/1459	4.38	4.30	4.16	4.17	4.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	34	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.73	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	2	0	0	6	13	6	4.00	836/1450	4.17	4.01	4.09	4.10	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	3	27	4.78	367/1409	4.76	4.49	4.42	4.43	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	5	26	4.78	766/1407	4.82	4.70	4.69	4.67	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	2	7	5	17	4.19	883/1399	4.21	4.22	4.26	4.27	4.19	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	5	0	8	18	4.16	945/1400	4.43	4.27	4.27	4.28	4.16	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	3	0	4	8	15	4.07	570/1179	3.89	3.87	3.96	4.02	4.07	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	2	4	3	12	3.91	788/1262	3.73	3.81	4.05	4.14	3.91	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	4	0	5	15	4.29	757/1259	4.08	4.13	4.29	4.34	4.29	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	2	2	3	17	4.46	625/1256	4.28	4.21	4.30	4.34	4.46	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	15	1	1	1	1	5	3.89	492/ 788	3.82	3.67	4.00	4.07	3.89	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	32	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	4.20	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	33	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	4.23	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	33	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.36	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	33	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.20	3.96	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	33	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.04	4.11	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.75	4.49	4.70	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	33	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.42	4.53	4.66	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	33	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	4.25	4.44	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	33	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.42	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	33	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	3.75	3.92	4.43	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	33	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.48	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	33	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	4.13	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	33	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.33	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	33	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	3.90	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	33	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.88	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	33	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	33	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.88	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	33	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	33	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.67	****	

Course-Section: ECON 311 0301  
 Title INTERM MICROECON ANALY  
 Instructor: LORD, WILLIAM  
 Enrollment: 79  
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 499  
 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	1	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	7
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	6	C	7	General	1	Under-grad	34	Non-major	28
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	12	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	31				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ECON 312 0101  
 Title INTERM MACROECON ANALY  
 Instructor: CINYABUGUMA, MA  
 Enrollment: 35  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 500  
 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	3	7	13	4.43	639/1481	3.97	4.20	4.29	4.29	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	2	18	4.57	446/1481	4.04	4.21	4.23	4.23	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	219/1249	4.18	4.30	4.27	4.28	4.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	2	2	5	11	4.25	740/1424	4.05	4.15	4.21	4.27	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	5	3	12	4.24	519/1396	3.63	3.96	3.98	4.00	4.24	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	2	3	6	9	4.10	695/1342	4.17	4.06	4.07	4.12	4.10	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	4	17	4.57	390/1459	4.13	4.30	4.16	4.17	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	0	20	4.90	702/1480	4.84	4.73	4.68	4.65	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	1	6	5	6	3.89	989/1450	3.79	4.01	4.09	4.10	3.89	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	2	3	14	4.38	913/1409	4.27	4.49	4.42	4.43	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	5	15	4.55	1076/1407	4.54	4.70	4.69	4.67	4.55	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	2	1	6	11	4.14	929/1399	4.05	4.22	4.26	4.27	4.14	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	3	16	4.50	591/1400	4.12	4.27	4.27	4.28	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	11	3	0	2	2	4	3.36	960/1179	3.90	3.87	3.96	4.02	3.36	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	1	1	7	4.30	537/1262	3.63	3.81	4.05	4.14	4.30	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	2	1	2	6	4.09	869/1259	3.98	4.13	4.29	4.34	4.09	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	984/1256	3.97	4.21	4.30	4.34	3.91	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	4	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	394/ 788	4.00	3.67	4.00	4.07	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 1	B 7		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 5	C 1	General 2	Under-grad 23 Non-major 22
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 3	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		

