

Course-Section: ECON 101 0101
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS
 Instructor: MCCONNELL, VIRG
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 491
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	12	5	3.95	1171/1522	3.92	4.17	4.30	4.14	3.95	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	11	9	4.23	904/1522	3.94	4.16	4.26	4.18	4.23	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	8	11	4.36	682/1285	3.97	4.22	4.30	4.22	4.36	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	1	1	2	6	2	3.58	1289/1476	3.82	4.00	4.22	4.09	3.58	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	4	8	7	3.86	932/1412	3.83	3.88	4.06	4.01	3.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	1	0	2	5	2	3.70	1076/1381	3.53	3.82	4.08	3.93	3.70	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	6	11	4.18	850/1500	4.12	4.31	4.18	4.16	4.18	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	9	12	4.57	1019/1517	4.44	4.53	4.65	4.62	4.57	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	3	5	9	2	3.53	1269/1497	3.78	3.92	4.11	4.02	3.53	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	4	9	7	4.00	1186/1440	4.29	4.43	4.45	4.40	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	2	5	13	4.43	1224/1448	4.51	4.65	4.71	4.63	4.43	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	3	9	7	3.95	1107/1436	4.04	4.19	4.29	4.24	3.95	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	3	9	7	3.86	1143/1432	4.16	4.27	4.29	4.23	3.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	14	2	1	2	3	0	2.75	1133/1221	3.66	3.78	3.93	3.86	2.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	1	2	6	2	3.38	1088/1280	3.48	3.76	4.10	3.92	3.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	1	6	5	4.15	873/1277	3.84	4.03	4.34	4.13	4.15	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	3	5	4	3.92	943/1269	3.84	4.07	4.31	4.04	3.92	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	7	2	1	1	2	0	2.50	832/ 854	3.22	3.77	4.02	3.87	2.50	

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	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	7	General	2	Under-grad	22	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
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	13				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ECON 101 0201
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS
 Instructor: MCCONNELL, VIRG
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 492
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	5	15	4.40	733/1522	3.92	4.17	4.30	4.14	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	5	15	4.32	799/1522	3.94	4.16	4.26	4.18	4.32	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	6	18	4.75	278/1285	3.97	4.22	4.30	4.22	4.75		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	4	1	9	4.36	682/1476	3.82	4.00	4.22	4.09	4.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	8	12	4.16	646/1412	3.83	3.88	4.06	4.01	4.16	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	13	0	2	1	1	7	4.18	673/1381	3.53	3.82	4.08	3.93	4.18	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	5	17	4.48	512/1500	4.12	4.31	4.18	4.16	4.48	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	438/1517	4.44	4.53	4.65	4.62	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	4	11	6	4.10	839/1497	3.78	3.92	4.11	4.02	4.10	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	4	19	4.68	591/1440	4.29	4.43	4.45	4.40	4.68	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	20	4.76	840/1448	4.51	4.65	4.71	4.63	4.76	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	7	15	4.44	672/1436	4.04	4.19	4.29	4.24	4.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	2	3	16	4.29	854/1432	4.16	4.27	4.29	4.23	4.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	15	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	480/1221	3.66	3.78	3.93	3.86	4.22	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	2	2	3	4	3.38	1088/1280	3.48	3.76	4.10	3.92	3.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	2	1	10	4.43	672/1277	3.84	4.03	4.34	4.13	4.43	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	420/1269	3.84	4.07	4.31	4.04	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	6	1	0	1	4	2	3.75	588/ 854	3.22	3.77	4.02	3.87	3.75	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 228	****	4.00	4.35	4.33	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 65	****	5.00	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	4.88	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	4.11	****	

Course-Section: ECON 101 0201
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS
 Instructor: MCCONNELL, VIRG
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 492
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	8	General	5	Under-grad	25	Non-major	25
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 101 0301
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS
 Instructor: COOMBER, WILLIA
 Enrollment: 43
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 493
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	6	9	5	3.81	1269/1522	3.92	4.17	4.30	4.14	3.81	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	7	6	3	3.29	1432/1522	3.94	4.16	4.26	4.18	3.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	5	5	5	4	3.19	1236/1285	3.97	4.22	4.30	4.22	3.19	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	5	6	5	3	3.20	1391/1476	3.82	4.00	4.22	4.09	3.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	0	5	6	5	3.67	1077/1412	3.83	3.88	4.06	4.01	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	3	7	4	4	3.37	1214/1381	3.53	3.82	4.08	3.93	3.37	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	2	5	6	4	3.19	1406/1500	4.12	4.31	4.18	4.16	3.19	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	14	4	4.10	1355/1517	4.44	4.53	4.65	4.62	4.10	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	2	3	6	2	3.62	1233/1497	3.78	3.92	4.11	4.02	3.62	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	5	5	6	3.94	1225/1440	4.29	4.43	4.45	4.40	3.94	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	1287/1448	4.51	4.65	4.71	4.63	4.29	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	4	4	4	5	3.59	1265/1436	4.04	4.19	4.29	4.24	3.59	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	5	3	1	6	3.24	1338/1432	4.16	4.27	4.29	4.23	3.24	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	2	0	4	6	4	3.63	850/1221	3.66	3.78	3.93	3.86	3.63	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	1	5	2	2	3.27	1126/1280	3.48	3.76	4.10	3.92	3.27	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	9	0	1	3.09	1209/1277	3.84	4.03	4.34	4.13	3.09	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	2	6	1	1	2.91	1231/1269	3.84	4.07	4.31	4.04	2.91	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	3	2	1	4	0	1	2.63	826/ 854	3.22	3.77	4.02	3.87	2.63	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	21	Non-major	20
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	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	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 101 0401
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS
 Instructor: DASGUPTA, NANDI
 Enrollment: 43
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 494
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	5	9	4.21	939/1522	3.92	4.17	4.30	4.14	4.21	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	7	8	4.28	854/1522	3.94	4.16	4.26	4.18	4.28	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	9	7	4.16	841/1285	3.97	4.22	4.30	4.22	4.16	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	827/1476	3.82	4.00	4.22	4.09	4.22	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	3	2	3	6	3.50	1165/1412	3.83	3.88	4.06	4.01	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	11	1	0	2	0	3	3.67	1097/1381	3.53	3.82	4.08	3.93	3.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	527/1500	4.12	4.31	4.18	4.16	4.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	11	6	4.35	1201/1517	4.44	4.53	4.65	4.62	4.35	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	506/1497	3.78	3.92	4.11	4.02	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	7	10	4.42	904/1440	4.29	4.43	4.45	4.40	4.42	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	521/1448	4.51	4.65	4.71	4.63	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	6	9	4.33	793/1436	4.04	4.19	4.29	4.24	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	8	7	4.17	949/1432	4.16	4.27	4.29	4.23	4.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	10	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	871/1221	3.66	3.78	3.93	3.86	3.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	1	0	5	3	3.80	874/1280	3.48	3.76	4.10	3.92	3.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	903/1277	3.84	4.03	4.34	4.13	4.10	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	960/1269	3.84	4.07	4.31	4.04	3.90	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	7	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 854	3.22	3.77	4.02	3.87	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
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	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 101 0501
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS
 Instructor: DASGUPTA, NANDI
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 495
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	6	7	4.18	980/1522	3.92	4.17	4.30	4.14	4.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	383/1522	3.94	4.16	4.26	4.18	4.65	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	268/1285	3.97	4.22	4.30	4.22	4.76	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	703/1476	3.82	4.00	4.22	4.09	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	411/1412	3.83	3.88	4.06	4.01	4.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	806/1381	3.53	3.82	4.08	3.93	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	337/1500	4.12	4.31	4.18	4.16	4.65	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	17	0	4.00	1389/1517	4.44	4.53	4.65	4.62	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	1	9	5	4.13	807/1497	3.78	3.92	4.11	4.02	4.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	452/1440	4.29	4.43	4.45	4.40	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	575/1448	4.51	4.65	4.71	4.63	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	295/1436	4.04	4.19	4.29	4.24	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	200/1432	4.16	4.27	4.29	4.23	4.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	8	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	727/1221	3.66	3.78	3.93	3.86	3.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	3	0	0	1	4	3.38	1091/1280	3.48	3.76	4.10	3.92	3.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	3	0	4	3.75	1066/1277	3.84	4.03	4.34	4.13	3.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	1	2	0	4	3.63	1089/1269	3.84	4.07	4.31	4.04	3.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	7	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 854	3.22	3.77	4.02	3.87	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.19	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	2	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	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	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	1	2	10	2	4	3.32	1454/1522	3.92	4.17	4.30	4.14	3.32	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	0	8	3	5	3.37	1412/1522	3.94	4.16	4.26	4.18	3.37	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	1	3	8	4	3.47	1172/1285	3.97	4.22	4.30	4.22	3.47	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	2	0	4	2	3.75	1198/1476	3.82	4.00	4.22	4.09	3.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	3	9	3	3.61	1106/1412	3.83	3.88	4.06	4.01	3.61	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	2	0	0	2	1	3.00	1286/1381	3.53	3.82	4.08	3.93	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	7	7	4.05	961/1500	4.12	4.31	4.18	4.16	4.05	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	14	4	4.16	1325/1517	4.44	4.53	4.65	4.62	4.16	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	2	2	5	5	2	3.19	1390/1497	3.78	3.92	4.11	4.02	3.19	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	3	8	7	4.05	1167/1440	4.29	4.43	4.45	4.40	4.05	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	1	2	6	8	4.06	1347/1448	4.51	4.65	4.71	4.63	4.06	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	3	3	7	5	3.63	1251/1436	4.04	4.19	4.29	4.24	3.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	4	3	9	3.89	1130/1432	4.16	4.27	4.29	4.23	3.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	15	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1221	3.66	3.78	3.93	3.86	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	2	1	3	1	2	3.00	1187/1280	3.48	3.76	4.10	3.92	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	1	1	4	2	3.56	1124/1277	3.84	4.03	4.34	4.13	3.56	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	1	3	1	3	3.44	1133/1269	3.84	4.07	4.31	4.04	3.44	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	7	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 854	3.22	3.77	4.02	3.87	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 228	****	4.00	4.35	4.33	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.53	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.57	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0	Major 1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 5			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 1	General 4	Under-grad 19	Non-major 18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	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 6		
				? 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	0	0	1	1	7	9	6	3.75	1295/1522	3.92	4.17	4.30	4.14	3.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	10	6	7	3.79	1248/1522	3.94	4.16	4.26	4.18	3.79	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	4	6	8	5	3.50	1160/1285	3.97	4.22	4.30	4.22	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	2	3	2	2	4	3.23	1384/1476	3.82	4.00	4.22	4.09	3.23	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	6	6	9	3.91	878/1412	3.83	3.88	4.06	4.01	3.91	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	1	2	6	2	2	3.15	1268/1381	3.53	3.82	4.08	3.93	3.15	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	4	7	12	4.21	829/1500	4.12	4.31	4.18	4.16	4.21	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	16	8	4.33	1217/1517	4.44	4.53	4.65	4.62	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	1	7	3	3	3.57	1250/1497	3.78	3.92	4.11	4.02	3.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	5	6	11	4.17	1106/1440	4.29	4.43	4.45	4.40	4.17	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	5	7	12	4.29	1287/1448	4.51	4.65	4.71	4.63	4.29	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3	7	6	8	3.79	1200/1436	4.04	4.19	4.29	4.24	3.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	1	7	13	4.25	884/1432	4.16	4.27	4.29	4.23	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	15	1	0	3	3	1	3.38	967/1221	3.66	3.78	3.93	3.86	3.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	2	3	3	5	3.85	854/1280	3.48	3.76	4.10	3.92	3.85	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	873/1277	3.84	4.03	4.34	4.13	4.15	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	791/1269	3.84	4.07	4.31	4.04	4.23	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	8	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	****/ 854	3.22	3.77	4.02	3.87	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 228	****	4.00	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 217	****	4.00	4.51	4.51	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	4.03	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	4.88	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.53	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	4.11	****	