Course-Section: ECON 312 0201  
 Title INTERM MACROECON ANALY  
 Instructor: THOMAS, MARK S  
 Enrollment: 44  
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 501  
 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	3	10	10	5	3.61	1324/1481	3.97	4.20	4.29	4.29	3.61	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	5	8	6	7	3.39	1365/1481	4.04	4.21	4.23	4.23	3.39	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	6	10	7	4	3.25	1163/1249	4.18	4.30	4.27	4.28	3.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	20	1	2	1	2	2	3.25	1333/1424	4.05	4.15	4.21	4.27	3.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	16	4	1	4	2	1	2.58	1360/1396	3.63	3.96	3.98	4.00	2.58	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	22	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	****/1342	4.17	4.06	4.07	4.12	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	5	6	8	6	3.41	1297/1459	4.13	4.30	4.16	4.17	3.41	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	27	4.96	281/1480	4.84	4.73	4.68	4.65	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	2	11	10	2	3.38	1272/1450	3.79	4.01	4.09	4.10	3.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	6	15	5	3.82	1234/1409	4.27	4.49	4.42	4.43	3.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	7	9	12	4.18	1281/1407	4.54	4.70	4.69	4.67	4.18	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	7	5	9	7	3.57	1223/1399	4.05	4.22	4.26	4.27	3.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	2	6	9	8	3.61	1204/1400	4.12	4.27	4.27	4.28	3.61	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	2	5	7	9	4.00	590/1179	3.90	3.87	3.96	4.02	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	1	6	2	2	3.25	1081/1262	3.63	3.81	4.05	4.14	3.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	5	4	3	3.83	1012/1259	3.98	4.13	4.29	4.34	3.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	7	3	2	3.58	1088/1256	3.97	4.21	4.30	4.34	3.58	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	8	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	****/ 788	4.00	3.67	4.00	4.07	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 11		
56-83	8	2.00-2.99 5	C 3	General 0	Under-grad 29 Non-major 28
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 8	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 24	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ECON 312 0301  
 Title INTERM MACROECON ANALY  
 Instructor: THOMAS, MARK S  
 Enrollment: 42  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 502  
 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	1	7	7	6	3.73	1271/1481	3.97	4.20	4.29	4.29	3.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	9	6	6	3.77	1194/1481	4.04	4.21	4.23	4.23	3.77	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	6	6	7	3.95	936/1249	4.18	4.30	4.27	4.28	3.95	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	0	2	6	2	4.00	959/1424	4.05	4.15	4.21	4.27	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	4	1	3	4	3.58	1036/1396	3.63	3.96	3.98	4.00	3.58	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	13	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	755/1342	4.17	4.06	4.07	4.12	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	6	6	7	3.81	1125/1459	4.13	4.30	4.16	4.17	3.81	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	421/1480	4.84	4.73	4.68	4.65	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	1	5	5	4	3.80	1055/1450	3.79	4.01	4.09	4.10	3.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	2	4	4	9	4.05	1137/1409	4.27	4.49	4.42	4.43	4.05	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	6	11	4.47	1130/1407	4.54	4.70	4.69	4.67	4.47	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	2	4	5	8	4.00	1002/1399	4.05	4.22	4.26	4.27	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	1	0	9	7	3.95	1060/1400	4.12	4.27	4.27	4.28	3.95	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	0	1	4	5	5	3.93	661/1179	3.90	3.87	3.96	4.02	3.93	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	2	3	5	1	3.45	1014/1262	3.63	3.81	4.05	4.14	3.45	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	2	0	4	4	1	3.18	1150/1259	3.98	4.13	4.29	4.34	3.18	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	2	3	2	4	3.73	1052/1256	3.97	4.21	4.30	4.34	3.73	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	8	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 788	4.00	3.67	4.00	4.07	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	7	General	1	Under-grad	22	Non-major	20
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 312 0401  
 Title INTERM MACROECON ANALY  
 Instructor: ANORUO, EMMANUE  
 Enrollment: 37  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 503  
 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	3	10	5	4.11	996/1481	3.97	4.20	4.29	4.29	4.11	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	603/1481	4.04	4.21	4.23	4.23	4.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	270/1249	4.18	4.30	4.27	4.28	4.72	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	248/1424	4.05	4.15	4.21	4.27	4.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	1	1	4	8	4.13	613/1396	3.63	3.96	3.98	4.00	4.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	394/1342	4.17	4.06	4.07	4.12	4.42	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	217/1459	4.13	4.30	4.16	4.17	4.72	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	10	4.56	1020/1480	4.84	4.73	4.68	4.65	4.56	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	2	0	0	3	8	4	4.07	803/1450	3.79	4.01	4.09	4.10	4.07	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	290/1409	4.27	4.49	4.42	4.43	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	300/1407	4.54	4.70	4.69	4.67	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	567/1399	4.05	4.22	4.26	4.27	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	658/1400	4.12	4.27	4.27	4.28	4.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	3	6	8	4.29	411/1179	3.90	3.87	3.96	4.02	4.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	995/1262	3.63	3.81	4.05	4.14	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	276/1259	3.98	4.13	4.29	4.34	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	457/1256	3.97	4.21	4.30	4.34	4.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	4.20	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	4.23	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 11	Required for Majors	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 7		Graduate 0
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	18
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Major 4
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	17
			? 0		

Course-Section: ECON 320 0101  
 Title QUANT MTHDS:MANAGEMENT  
 Instructor: PALMATEER, JASO  
 Enrollment: 77  
 Questionnaires: 46

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 504  
 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	8	18	19	4.24	857/1481	4.24	4.20	4.29	4.29	4.24	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	5	14	23	4.27	811/1481	4.27	4.21	4.23	4.23	4.27	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	1	8	11	23	4.23	765/1249	4.23	4.30	4.27	4.28	4.23	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	3	6	16	15	4.07	923/1424	4.07	4.15	4.21	4.27	4.07	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	20	3	4	3	7	8	3.52	1071/1396	3.52	3.96	3.98	4.00	3.52	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	10	0	2	7	10	16	4.14	649/1342	4.14	4.06	4.07	4.12	4.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	2	3	9	29	4.36	671/1459	4.36	4.30	4.16	4.17	4.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	31	14	4.31	1171/1480	4.31	4.73	4.68	4.65	4.31	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	1	13	13	10	3.86	1005/1450	3.86	4.01	4.09	4.10	3.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	4	7	32	4.65	574/1409	4.65	4.49	4.42	4.43	4.65	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	3	13	27	4.48	1130/1407	4.48	4.70	4.69	4.67	4.48	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	2	6	8	26	4.38	703/1399	4.38	4.22	4.26	4.27	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	7	8	26	4.27	852/1400	4.27	4.27	4.27	4.28	4.27	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	8	15	19	4.21	480/1179	4.21	3.87	3.96	4.02	4.21	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	2	6	6	7	3.86	829/1262	3.86	3.81	4.05	4.14	3.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	25	0	3	2	4	5	7	3.52	1091/1259	3.52	4.13	4.29	4.34	3.52	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	25	0	0	3	5	5	8	3.86	1004/1256	3.86	4.21	4.30	4.34	3.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	25	4	0	2	3	5	7	4.00	394/ 788	4.00	3.67	4.00	4.07	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 20	Required for Majors	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 17		Graduate 0
56-83	12	2.00-2.99 13	C 6	General	3
84-150	17	3.00-3.49 13	D 0		Under-grad 46
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 9	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	38
			? 0		