Course-Section: ECON 101 0701
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS
 Instructor: KAIKAI, ALPHA
 Enrollment: 43
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 497
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	5	Under-grad	24	Non-major	24
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	10	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	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 101 0801
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS
 Instructor: APPIAH, ELIZABE
 Enrollment: 60
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 498
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	6	7	12	3.96	1161/1522	3.92	4.17	4.30	4.14	3.96	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	7	7	12	4.04	1064/1522	3.94	4.16	4.26	4.18	4.04	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	9	15	4.32	714/1285	3.97	4.22	4.30	4.22	4.32	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	3	6	6	8	3.83	1164/1476	3.82	4.00	4.22	4.09	3.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	1	3	6	14	4.24	585/1412	3.83	3.88	4.06	4.01	4.24	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	13	2	0	3	1	8	3.93	911/1381	3.53	3.82	4.08	3.93	3.93	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	12	11	4.14	892/1500	4.12	4.31	4.18	4.16	4.14	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	25	4.89	509/1517	4.44	4.53	4.65	4.62	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	1	1	12	5	2	3.29	1361/1497	3.78	3.92	4.11	4.02	3.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	4	7	14	4.19	1100/1440	4.29	4.43	4.45	4.40	4.19	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	8	17	4.52	1148/1448	4.51	4.65	4.71	4.63	4.52	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	1	3	8	12	3.93	1137/1436	4.04	4.19	4.29	4.24	3.93	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	0	4	6	14	4.15	956/1432	4.16	4.27	4.29	4.23	4.15	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	3	0	5	10	7	3.72	803/1221	3.66	3.78	3.93	3.86	3.72	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	2	1	2	3	7	3.80	874/1280	3.48	3.76	4.10	3.92	3.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	1	5	2	8	4.06	913/1277	3.84	4.03	4.34	4.13	4.06	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	1	1	3	9	4.20	816/1269	3.84	4.07	4.31	4.04	4.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	8	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	426/ 854	3.22	3.77	4.02	3.87	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	3	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 215	****	4.50	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	2	0	1	0	3	3.33	****/ 228	****	4.00	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	4	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 217	****	4.00	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	3	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 205	****	4.75	4.23	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	3	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 65	****	5.00	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 78	****	4.88	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	2	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	1	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	2	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	4.11	****	

Course-Section: ECON 101 0801
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS
 Instructor: APPIAH, ELIZABE
 Enrollment: 60
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 498
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	7	General	2	Under-grad	28	Non-major	28
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	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	3	2	1	6	5	3.47	1413/1522	3.92	4.17	4.30	4.14	3.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	1	5	4	4	3.29	1429/1522	3.94	4.16	4.26	4.18	3.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	1	3	5	4	3.24	1229/1285	3.97	4.22	4.30	4.22	3.24	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	2	0	3	4	5	3.71	1217/1476	3.82	4.00	4.22	4.09	3.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	3	1	2	4	3	3.23	1293/1412	3.83	3.88	4.06	4.01	3.23	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	3	1	6	4	3.60	1130/1381	3.53	3.82	4.08	3.93	3.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	3	1	5	5	3.50	1298/1500	4.12	4.31	4.18	4.16	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	952/1517	4.44	4.53	4.65	4.62	4.65	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	2	0	3	3	5	3.69	1186/1497	3.78	3.92	4.11	4.02	3.69	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	0	2	3	10	4.12	1142/1440	4.29	4.43	4.45	4.40	4.12	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	1232/1448	4.51	4.65	4.71	4.63	4.41	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	1	2	6	5	3.69	1234/1436	4.04	4.19	4.29	4.24	3.69	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	732/1432	4.16	4.27	4.29	4.23	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	343/1221	3.66	3.78	3.93	3.86	4.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	3	1	1	4	3	3.25	1133/1280	3.48	3.76	4.10	3.92	3.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	2	0	1	5	4	3.75	1066/1277	3.84	4.03	4.34	4.13	3.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	2	0	0	3	7	4.08	857/1269	3.84	4.07	4.31	4.04	4.08	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	8	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 854	3.22	3.77	4.02	3.87	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 228	****	4.00	4.35	4.33	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 65	****	5.00	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	4.88	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	4.31	****	

Course-Section: ECON 101 0901
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS
 Instructor: COOMBER, WILLIA
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 499
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	2	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 101 1001
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS
 Instructor: FALCON, JAIME
 Enrollment: 43
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 500
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	5	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	548/1522	3.92	4.17	4.30	4.14	4.55	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	1	2	3	14	4.50	545/1522	3.94	4.16	4.26	4.18	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	2	3	16	4.67	366/1285	3.97	4.22	4.30	4.22	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	2	6	13	4.52	454/1476	3.82	4.00	4.22	4.09	4.52	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	2	1	4	13	4.40	430/1412	3.83	3.88	4.06	4.01	4.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	3	14	4.55	289/1381	3.53	3.82	4.08	3.93	4.55	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	1	1	2	16	4.65	325/1500	4.12	4.31	4.18	4.16	4.65	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	8	12	4.60	994/1517	4.44	4.53	4.65	4.62	4.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	296/1497	3.78	3.92	4.11	4.02	4.63	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	1	18	4.85	272/1440	4.29	4.43	4.45	4.40	4.85	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	0	19	4.90	494/1448	4.51	4.65	4.71	4.63	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	425/1436	4.04	4.19	4.29	4.24	4.65	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	1	17	4.75	350/1432	4.16	4.27	4.29	4.23	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	2	1	1	4	1	10	4.06	589/1221	3.66	3.78	3.93	3.86	4.06	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	363/1280	3.48	3.76	4.10	3.92	4.55	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	1	1	1	9	4.50	594/1277	3.84	4.03	4.34	4.13	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	200/1269	3.84	4.07	4.31	4.04	4.92	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	6	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	****/ 854	3.22	3.77	4.02	3.87	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 3	C 2	General 2	Under-grad 25 Non-major 25
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 0	D 1		
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 6	
			? 1		