Course-Section: ECON 374 0101  
 Title FUND FINANCIAL MGMT  
 Instructor: ANORUO, EMMANUE  
 Enrollment: 63  
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 505  
 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	2	0	0	2	3	13	10	4.11	1006/1481	4.11	4.20	4.29	4.29	4.11	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	11	15	4.46	574/1481	4.46	4.21	4.23	4.23	4.46	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	5	21	4.68	322/1249	4.68	4.30	4.27	4.28	4.68	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	4	0	0	4	9	11	4.29	695/1424	4.29	4.15	4.21	4.27	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	0	0	7	8	9	4.08	655/1396	4.08	3.96	3.98	4.00	4.08	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	12	0	2	0	5	9	4.31	494/1342	4.31	4.06	4.07	4.12	4.31	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	0	6	21	4.68	264/1459	4.68	4.30	4.16	4.17	4.68	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	7	21	4.75	880/1480	4.75	4.73	4.68	4.65	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	2	0	0	6	10	7	4.04	814/1450	4.04	4.01	4.09	4.10	4.04	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	2	24	4.79	367/1409	4.79	4.49	4.42	4.43	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	5	21	4.68	952/1407	4.68	4.70	4.69	4.67	4.68	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	7	19	4.61	459/1399	4.61	4.22	4.26	4.27	4.61	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	2	0	10	15	4.41	704/1400	4.41	4.27	4.27	4.28	4.41	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	2	3	5	14	4.29	411/1179	4.29	3.87	3.96	4.02	4.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	2	2	4	6	3.80	862/1262	3.80	3.81	4.05	4.14	3.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	0	2	4	8	4.20	821/1259	4.20	4.13	4.29	4.34	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	680/1256	4.40	4.21	4.30	4.34	4.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	9	2	0	2	0	2	3.00	****/ 788	****	3.67	4.00	4.07	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 17	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 1 Major 4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	6	2.00-2.99 5	C 2	General 2	Under-grad 29 Non-major 26
84-150	11	3.00-3.49 12	D 0		
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 25	
			? 1		

Course-Section: ECON 382 0101  
 Title ASIAN ECONOMIC HIST  
 Instructor: MITCH, DAVID F  
 Enrollment: 45  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 506  
 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	2	10	12	4.42	665/1481	4.42	4.20	4.29	4.29	4.42	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	9	10	4.17	909/1481	4.17	4.21	4.23	4.23	4.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	5	15	4.42	611/1249	4.42	4.30	4.27	4.28	4.42	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	2	9	9	4.24	762/1424	4.24	4.15	4.21	4.27	4.24	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	6	7	9	3.92	791/1396	3.92	3.96	3.98	4.00	3.92	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	12	6	4.00	755/1342	4.00	4.06	4.07	4.12	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	5	5	14	4.38	647/1459	4.38	4.30	4.16	4.17	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	631/1480	4.91	4.73	4.68	4.65	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	1	2	10	5	4.06	808/1450	4.06	4.01	4.09	4.10	4.06	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	6	14	4.48	800/1409	4.48	4.49	4.42	4.43	4.48	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	682/1407	4.83	4.70	4.69	4.67	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	4	10	8	4.04	987/1399	4.04	4.22	4.26	4.27	4.04	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	8	13	4.48	624/1400	4.48	4.27	4.27	4.28	4.48	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	5	5	10	4.25	442/1179	4.25	3.87	3.96	4.02	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	2	2	5	7	4.06	687/1262	4.06	3.81	4.05	4.14	4.06	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	2	5	8	4.25	783/1259	4.25	4.13	4.29	4.34	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	4	4	8	4.25	773/1256	4.25	4.21	4.30	4.34	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	6	2	0	4	2	1	3.00	713/ 788	3.00	3.67	4.00	4.07	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors	16
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 1	B 11		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 4	C 1	General	8
84-150	9	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 2	Other	11

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

Course-Section: ECON 387 0101  
 Title ECON DEVEL LATIN AMER  
 Instructor: GINDLING, THOMA  
 Enrollment: 38  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 507  
 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	6	13	4.39	688/1481	4.39	4.20	4.29	4.29	4.39	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	9	11	4.30	769/1481	4.30	4.21	4.23	4.23	4.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	17	4.61	405/1249	4.61	4.30	4.27	4.28	4.61	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	2	7	11	4.45	509/1424	4.45	4.15	4.21	4.27	4.45	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	5	7	7	3.61	1025/1396	3.61	3.96	3.98	4.00	3.61	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	13	7	4.13	660/1342	4.13	4.06	4.07	4.12	4.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	5	14	4.43	565/1459	4.43	4.30	4.16	4.17	4.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13	10	4.43	1093/1480	4.43	4.73	4.68	4.65	4.43	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	1	1	10	8	4.25	630/1450	4.25	4.01	4.09	4.10	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	21	4.87	246/1409	4.87	4.49	4.42	4.43	4.87	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	1	21	4.83	682/1407	4.83	4.70	4.69	4.67	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	6	14	4.48	601/1399	4.48	4.22	4.26	4.27	4.48	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	17	4.74	336/1400	4.74	4.27	4.27	4.28	4.74	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	17	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	****/1179	****	3.87	3.96	4.02	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	1	4	3	5	3.71	907/1262	3.71	3.81	4.05	4.14	3.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	809/1259	4.21	4.13	4.29	4.34	4.21	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	0	5	8	4.43	658/1256	4.43	4.21	4.30	4.34	4.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	11	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 788	****	3.67	4.00	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	4.23	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.75	4.49	4.70	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 69	****	4.42	4.53	4.66	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 63	****	4.25	4.44	4.56	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	3.75	3.92	4.43	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.48	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	4.13	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.33	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	3.90	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.88	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.88	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.67	****	