Course-Section: ECON 101 1101
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS
 Instructor: APPIAH, ELIZABE
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 501
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	2	2	2	2	3.50	1402/1522	3.92	4.17	4.30	4.14	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	3	2	2	3.63	1316/1522	3.94	4.16	4.26	4.18	3.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	3	2	1	2	3.25	1225/1285	3.97	4.22	4.30	4.22	3.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	5	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1363/1476	3.82	4.00	4.22	4.09	3.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	1	3	0	2	3.14	1312/1412	3.83	3.88	4.06	4.01	3.14	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	5	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	1374/1381	3.53	3.82	4.08	3.93	1.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	1183/1500	4.12	4.31	4.18	4.16	3.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	1268/1517	4.44	4.53	4.65	4.62	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	3	2	1	3.43	1315/1497	3.78	3.92	4.11	4.02	3.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1186/1440	4.29	4.43	4.45	4.40	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	1327/1448	4.51	4.65	4.71	4.63	4.17	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	1241/1436	4.04	4.19	4.29	4.24	3.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1156/1432	4.16	4.27	4.29	4.23	3.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	1064/1221	3.66	3.78	3.93	3.86	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1250/1280	3.48	3.76	4.10	3.92	2.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	1260/1277	3.84	4.03	4.34	4.13	2.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	1258/1269	3.84	4.07	4.31	4.04	2.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 215	****	4.50	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 228	****	4.00	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.00	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 205	****	4.75	4.23	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	5.00	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	4.88	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	4.11	****	

Course-Section: ECON 101 1101
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS
 Instructor: APPIAH, ELIZABE
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 501
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ECON 102 0101
 Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS
 Instructor: GINDLING, THOMA
 Enrollment: 74
 Questionnaires: 42

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 502
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	1	4	15	19	4.33	814/1522	3.95	4.17	4.30	4.14	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	5	7	26	4.49	576/1522	3.92	4.16	4.26	4.18	4.49	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	3	9	27	4.62	415/1285	4.03	4.22	4.30	4.22	4.62		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	15	1	1	5	2	15	4.21	850/1476	3.73	4.00	4.22	4.09	4.21	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	2	2	5	11	18	4.08	715/1412	3.62	3.88	4.06	4.01	4.08	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	12	1	2	2	9	13	4.15	713/1381	3.66	3.82	4.08	3.93	4.15	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	1	4	6	27	4.46	541/1500	3.86	4.31	4.18	4.16	4.46	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	14	25	4.64	952/1517	4.29	4.53	4.65	4.62	4.64	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	0	0	0	6	16	7	4.03	878/1497	3.69	3.92	4.11	4.02	4.03	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	5	33	4.82	320/1440	4.44	4.43	4.45	4.40	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	6	32	4.79	783/1448	4.66	4.65	4.71	4.63	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	1	2	3	32	4.64	436/1436	4.16	4.19	4.29	4.24	4.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	8	27	4.72	383/1432	4.27	4.27	4.29	4.23	4.72	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	18	1	4	3	3	6	3.53	891/1221	3.63	3.78	3.93	3.86	3.53	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	1	3	5	3	3.83	859/1280	3.51	3.76	4.10	3.92	3.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	31	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	409/1277	3.84	4.03	4.34	4.13	4.73	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	31	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	485/1269	3.79	4.07	4.31	4.04	4.64	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 0	A 12	Required for Majors	6
28-55	7	1.00-1.99 0	B 16		Graduate 0
56-83	7	2.00-2.99 1	C 6	General	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 10	D 0		Under-grad 42
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 8	F 1	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	26
			? 1		

Course-Section: ECON 102 0201
 Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS
 Instructor: GOLDFARB, MARSH
 Enrollment: 81
 Questionnaires: 46

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 503
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	5	11	11	17	3.78	1279/1522	3.95	4.17	4.30	4.14	3.78	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	11	15	17	4.00	1080/1522	3.92	4.16	4.26	4.18	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	2	8	15	18	3.93	1000/1285	4.03	4.22	4.30	4.22	3.93	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	19	2	1	8	6	8	3.68	1233/1476	3.73	4.00	4.22	4.09	3.68	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	1	2	9	10	19	4.07	715/1412	3.62	3.88	4.06	4.01	4.07	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	25	0	2	6	5	6	3.79	1028/1381	3.66	3.82	4.08	3.93	3.79	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	7	5	12	18	3.78	1168/1500	3.86	4.31	4.18	4.16	3.78	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	24	20	4.45	1120/1517	4.29	4.53	4.65	4.62	4.45	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	2	11	15	9	3.84	1089/1497	3.69	3.92	4.11	4.02	3.84	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	5	9	26	4.46	851/1440	4.44	4.43	4.45	4.40	4.46	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	2	12	27	4.61	1072/1448	4.66	4.65	4.71	4.63	4.61	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	3	8	7	21	4.10	1003/1436	4.16	4.19	4.29	4.24	4.10	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	2	9	11	18	4.05	1018/1432	4.27	4.27	4.29	4.23	4.05	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	17	4	3	5	5	7	3.33	983/1221	3.63	3.78	3.93	3.86	3.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	33	0	2	3	0	2	6	3.54	1018/1280	3.51	3.76	4.10	3.92	3.54	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	34	0	3	2	2	1	4	3.08	1210/1277	3.84	4.03	4.34	4.13	3.08	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	34	0	3	0	4	1	4	3.25	1174/1269	3.79	4.07	4.31	4.04	3.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	34	7	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/ 854	3.87	3.77	4.02	3.87	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	8	0.00-0.99 0	A 18	Required for Majors 10	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	8	1.00-1.99 0	B 13		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 2	C 7	General 5	Under-grad 46 Non-major 45
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 8	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 9	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 22	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ECON 102 0501
 Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS
 Instructor: COBB, VINCENT
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 504
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	2	3	2	10	3.84	1249/1522	3.95	4.17	4.30	4.14	3.84	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	2	3	5	6	3.47	1376/1522	3.92	4.16	4.26	4.18	3.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	1	3	6	7	3.79	1074/1285	4.03	4.22	4.30	4.22	3.79	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	4	1	2	2	2	7	3.86	1150/1476	3.73	4.00	4.22	4.09	3.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	1	6	4	5	3.37	1243/1412	3.62	3.88	4.06	4.01	3.37	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	5	1	4	1	5	3.00	1286/1381	3.66	3.82	4.08	3.93	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	3	2	4	7	3.47	1315/1500	3.86	4.31	4.18	4.16	3.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	12	7	4.37	1193/1517	4.29	4.53	4.65	4.62	4.37	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	3	2	3	3	3	3.07	1412/1497	3.69	3.92	4.11	4.02	3.07	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	1	1	6	8	4.12	1142/1440	4.44	4.43	4.45	4.40	4.12	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	840/1448	4.66	4.65	4.71	4.63	4.76	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	3	1	4	8	3.88	1165/1436	4.16	4.19	4.29	4.24	3.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	2	4	9	4.12	984/1432	4.27	4.27	4.29	4.23	4.12	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	5	2	2	2	1	4	3.27	1004/1221	3.63	3.78	3.93	3.86	3.27	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	2	0	5	2	3.27	1126/1280	3.51	3.76	4.10	3.92	3.27	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	855/1277	3.84	4.03	4.34	4.13	4.18	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	1	3	2	4	3.64	1085/1269	3.79	4.07	4.31	4.04	3.64	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	9	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 854	3.87	3.77	4.02	3.87	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.13	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	3.90	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.53	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5	General	1	Under-grad	20	Non-major	19
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	5						
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0						
				P	0						
				I	0						
				?	0	Other	11				

Course-Section: ECON 102 0601
 Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS
 Instructor: THOMAS, MARK S
 Enrollment: 74
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 505
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies							Instructor		Course Dept		UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	0	8	8	3	3.48	1413/1522	3.95	4.17	4.30	4.14	3.48
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	10	6	3	3.43	1396/1522	3.92	4.16	4.26	4.18	3.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	4	5	6	5	3.48	1172/1285	4.03	4.22	4.30	4.22	3.48
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	11	1	2	5	1	1	2.90	1433/1476	3.73	4.00	4.22	4.09	2.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	7	2	3	4	2	2.56	1382/1412	3.62	3.88	4.06	4.01	2.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	15	2	0	0	2	1	3.00	****/1381	3.66	3.82	4.08	3.93	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	3	4	7	6	3.80	1147/1500	3.86	4.31	4.18	4.16	3.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	1	19	0	3.86	1458/1517	4.29	4.53	4.65	4.62	3.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	1	9	6	1	3.28	1364/1497	3.69	3.92	4.11	4.02	3.28
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	4	8	8	4.20	1094/1440	4.44	4.43	4.45	4.40	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	2	8	9	4.25	1300/1448	4.66	4.65	4.71	4.63	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	5	12	4	3.95	1107/1436	4.16	4.19	4.29	4.24	3.95
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	3	10	6	4.05	1013/1432	4.27	4.27	4.29	4.23	4.05
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	1	4	5	8	3.95	659/1221	3.63	3.78	3.93	3.86	3.95
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	3	1	5	4	1	2.93	1218/1280	3.51	3.76	4.10	3.92	2.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	3	2	4	4	1	2.86	1248/1277	3.84	4.03	4.34	4.13	2.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	2	2	5	4	1	3.00	1207/1269	3.79	4.07	4.31	4.04	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	8	8	1	0	3	0	2	3.33	726/ 854	3.87	3.77	4.02	3.87	3.33

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ECON 102 0801
 Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS
 Instructor: COOMBER, WILLIA
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 506
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	3	5	8	4.31	837/1522	3.95	4.17	4.30	4.14	4.31	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	9	5	4.19	945/1522	3.92	4.16	4.26	4.18	4.19	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	2	0	5	9	4.31	722/1285	4.03	4.22	4.30	4.22	4.31	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	4	7	4	4.00	1009/1476	3.73	4.00	4.22	4.09	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	2	0	0	3	7	3	4.00	760/1412	3.62	3.88	4.06	4.01	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	7	4	3	3.71	1070/1381	3.66	3.82	4.08	3.93	3.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	1	7	1	6	3.80	1147/1500	3.86	4.31	4.18	4.16	3.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	13	2	4.13	1337/1517	4.29	4.53	4.65	4.62	4.13	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	674/1497	3.69	3.92	4.11	4.02	4.23	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	682/1440	4.44	4.43	4.45	4.40	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	602/1448	4.66	4.65	4.71	4.63	4.87	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	8	5	4.20	934/1436	4.16	4.19	4.29	4.24	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	758/1432	4.27	4.27	4.29	4.23	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	0	5	1	6	4.08	578/1221	3.63	3.78	3.93	3.86	4.08	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	718/1280	3.51	3.76	4.10	3.92	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	743/1277	3.84	4.03	4.34	4.13	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	637/1269	3.79	4.07	4.31	4.04	4.44	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	4	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	252/ 854	3.87	3.77	4.02	3.87	4.40	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	4.00	4.35	4.33	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.41	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	5.00	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.88	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	4.11	****	

Course-Section: ECON 102 0801
 Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS
 Instructor: COOMBER, WILLIA
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 506
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	18	Non-major	16
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 121 0101
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I
 Instructor: ST MARTIN, JEAN
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 507
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	8	12	4.52	582/1522	4.47	4.17	4.30	4.14	4.52	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	16	4.67	358/1522	4.53	4.16	4.26	4.18	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	16	4.62	415/1285	4.60	4.22	4.30	4.22	4.62	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	629/1476	4.24	4.00	4.22	4.09	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	2	4	5	7	3.65	1083/1412	4.10	3.88	4.06	4.01	3.65	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	1	4	5	4	3.86	977/1381	4.17	3.82	4.08	3.93	3.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	312/1500	4.71	4.31	4.18	4.16	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	14	7	4.33	1217/1517	4.45	4.53	4.65	4.62	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	7	11	4.45	457/1497	4.30	3.92	4.11	4.02	4.45	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	432/1440	4.78	4.43	4.45	4.40	4.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	247/1448	4.84	4.65	4.71	4.63	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	467/1436	4.63	4.19	4.29	4.24	4.62	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	227/1432	4.69	4.27	4.29	4.23	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	15	2	1	1	2	0	2.50	1165/1221	3.24	3.78	3.93	3.86	2.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	3	1	1	5	3.55	1013/1280	3.90	3.76	4.10	3.92	3.55	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	2	1	2	4	3.60	1113/1277	3.79	4.03	4.34	4.13	3.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	1	0	5	4	3.91	960/1269	3.93	4.07	4.31	4.04	3.91	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	8	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 854	3.19	3.77	4.02	3.87	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 10		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 2	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 21 Non-major 19
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 6	D 2		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 1	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 17	
			? 1		