Course-Section: ECON 387 0101  
 Title ECON DEVEL LATIN AMER  
 Instructor: GINDLING, THOMA  
 Enrollment: 38  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 507  
 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	1	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C	1	General	6	Under-grad	23	Non-major	16
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 405 0101  
 Title BENEFIT-COST EVALUATIO  
 Instructor: FARROW, SCOTT  
 Enrollment: 44  
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 508  
 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	3	7	13	9	3.88	1180/1481	3.88	4.20	4.29	4.45	3.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	12	11	6	3.63	1275/1481	3.63	4.21	4.23	4.32	3.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	10	14	6	3.81	1022/1249	3.81	4.30	4.27	4.44	3.81	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	12	15	4.28	706/1424	4.28	4.15	4.21	4.35	4.28	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	3	15	10	3.94	772/1396	3.94	3.96	3.98	4.09	3.94	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	7	11	12	4.10	701/1342	4.10	4.06	4.07	4.21	4.10	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	7	6	17	4.19	836/1459	4.19	4.30	4.16	4.25	4.19	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	31	4.97	281/1480	4.97	4.73	4.68	4.74	4.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	8	8	9	4.04	814/1450	4.04	4.01	4.09	4.28	4.04	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	3	9	17	4.40	891/1409	4.40	4.49	4.42	4.51	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	1	3	25	4.73	861/1407	4.73	4.70	4.69	4.79	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	9	10	10	3.97	1039/1399	3.97	4.22	4.26	4.36	3.97	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	6	10	12	4.00	1017/1400	4.00	4.27	4.27	4.38	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	5	1	2	7	10	4	3.58	866/1179	3.58	3.87	3.96	4.07	3.58	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	4	7	3	3.73	897/1262	3.73	3.81	4.05	4.33	3.73	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	777/1259	4.27	4.13	4.29	4.57	4.27	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	614/1256	4.47	4.21	4.30	4.60	4.47	
4. Were special techniques successful	18	1	0	0	5	4	5	4.00	394/ 788	4.00	3.67	4.00	4.26	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 14	Graduate	4
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 7	C 5	General	8
84-150	17	3.00-3.49 4	D 0	Under-grad	29
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other	17
			? 1		

Course-Section: ECON 408 0101  
 Title: MANAGERIAL ECONOMICS  
 Instructor: DASGUPTA, NANDI  
 Enrollment: 47  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 509  
 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	1	2	12	5	4.05	1037/1481	4.05	4.20	4.29	4.45	4.05	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	5	11	4.29	790/1481	4.29	4.21	4.23	4.32	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	17	4.67	334/1249	4.67	4.30	4.27	4.44	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	840/1424	4.17	4.15	4.21	4.35	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	1	4	5	7	3.60	1025/1396	3.60	3.96	3.98	4.09	3.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	649/1342	4.14	4.06	4.07	4.21	4.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	0	5	14	4.48	505/1459	4.48	4.30	4.16	4.25	4.48	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	928/1480	4.70	4.73	4.68	4.74	4.70	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	5	3	8	4.19	702/1450	4.19	4.01	4.09	4.28	4.19	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	762/1409	4.50	4.49	4.42	4.51	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	823/1407	4.75	4.70	4.69	4.79	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	6	11	4.35	733/1399	4.35	4.22	4.26	4.36	4.35	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	4	12	4.30	829/1400	4.30	4.27	4.27	4.38	4.30	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	13	0	2	1	0	3	3.67	840/1179	3.67	3.87	3.96	4.07	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1262	****	3.81	4.05	4.33	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1259	****	4.13	4.29	4.57	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1256	****	4.21	4.30	4.60	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	18	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 788	****	3.67	4.00	4.26	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	3	General	2	Under-grad	21	Non-major	16
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	8	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	18				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 412 0101  
 Title TOPICS IN MACROECONOMI  
 Instructor: GRIBBIN, JOSEPH  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 510  
 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	1	2	10	4.69	362/1481	4.69	4.20	4.29	4.45	4.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	517/1481	4.50	4.21	4.23	4.32	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	1	9	4.46	548/1249	4.46	4.30	4.27	4.44	4.46	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	4	6	4.17	840/1424	4.17	4.15	4.21	4.35	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	3	9	4.46	330/1396	4.46	3.96	3.98	4.09	4.46	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	0	1	8	4.27	527/1342	4.27	4.06	4.07	4.21	4.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	792/1459	4.23	4.30	4.16	4.25	4.23	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.73	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	1	0	3	4	3.89	989/1450	3.89	4.01	4.09	4.28	3.89	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	290/1409	4.83	4.49	4.42	4.51	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	400/1407	4.92	4.70	4.69	4.79	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	2	0	10	4.38	703/1399	4.38	4.22	4.26	4.36	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	0	10	4.38	729/1400	4.38	4.27	4.27	4.38	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	243/1179	4.54	3.87	3.96	4.07	4.54	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	645/1262	4.14	3.81	4.05	4.33	4.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	764/1259	4.29	4.13	4.29	4.57	4.29	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	532/1256	4.57	4.21	4.30	4.60	4.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 788	****	3.67	4.00	4.26	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	37/ 68	4.75	4.75	4.49	4.68	4.75	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	1	2	1	8	4.33	52/ 69	4.33	4.42	4.53	4.64	4.33	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	2	9	4.50	31/ 63	4.50	4.25	4.44	4.49	4.50	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	3	8	4.42	39/ 69	4.42	4.42	4.35	4.53	4.42	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	2	1	0	4	5	3.75	43/ 68	3.75	3.75	3.92	4.10	3.75	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ECON 414 0101  
 Title PUBLIC POLICY TOWARD B  
 Instructor: CARROLL, KATHLE  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 511  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	362/1481	4.69	4.20	4.29	4.45	4.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	10	4.62	386/1481	4.62	4.21	4.23	4.32	4.62	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	393/1249	4.62	4.30	4.27	4.44	4.62	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	310/1424	4.64	4.15	4.21	4.35	4.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	4	1	4	3.31	1181/1396	3.31	3.96	3.98	4.09	3.31	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	277/1342	4.55	4.06	4.07	4.21	4.55	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	242/1459	4.69	4.30	4.16	4.25	4.69	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.73	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	1	0	5	4	4.20	692/1450	4.20	4.01	4.09	4.28	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	275/1409	4.85	4.49	4.42	4.51	4.85	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	400/1407	4.92	4.70	4.69	4.79	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	0	3	9	4.46	613/1399	4.46	4.22	4.26	4.36	4.46	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	4	8	4.38	729/1400	4.38	4.27	4.27	4.38	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	340/1179	4.40	3.87	3.96	4.07	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	645/1262	4.14	3.81	4.05	4.33	4.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	532/1259	4.57	4.13	4.29	4.57	4.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	256/1256	4.86	4.21	4.30	4.60	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	318/ 788	4.20	3.67	4.00	4.26	4.20	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 1
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	5
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 12
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	7
			? 2		



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	0	1	7	9	4.28	818/1481	4.28	4.20	4.29	4.45	4.28	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	5	9	4.22	854/1481	4.22	4.21	4.23	4.32	4.22	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	5	11	4.44	573/1249	4.44	4.30	4.27	4.44	4.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	2	9	6	4.24	762/1424	4.24	4.15	4.21	4.35	4.24	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	0	3	4	8	4.13	623/1396	4.13	3.96	3.98	4.09	4.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	8	7	4.29	511/1342	4.29	4.06	4.07	4.21	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	4	12	4.50	460/1459	4.50	4.30	4.16	4.25	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	729/1480	4.89	4.73	4.68	4.74	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	567/1450	4.31	4.01	4.09	4.28	4.31	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	3	12	4.44	839/1409	4.44	4.49	4.42	4.51	4.44	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	659/1407	4.83	4.70	4.69	4.79	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	2	2	1	12	4.17	910/1399	4.17	4.22	4.26	4.36	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	2	2	11	4.11	977/1400	4.11	4.27	4.27	4.38	4.11	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	12	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	****/1179	****	3.87	3.96	4.07	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	1026/1262	3.43	3.81	4.05	4.33	3.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	764/1259	4.29	4.13	4.29	4.57	4.29	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	901/1256	4.00	4.21	4.30	4.60	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	5	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 788	****	3.67	4.00	4.26	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	4.45	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	3.87	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.20	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.04	3.86	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 12	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	6
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 19
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: ECON 444 0101  
 Title HIST OF ECON THOUGHT I  
 Instructor: BRADLEY, MICHAEL  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 513  
 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	3	5	4.63	439/1481	4.63	4.20	4.29	4.45	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	374/1481	4.63	4.21	4.23	4.32	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	381/1249	4.63	4.30	4.27	4.44	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	165/1424	4.83	4.15	4.21	4.35	4.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	90/1396	4.88	3.96	3.98	4.09	4.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	135/1342	4.75	4.06	4.07	4.21	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	378/1459	4.57	4.30	4.16	4.25	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.73	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	119/1450	4.86	4.01	4.09	4.28	4.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	618/1409	4.63	4.49	4.42	4.51	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.70	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	267/1399	4.75	4.22	4.26	4.36	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	198/1400	4.86	4.27	4.27	4.38	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	590/1179	4.00	3.87	3.96	4.07	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	507/1262	4.33	3.81	4.05	4.33	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	588/1259	4.50	4.13	4.29	4.57	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	457/1256	4.67	4.21	4.30	4.60	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	394/ 788	4.00	3.67	4.00	4.26	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 1
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	7
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 2
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	6
			? 1		

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

Course-Section: ECON 467 0101  
 Title HEALTH ECONOMICS  
 Instructor: GOLDFARB, MARSH  
 Enrollment: 54  
 Questionnaires: 43

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 514  
 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	2	11	29	4.64	417/1481	4.64	4.20	4.29	4.45	4.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	5	10	26	4.45	589/1481	4.45	4.21	4.23	4.32	4.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	12	27	4.51	488/1249	4.51	4.30	4.27	4.44	4.51	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	21	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	271/1424	4.68	4.15	4.21	4.35	4.68	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	2	8	11	17	3.97	735/1396	3.98	3.96	3.98	4.09	3.97	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	27	0	2	0	2	9	4.38	424/1342	4.38	4.06	4.07	4.21	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	0	1	5	15	19	4.30	732/1459	4.30	4.30	4.16	4.25	4.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	3	28	9	4.15	1288/1480	4.15	4.73	4.68	4.74	4.15	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	0	1	4	13	14	4.25	630/1450	4.25	4.01	4.09	4.28	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	8	32	4.76	417/1409	4.76	4.49	4.42	4.51	4.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	5	35	4.83	682/1407	4.83	4.70	4.69	4.79	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	3	7	30	4.61	459/1399	4.61	4.22	4.26	4.36	4.61	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	5	33	4.73	336/1400	4.73	4.27	4.27	4.38	4.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	27	0	0	5	0	6	4.09	560/1179	4.09	3.87	3.96	4.07	4.09	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	26	0	2	1	3	3	8	3.82	849/1262	3.82	3.81	4.05	4.33	3.82	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	26	0	1	0	2	4	10	4.29	757/1259	4.29	4.13	4.29	4.57	4.29	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	26	0	1	1	2	3	10	4.18	820/1256	4.18	4.21	4.30	4.60	4.18	
4. Were special techniques successful	26	13	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 788	****	3.67	4.00	4.26	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 1	A 9	Required for Majors	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 21		Graduate 3
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 11	C 7	General	8
84-150	21	3.00-3.49 10	D 0		Under-grad 40
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00 11	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	26
			? 1		

Course-Section: ECON 471 0101  
 Title MONEY & CAPITAL MARKET  
 Instructor: Morris, Russell  
 Enrollment: 46  
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 515  
 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	1	3	10	14	4.21	909/1481	4.21	4.20	4.29	4.45	4.21	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	5	6	15	4.18	900/1481	4.20	4.21	4.23	4.32	4.18	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	4	7	16	4.21	781/1249	4.28	4.30	4.27	4.44	4.21	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	9	1	1	3	6	8	4.00	959/1424	4.36	4.15	4.21	4.35	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	5	8	13	4.11	643/1396	4.09	3.96	3.98	4.09	4.11	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	8	1	2	6	5	5	3.58	1084/1342	3.60	4.06	4.07	4.21	3.58	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	5	5	16	4.21	809/1459	4.36	4.30	4.16	4.25	4.21	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	2	25	4.82	811/1480	4.91	4.73	4.68	4.74	4.82	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	1	0	7	6	7	3.86	1014/1450	3.97	4.01	4.09	4.28	3.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	3	8	16	4.36	946/1409	4.60	4.49	4.42	4.51	4.36	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	2	6	19	4.54	1084/1407	4.73	4.70	4.69	4.79	4.54	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	5	7	14	4.14	929/1399	4.24	4.22	4.26	4.36	4.14	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	3	2	4	16	4.07	994/1400	4.11	4.27	4.27	4.38	4.07	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	18	1	0	4	1	2	3.38	956/1179	3.56	3.87	3.96	4.07	3.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	1	6	6	4.21	596/1262	4.11	3.81	4.05	4.33	4.21	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	1	3	2	7	4.15	841/1259	4.58	4.13	4.29	4.57	4.15	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	3	1	8	4.42	669/1256	4.46	4.21	4.30	4.60	4.42	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	7	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	****/ 788	****	3.67	4.00	4.26	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 10		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 5	General 0	Under-grad 29 Non-major 29
84-150	16	3.00-3.49 10	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 25	
			? 1		