Course-Section: ECON 121 0201
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I
 Instructor: ST MARTIN, JEAN
 Enrollment: 44
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 508
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	8	13	4.55	559/1522	4.47	4.17	4.30	4.14	4.55	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	15	4.68	334/1522	4.53	4.16	4.26	4.18	4.68	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	220/1285	4.60	4.22	4.30	4.22	4.82	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	1	8	6	4.33	703/1476	4.24	4.00	4.22	4.09	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	3	7	6	4.06	728/1412	4.10	3.88	4.06	4.01	4.06	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	1	1	5	8	4.33	519/1381	4.17	3.82	4.08	3.93	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	154/1500	4.71	4.31	4.18	4.16	4.82	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	17	5	4.23	1284/1517	4.45	4.53	4.65	4.62	4.23	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	385/1497	4.30	3.92	4.11	4.02	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	192/1440	4.78	4.43	4.45	4.40	4.91	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	247/1448	4.84	4.65	4.71	4.63	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	394/1436	4.63	4.19	4.29	4.24	4.68	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	214/1432	4.69	4.27	4.29	4.23	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	17	2	0	1	1	0	2.25	****/1221	3.24	3.78	3.93	3.86	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	357/1280	3.90	3.76	4.10	3.92	4.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	827/1277	3.79	4.03	4.34	4.13	4.22	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	692/1269	3.93	4.07	4.31	4.04	4.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	7	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 854	3.19	3.77	4.02	3.87	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 10		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 3	C 3	General 1	Under-grad 22 Non-major 20
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		
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 19	
			? 1		

Course-Section: ECON 121 0301
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I
 Instructor: ST MARTIN, JEAN
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 509
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	8	15	4.46	656/1522	4.47	4.17	4.30	4.14	4.46	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	7	18	4.65	371/1522	4.53	4.16	4.26	4.18	4.65	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	19	4.69	337/1285	4.60	4.22	4.30	4.22	4.69	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	0	3	6	9	4.33	703/1476	4.24	4.00	4.22	4.09	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	6	0	0	7	7	5	3.89	900/1412	4.10	3.88	4.06	4.01	3.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	7	0	0	2	11	5	4.17	693/1381	4.17	3.82	4.08	3.93	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	3	20	4.72	252/1500	4.71	4.31	4.18	4.16	4.72	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	1	17	6	4.21	1295/1517	4.45	4.53	4.65	4.62	4.21	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	9	13	4.52	370/1497	4.30	3.92	4.11	4.02	4.52	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	224/1440	4.78	4.43	4.45	4.40	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	198/1448	4.84	4.65	4.71	4.63	4.96	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	98/1436	4.63	4.19	4.29	4.24	4.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	22	4.84	240/1432	4.69	4.27	4.29	4.23	4.84	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	13	1	0	1	0	7	4.33	408/1221	3.24	3.78	3.93	3.86	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	553/1280	3.90	3.76	4.10	3.92	4.30	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	594/1277	3.79	4.03	4.34	4.13	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	1	2	1	6	4.20	816/1269	3.93	4.07	4.31	4.04	4.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	18	5	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/ 854	3.19	3.77	4.02	3.87	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	4.50	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	4.00	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.00	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	4.75	4.23	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	5.00	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.88	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	4.11	****	

Course-Section: ECON 121 0301
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I
 Instructor: ST MARTIN, JEAN
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 509
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	4	C	4	General	2	Under-grad	27	Non-major	26
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 121 0401
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I
 Instructor: COLE, RICHARD
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 510
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	12	17	4.44	694/1522	4.47	4.17	4.30	4.14	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	10	17	4.38	738/1522	4.53	4.16	4.26	4.18	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	11	18	4.47	578/1285	4.60	4.22	4.30	4.22	4.47	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	5	8	9	4.18	871/1476	4.24	4.00	4.22	4.09	4.18	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	1	1	9	17	4.50	339/1412	4.10	3.88	4.06	4.01	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	1	5	8	11	4.16	693/1381	4.17	3.82	4.08	3.93	4.16	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	9	22	4.71	263/1500	4.71	4.31	4.18	4.16	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	23	4.74	820/1517	4.45	4.53	4.65	4.62	4.74	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	2	18	6	4.04	878/1497	4.30	3.92	4.11	4.02	4.04	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	7	23	4.71	552/1440	4.78	4.43	4.45	4.40	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	7	24	4.77	821/1448	4.84	4.65	4.71	4.63	4.77	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	12	18	4.55	551/1436	4.63	4.19	4.29	4.24	4.55	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	2	7	20	4.50	632/1432	4.69	4.27	4.29	4.23	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	10	2	5	2	2	9	3.55	879/1221	3.24	3.78	3.93	3.86	3.55	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	2	0	3	6	5	3.75	907/1280	3.90	3.76	4.10	3.92	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	2	3	4	3	4	3.25	1193/1277	3.79	4.03	4.34	4.13	3.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	2	0	3	4	7	3.88	972/1269	3.93	4.07	4.31	4.04	3.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	8	1	2	2	2	1	3.00	779/ 854	3.19	3.77	4.02	3.87	3.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	29	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 215	****	4.50	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 228	****	4.00	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 217	****	4.00	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 205	****	4.75	4.23	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	30	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	5.00	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	30	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	4.88	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	30	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	30	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	30	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	30	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	30	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	4.11	****	

Course-Section: ECON 121 0401
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I
 Instructor: COLE, RICHARD
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 510
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	1	A	12	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B	8						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	6	C	5	General	5	Under-grad	32	Non-major	31
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	20				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 121 0501
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I
 Instructor: COLE, RICHARD
 Enrollment: 43
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 511
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	2	9	10	4.38	756/1522	4.47	4.17	4.30	4.14	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	2	8	10	4.29	844/1522	4.53	4.16	4.26	4.18	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	3	7	11	4.38	666/1285	4.60	4.22	4.30	4.22	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	4	0	1	3	9	4	3.94	1079/1476	4.24	4.00	4.22	4.09	3.94	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	0	1	6	12	4.40	430/1412	4.10	3.88	4.06	4.01	4.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	3	0	0	2	8	8	4.33	519/1381	4.17	3.82	4.08	3.93	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	0	8	13	4.62	374/1500	4.71	4.31	4.18	4.16	4.62	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	873/1517	4.45	4.53	4.65	4.62	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	14	2	4.00	898/1497	4.30	3.92	4.11	4.02	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	2	17	4.64	643/1440	4.78	4.43	4.45	4.40	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	1114/1448	4.84	4.65	4.71	4.63	4.55	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	3	6	11	4.40	720/1436	4.63	4.19	4.29	4.24	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	4	5	12	4.38	775/1432	4.69	4.27	4.29	4.23	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	5	4	3	3	2	2.59	1156/1221	3.24	3.78	3.93	3.86	2.59	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	4	0	2	5	4	3.33	1106/1280	3.90	3.76	4.10	3.92	3.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	2	2	4	2	5	3.40	1171/1277	3.79	4.03	4.34	4.13	3.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	3	3	2	1	6	3.27	1172/1269	3.93	4.07	4.31	4.04	3.27	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	7	1	1	1	4	1	3.38	714/ 854	3.19	3.77	4.02	3.87	3.38	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 228	****	4.00	4.35	4.33	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	4.03	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.88	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	3.99	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	4.11	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	8	General	5	Under-grad	23	Non-major	24
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						

Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
				P	0			
				I	0	Other	12	
				?	0			

Course-Section: ECON 122 0101
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING II
 Instructor: HARDY, TIMOTHY
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 512
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	605/1522	3.95	4.17	4.30	4.14	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	545/1522	4.11	4.16	4.26	4.18	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	531/1285	4.13	4.22	4.30	4.22	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	703/1476	3.89	4.00	4.22	4.09	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	621/1412	4.07	3.88	4.06	4.01	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	806/1381	3.85	3.82	4.08	3.93	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	700/1500	4.33	4.31	4.18	4.16	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	1319/1517	4.39	4.53	4.65	4.62	4.17	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	654/1497	3.82	3.92	4.11	4.02	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	682/1440	4.19	4.43	4.45	4.40	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	765/1448	4.56	4.65	4.71	4.63	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	720/1436	4.02	4.19	4.29	4.24	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	527/1432	3.99	4.27	4.29	4.23	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	500/1221	3.90	3.78	3.93	3.86	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	585/1280	3.59	3.76	4.10	3.92	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	930/1277	4.02	4.03	4.34	4.13	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	875/1269	4.22	4.07	4.31	4.04	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	779/ 854	3.33	3.77	4.02	3.87	3.00	

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 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 5	General	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 6
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	6
			? 0		

Course-Section: ECON 122 0201
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING II
 Instructor: MCBRIDE, CHUCK
 Enrollment: 44
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 513
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	5	7	4.27	889/1522	3.95	4.17	4.30	4.14	4.27	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	3	5	5	4.00	1080/1522	4.11	4.16	4.26	4.18	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	499/1285	4.13	4.22	4.30	4.22	4.53	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	1009/1476	3.89	4.00	4.22	4.09	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	3	1	9	4.29	538/1412	4.07	3.88	4.06	4.01	4.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	470/1381	3.85	3.82	4.08	3.93	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	1	3	10	4.40	630/1500	4.33	4.31	4.18	4.16	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	2	12	0	3.86	1458/1517	4.39	4.53	4.65	4.62	3.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	4	6	3	3.92	1006/1497	3.82	3.92	4.11	4.02	3.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	1079/1440	4.19	4.43	4.45	4.40	4.21	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	935/1448	4.56	4.65	4.71	4.63	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	3	1	5	5	3.86	1177/1436	4.02	4.19	4.29	4.24	3.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	4	6	3.93	1108/1432	3.99	4.27	4.29	4.23	3.93	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	10	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	461/1221	3.90	3.78	3.93	3.86	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1280	3.59	3.76	4.10	3.92	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1277	4.02	4.03	4.34	4.13	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1269	4.22	4.07	4.31	4.04	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 854	3.33	3.77	4.02	3.87	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 2	C 2	General	1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 6	D 0		Under-grad 16
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	13
			? 0		

Course-Section: ECON 122 0301
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING II
 Instructor: MCBRIDE, CHUCK
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 514
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	3	2	3.67	1338/1522	3.95	4.17	4.30	4.14	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	2	2	3.56	1344/1522	4.11	4.16	4.26	4.18	3.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	1	4	3.67	1123/1285	4.13	4.22	4.30	4.22	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	860/1476	3.89	4.00	4.22	4.09	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	594/1412	4.07	3.88	4.06	4.01	4.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	806/1381	3.85	3.82	4.08	3.93	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	924/1500	4.33	4.31	4.18	4.16	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	1	4.13	1343/1517	4.39	4.53	4.65	4.62	4.13
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	2	2	3	1	3.38	1334/1497	3.82	3.92	4.11	4.02	3.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	3	1	3	3.75	1304/1440	4.19	4.43	4.45	4.40	3.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	1353/1448	4.56	4.65	4.71	4.63	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	4	1	2	3.50	1282/1436	4.02	4.19	4.29	4.24	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	2	1	3.38	1311/1432	3.99	4.27	4.29	4.23	3.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	899/1221	3.90	3.78	3.93	3.86	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	3	1	1	3.00	1187/1280	3.59	3.76	4.10	3.92	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	2	1	3	1	3.43	1164/1277	4.02	4.03	4.34	4.13	3.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	836/1269	4.22	4.07	4.31	4.04	4.14
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	625/ 854	3.33	3.77	4.02	3.87	3.67

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 3	Required for Majors	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General	9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		Major 8
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	6
			? 0		