Course-Section: ECON 471 0201  
 Title MONEY & CAPITAL MARKET  
 Instructor: Morris, Russell  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 516  
 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	1	1	1	2	9	4.21	896/1481	4.21	4.20	4.29	4.45	4.21	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	865/1481	4.20	4.21	4.23	4.32	4.21	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	1	9	4.36	663/1249	4.28	4.30	4.27	4.44	4.36	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	240/1424	4.36	4.15	4.21	4.35	4.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	5	6	4.07	662/1396	4.09	3.96	3.98	4.09	4.07	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	1060/1342	3.60	4.06	4.07	4.21	3.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	460/1459	4.36	4.30	4.16	4.25	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1480	4.91	4.73	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	786/1450	3.97	4.01	4.09	4.28	4.09	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	275/1409	4.60	4.49	4.42	4.51	4.85	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	400/1407	4.73	4.70	4.69	4.79	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	753/1399	4.24	4.22	4.26	4.36	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	3	6	4.15	945/1400	4.11	4.27	4.27	4.38	4.15	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	9	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	793/1179	3.56	3.87	3.96	4.07	3.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	708/1262	4.11	3.81	4.05	4.33	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1259	4.58	4.13	4.29	4.57	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	571/1256	4.46	4.21	4.30	4.60	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	5	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 788	****	3.67	4.00	4.26	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.75	4.49	4.68	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.42	4.53	4.64	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	4.25	4.44	4.49	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.42	4.35	4.53	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	3.75	3.92	4.10	****	

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	0	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	1
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 15
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0		
			? 1	Other	12

Course-Section: ECON 475 0101  
 Title FINANCIAL INVSTMNT ANA  
 Instructor: COATES, DENNIS  
 Enrollment: 37  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 517  
 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	1	0	5	15	4.62	450/1481	4.62	4.20	4.29	4.45	4.62	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	16	4.62	386/1481	4.62	4.21	4.23	4.32	4.62	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	1	17	4.57	432/1249	4.57	4.30	4.27	4.44	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	3	15	4.48	473/1424	4.48	4.15	4.21	4.35	4.48	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	7	12	4.48	321/1396	4.48	3.96	3.98	4.09	4.48	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	10	8	4.24	557/1342	4.24	4.06	4.07	4.21	4.24	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	19	4.86	131/1459	4.86	4.30	4.16	4.25	4.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.73	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	9	7	4.35	525/1450	4.35	4.01	4.09	4.28	4.35	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	334/1409	4.81	4.49	4.42	4.51	4.81	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	804/1407	4.76	4.70	4.69	4.79	4.76	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	445/1399	4.62	4.22	4.26	4.36	4.62	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	421/1400	4.67	4.27	4.27	4.38	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	16	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/1179	****	3.87	3.96	4.07	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	467/1262	4.38	3.81	4.05	4.33	4.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	987/1259	3.89	4.13	4.29	4.57	3.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	1	0	2	4	3.88	996/1256	3.88	4.21	4.30	4.60	3.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	3	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/ 788	****	3.67	4.00	4.26	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	2	Under-grad	21	Non-major	20
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 478 0101  
 Title REAL ESTATE ECON AND F  
 Instructor: GETTER, DARYL  
 Enrollment: 55  
 Questionnaires: 44

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 518  
 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	2	9	32	4.70	362/1481	4.70	4.20	4.29	4.45	4.70	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	6	35	4.77	219/1481	4.77	4.21	4.23	4.32	4.77	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	2	7	32	4.60	405/1249	4.60	4.30	4.27	4.44	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	7	1	3	3	7	22	4.28	717/1424	4.28	4.15	4.21	4.35	4.28	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	29	0	2	2	1	9	4.21	536/1396	4.21	3.96	3.98	4.09	4.21	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	11	0	3	4	8	16	4.19	592/1342	4.19	4.06	4.07	4.21	4.19	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	1	5	35	4.76	189/1459	4.76	4.30	4.16	4.25	4.76	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	2	0	1	39	4.83	797/1480	4.83	4.73	4.68	4.74	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	2	0	0	1	5	28	4.79	144/1450	4.79	4.01	4.09	4.28	4.79	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	1	39	4.93	150/1409	4.93	4.49	4.42	4.51	4.93	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	0	40	4.95	250/1407	4.95	4.70	4.69	4.79	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	0	3	37	4.85	170/1399	4.85	4.22	4.26	4.36	4.85	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	2	38	4.88	177/1400	4.88	4.27	4.27	4.38	4.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	26	0	1	0	4	8	4.46	291/1179	4.46	3.87	3.96	4.07	4.46	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	29	0	1	0	2	1	11	4.40	437/1262	4.40	3.81	4.05	4.33	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	29	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	380/1259	4.73	4.13	4.29	4.57	4.73	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	29	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	382/1256	4.73	4.21	4.30	4.60	4.73	
4. Were special techniques successful	29	9	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	****/ 788	****	3.67	4.00	4.26	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	3.87	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.42	4.53	4.64	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	4.25	4.44	4.49	****	
Self Paced															
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	10	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	23						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	7	C	6	General	7	Under-grad	44	Non-major	41
84-150	25	3.00-3.49	12	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	13	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	31				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 481 0101  
 Title INTERNATIONAL TRADE TH  
 Instructor: TAKACS, WENDY E  
 Enrollment: 31  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 519  
 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	2	4	15	4.62	450/1481	4.62	4.20	4.29	4.45	4.62	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	16	4.62	386/1481	4.62	4.21	4.23	4.32	4.62	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	15	4.57	432/1249	4.57	4.30	4.27	4.44	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	740/1424	4.25	4.15	4.21	4.35	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	1	3	3	8	4.00	707/1396	4.00	3.96	3.98	4.09	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	13	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	384/1342	4.43	4.06	4.07	4.21	4.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	3	14	4.55	402/1459	4.55	4.30	4.16	4.25	4.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	702/1480	4.90	4.73	4.68	4.74	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	296/1450	4.56	4.01	4.09	4.28	4.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	334/1409	4.81	4.49	4.42	4.51	4.81	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	250/1407	4.95	4.70	4.69	4.79	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	2	16	4.62	445/1399	4.62	4.22	4.26	4.36	4.62	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	17	4.71	361/1400	4.71	4.27	4.27	4.38	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	15	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	177/1179	4.67	3.87	3.96	4.07	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	305/1262	4.58	3.81	4.05	4.33	4.58	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	0	2	0	8	4.27	770/1259	4.27	4.13	4.29	4.57	4.27	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	549/1256	4.55	4.21	4.30	4.60	4.55	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	8	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 788	****	3.67	4.00	4.26	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.93	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 8		Graduate 1
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 4	General	6
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 20
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	11
			? 1		



Course-Section: ECON 482 0101  
 Title INTERNATIONAL FINANCE  
 Instructor: MCINTYRE, KEVIN  
 Enrollment: 44  
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 520  
 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	6	5	20	4.45	613/1481	4.45	4.20	4.29	4.45	4.45	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	8	19	4.42	646/1481	4.42	4.21	4.23	4.32	4.42	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	10	19	4.60	405/1249	4.60	4.30	4.27	4.44	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	1	9	14	4.54	395/1424	4.54	4.15	4.21	4.35	4.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	1	7	7	10	4.04	681/1396	4.04	3.96	3.98	4.09	4.04	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	1	6	5	9	4.05	731/1342	4.05	4.06	4.07	4.21	4.05	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	3	6	20	4.59	367/1459	4.59	4.30	4.16	4.25	4.59	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	0	18	9	4.33	1158/1480	4.33	4.73	4.68	4.74	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	1	9	13	4.52	319/1450	4.52	4.01	4.09	4.28	4.52	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	5	24	4.83	304/1409	4.83	4.49	4.42	4.51	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	6	23	4.79	747/1407	4.79	4.70	4.69	4.79	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	6	22	4.72	300/1399	4.72	4.22	4.26	4.36	4.72	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	5	23	4.76	312/1400	4.76	4.27	4.27	4.38	4.76	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	20	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	307/1179	4.44	3.87	3.96	4.07	4.44	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	330/1262	4.54	3.81	4.05	4.33	4.54	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	1	1	2	2	7	4.00	895/1259	4.00	4.13	4.29	4.57	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	1	1	0	11	4.62	506/1256	4.62	4.21	4.30	4.60	4.62	
4. Were special techniques successful	18	10	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 788	****	3.67	4.00	4.26	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 1	A 8	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 10		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 6	C 8	General 3	Under-grad 31 Non-major 27
84-150	16	3.00-3.49 10	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 24	
			? 2		

Course-Section: ECON 490 0101  
 Title ANALYTIC METHODS IN EC  
 Instructor: THOMAS, MARK S  
 Enrollment: 38  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 521  
 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	3	2	4	6	4	3.32	1413/1481	3.32	4.20	4.29	4.45	3.32	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	3	8	6	3.89	1124/1481	3.89	4.21	4.23	4.32	3.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	7	4	7	3.89	984/1249	3.89	4.30	4.27	4.44	3.89	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	1	3	1	5	4	3.57	1251/1424	3.57	4.15	4.21	4.35	3.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	5	0	3	1	5	3.07	1278/1396	3.07	3.96	3.98	4.09	3.07	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	3	3	4	3	3	3.00	1269/1342	3.00	4.06	4.07	4.21	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	1	5	11	4.44	550/1459	4.44	4.30	4.16	4.25	4.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	0	0	17	4.83	797/1480	4.83	4.73	4.68	4.74	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	1	1	7	4	0	3.08	1346/1450	3.08	4.01	4.09	4.28	3.08	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	3	3	11	4.33	968/1409	4.33	4.49	4.42	4.51	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	3	0	3	5	7	3.72	1347/1407	3.72	4.70	4.69	4.79	3.72	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	4	6	6	3.89	1105/1399	3.89	4.22	4.26	4.36	3.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	2	2	2	9	3.82	1113/1400	3.82	4.27	4.27	4.38	3.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	1	0	3	6	4	3.86	726/1179	3.86	3.87	3.96	4.07	3.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	1	0	2	3	3.38	1044/1262	3.38	3.81	4.05	4.33	3.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	2	1	2	1	2	3.00	1162/1259	3.00	4.13	4.29	4.57	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	2	2	1	2	3.13	1162/1256	3.13	4.21	4.30	4.60	3.13	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 788	****	3.67	4.00	4.26	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 2	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0 Major 6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 10		
56-83	9	2.00-2.99 2	C 3	General 1	Under-grad 20 Non-major 14
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 7	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 13	
			? 1		

Course-Section: ECON 493 0601  
 Title INDIV RESEARCH IN ECON  
 Instructor: COATES, DENNIS  
 Enrollment: 1  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 522  
 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	0	1	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.20	4.29	4.45	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.21	4.23	4.32	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.15	4.21	4.35	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1396	5.00	3.96	3.98	4.09	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.06	4.07	4.21	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.30	4.16	4.25	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.73	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1450	5.00	4.01	4.09	4.28	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ECON 600 0101  
 Title POLICY CONSQ:ECON ANAL  
 Instructor: MUTTER, RYAN L  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 523  
 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	1	3	2	7	3.93	1143/1481	3.93	4.20	4.29	4.28	3.93	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	4	4	4	3.57	1296/1481	3.57	4.21	4.23	4.11	3.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	6	2	3.43	1132/1249	3.43	4.30	4.27	4.24	3.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	840/1424	4.17	4.15	4.21	4.16	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	8	5	4.29	476/1396	4.29	3.96	3.98	4.00	4.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	592/1342	4.20	4.06	4.07	4.18	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	2	5	4	3.71	1177/1459	3.71	4.30	4.16	4.01	3.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.73	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	2	5	5	2	3.50	1223/1450	3.50	4.01	4.09	3.96	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	946/1409	4.36	4.49	4.42	4.36	4.36	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	899/1407	4.71	4.70	4.69	4.73	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	4	4	4	3.64	1203/1399	3.64	4.22	4.26	4.16	3.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	2	7	3.93	1074/1400	3.93	4.27	4.27	4.17	3.93	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	12	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1179	****	3.87	3.96	3.81	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	5	2	1	3.20	1092/1262	3.20	3.81	4.05	4.07	3.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	867/1259	4.10	4.13	4.29	4.30	4.10	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	860/1256	4.10	4.21	4.30	4.33	4.10	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	9	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 788	****	3.67	4.00	3.97	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 1	A 6	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		Graduate 10
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		Under-grad 4
Grad.	10	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	14
			? 0		

Course-Section: ECON 602 0101  
 Title: MACROECONOMIC ANALYSIS  
 Instructor: CINYABUGUMA, MA  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 524  
 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	2	1	4	3	3.80	1225/1481	3.80	4.20	4.29	4.28	3.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	2	3.80	1179/1481	3.80	4.21	4.23	4.11	3.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	3	3	3.90	980/1249	3.90	4.30	4.27	4.24	3.90	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	4	0	1	3.17	1347/1424	3.17	4.15	4.21	4.16	3.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	3	2	3.50	1083/1396	3.50	3.96	3.98	4.00	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	755/1342	4.00	4.06	4.07	4.18	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	5	2	2	3.40	1297/1459	3.40	4.30	4.16	4.01	3.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.73	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	1	3	3	0	3.29	1299/1450	3.29	4.01	4.09	3.96	3.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	2	4	3	3.80	1238/1409	3.80	4.49	4.42	4.36	3.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	728/1407	4.80	4.70	4.69	4.73	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	2	3	2	3.30	1285/1399	3.30	4.22	4.26	4.16	3.30	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	2	2	2	3.00	1312/1400	3.00	4.27	4.27	4.17	3.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	1011/1179	3.20	3.87	3.96	3.81	3.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	1	4	1	3.25	1081/1262	3.25	3.81	4.05	4.07	3.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	3	0	5	4.25	783/1259	4.25	4.13	4.29	4.30	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	837/1256	4.14	4.21	4.30	4.33	4.14	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	6	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 788	****	3.67	4.00	3.97	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ECON 612 0101  
 Title ECONOMETRICS II  
 Instructor: COATES, DENNIS  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 525  
 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	1	0	0	5	6	4.25	844/1481	4.25	4.20	4.29	4.28	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	7	4	4.17	909/1481	4.17	4.21	4.23	4.11	4.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	810/1249	4.17	4.30	4.27	4.24	4.17	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	684/1424	4.30	4.15	4.21	4.16	4.30	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	5	4	4.00	707/1396	4.00	3.96	3.98	4.00	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	214/1342	4.64	4.06	4.07	4.18	4.64	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	535/1459	4.45	4.30	4.16	4.01	4.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	974/1480	4.64	4.73	4.68	4.74	4.64	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	662/1450	4.22	4.01	4.09	3.96	4.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	603/1409	4.64	4.49	4.42	4.36	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.70	4.69	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	417/1399	4.64	4.22	4.26	4.16	4.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	991/1400	4.08	4.27	4.27	4.17	4.08	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	487/1179	4.20	3.87	3.96	3.81	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	570/1262	4.25	3.81	4.05	4.07	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	358/1259	4.75	4.13	4.29	4.30	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	194/1256	4.92	4.21	4.30	4.33	4.92	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	495/ 788	3.88	3.67	4.00	3.97	3.88	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	4.75	4.49	4.23	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.42	4.53	4.46	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	4.25	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.42	4.35	4.16	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	3.75	3.92	3.71	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.38	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.95	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.54	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ECON 699 0101  
 Title SEM. ECON. POLICY ANAL  
 Instructor: MITCH, DAVID  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 526  
 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	2	4	1	3.86	1193/1481	3.86	4.20	4.29	4.28	3.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	2	1	2	3.43	1355/1481	3.43	4.21	4.23	4.11	3.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1249	****	4.30	4.27	4.24	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	959/1424	4.00	4.15	4.21	4.16	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1396	****	3.96	3.98	4.00	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	112/1342	4.80	4.06	4.07	4.18	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	0	3	1	0	1	2.80	1412/1459	2.80	4.30	4.16	4.01	2.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.73	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	1	4	1	3.71	1133/1450	3.71	4.01	4.09	3.96	3.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	2	2	0	3.00	1356/1409	3.00	4.49	4.42	4.36	3.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	963/1407	4.67	4.70	4.69	4.73	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	3	2	0	3.00	1325/1399	3.00	4.22	4.26	4.16	3.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	1	3	0	3.00	1312/1400	3.00	4.27	4.27	4.17	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	610/1262	4.20	3.81	4.05	4.07	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	509/1259	4.60	4.13	4.29	4.30	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	516/1256	4.60	4.21	4.30	4.33	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 788	****	3.67	4.00	3.97	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	4.75	4.49	4.23	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	36/ 69	4.50	4.42	4.53	4.46	4.50	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	45/ 63	4.00	4.25	4.44	4.44	4.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.42	4.35	4.16	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	3.75	3.92	3.71	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 3	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0	Under-grad 5
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Non-major 8
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 1	Electives 0
					Other 7

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