Course-Section: ECON 122 0401
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING II
 Instructor: HARDY, TIMOTHY
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 515
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	3	2	3	3.67	1338/1522	3.95	4.17	4.30	4.14	3.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	358/1522	4.11	4.16	4.26	4.18	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	478/1285	4.13	4.22	4.30	4.22	4.56	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	2	2	3.67	1245/1476	3.89	4.00	4.22	4.09	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	2	3	3.78	997/1412	4.07	3.88	4.06	4.01	3.78	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	977/1381	3.85	3.82	4.08	3.93	3.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1500	4.33	4.31	4.18	4.16	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1517	4.39	4.53	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	756/1497	3.82	3.92	4.11	4.02	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	0	8	4.67	604/1440	4.19	4.43	4.45	4.40	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1448	4.56	4.65	4.71	4.63	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	0	0	8	4.56	539/1436	4.02	4.19	4.29	4.24	4.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	0	7	4.33	820/1432	3.99	4.27	4.29	4.23	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	3	0	4	3.88	714/1221	3.90	3.78	3.93	3.86	3.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	988/1280	3.59	3.76	4.10	3.92	3.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	692/1277	4.02	4.03	4.34	4.13	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1269	4.22	4.07	4.31	4.04	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 854	3.33	3.77	4.02	3.87	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	9
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	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	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 122 0501
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING II
 Instructor: MALIN, BARRY
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 516
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	3	4	2	7	3.65	1347/1522	3.95	4.17	4.30	4.14	3.65	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	4	7	3.82	1233/1522	4.11	4.16	4.26	4.18	3.82	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	6	2	5	3.41	1197/1285	4.13	4.22	4.30	4.22	3.41	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	2	2	3	1	4	3.25	1380/1476	3.89	4.00	4.22	4.09	3.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	1	5	2	5	3.85	940/1412	4.07	3.88	4.06	4.01	3.85	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	2	2	1	0	3	3.00	1286/1381	3.85	3.82	4.08	3.93	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	4	1	8	3.81	1141/1500	4.33	4.31	4.18	4.16	3.81	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	714/1517	4.39	4.53	4.65	4.62	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	1	4	3	2	3.36	1337/1497	3.82	3.92	4.11	4.02	3.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	2	2	4	5	3.71	1318/1440	4.19	4.43	4.45	4.40	3.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	1297/1448	4.56	4.65	4.71	4.63	4.27	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	4	4	5	3.80	1197/1436	4.02	4.19	4.29	4.24	3.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	3	6	4	3.73	1199/1432	3.99	4.27	4.29	4.23	3.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	1	4	2	5	3.69	818/1221	3.90	3.78	3.93	3.86	3.69	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	1	1	3	2	3.50	1031/1280	3.59	3.76	4.10	3.92	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	804/1277	4.02	4.03	4.34	4.13	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	2	1	2	3	3.75	1030/1269	4.22	4.07	4.31	4.04	3.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	5	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 854	3.33	3.77	4.02	3.87	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 5	General	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 1		Non-major 16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	13
			? 0		

Course-Section: ECON 263 0101
 Title: SPORTS ECONOMICS
 Instructor: COATES, DENNIS
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 517
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	1	2	3	4	11	4.05	1094/1522	4.05	4.17	4.30	4.34	4.05	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	2	2	10	7	4.05	1058/1522	4.05	4.16	4.26	4.29	4.05	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	4	1	6	9	4.00	938/1285	4.00	4.22	4.30	4.36	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	3	1	1	6	10	3.90	1127/1476	3.90	4.00	4.22	4.20	3.90	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	2	7	9	4.15	655/1412	4.15	3.88	4.06	4.00	4.15	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	3	8	7	3.95	872/1381	3.95	3.82	4.08	3.97	3.95	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	463/1500	4.53	4.31	4.18	4.20	4.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	292/1517	4.95	4.53	4.65	4.63	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	3	9	4	4.06	859/1497	4.06	3.92	4.11	4.11	4.06	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	3	4	11	4.44	877/1440	4.44	4.43	4.45	4.42	4.44	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	1001/1448	4.67	4.65	4.71	4.78	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	2	7	8	4.22	906/1436	4.22	4.19	4.29	4.29	4.22	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	4	2	11	4.28	869/1432	4.28	4.27	4.29	4.31	4.28	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	7	4	1	1	1	4	3.00	1064/1221	3.00	3.78	3.93	4.02	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	2	1	1	4	3.56	1009/1280	3.56	3.76	4.10	4.08	3.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	2	2	0	4	3.44	1157/1277	3.44	4.03	4.34	4.33	3.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	2	0	3	0	4	3.44	1133/1269	3.44	4.07	4.31	4.33	3.44	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	2	2	0	0	1	4	3.71	604/ 854	3.71	3.77	4.02	4.00	3.71	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	B	8						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	8	Under-grad	23	Non-major	21
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 301 0101
 Title INTERMED ACCOUNTING I
 Instructor: CROTEAU, MARCI
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 518
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	4	15	4.55	559/1522	4.55	4.17	4.30	4.34	4.55	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	16	4.55	499/1522	4.55	4.16	4.26	4.25	4.55	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	15	4.64	395/1285	4.64	4.22	4.30	4.30	4.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	4	14	4.32	724/1476	4.32	4.00	4.22	4.26	4.32	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	6	11	4.09	703/1412	4.09	3.88	4.06	4.03	4.09	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	4	5	10	3.91	938/1381	3.91	3.82	4.08	4.13	3.91	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	3	18	4.68	287/1500	4.68	4.31	4.18	4.13	4.68	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	487/1517	4.91	4.53	4.65	4.62	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	534/1497	4.38	3.92	4.11	4.13	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	3	16	4.67	604/1440	4.67	4.43	4.45	4.46	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	20	4.86	602/1448	4.86	4.65	4.71	4.71	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	7	12	4.41	720/1436	4.41	4.19	4.29	4.30	4.41	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	2	17	4.59	537/1432	4.59	4.27	4.29	4.29	4.59	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	1	2	3	2	8	3.88	714/1221	3.88	3.78	3.93	3.94	3.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	5	4	8	4.18	637/1280	4.18	3.76	4.10	4.14	4.18	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	2	2	3	10	4.24	819/1277	4.24	4.03	4.34	4.38	4.24	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	707/1269	4.35	4.07	4.31	4.39	4.35	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	8	2	1	1	2	3	3.33	726/ 854	3.33	3.77	4.02	4.00	3.33	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 12	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 1	C 4	General 2	Under-grad 22 Non-major 19
84-150	7	3.00-3.49 2	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 8	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 16	
			? 1		

Course-Section: ECON 302 0101
 Title INTERMED ACCOUNTING II
 Instructor: CROTEAU, MARCI
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 519
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	176/1522	4.91	4.17	4.30	4.34	4.91	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	193/1522	4.82	4.16	4.26	4.25	4.82	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	16	4.64	395/1285	4.64	4.22	4.30	4.30	4.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	16	4.64	347/1476	4.64	4.00	4.22	4.26	4.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	339/1412	4.50	3.88	4.06	4.03	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	4	13	4.36	482/1381	4.36	3.82	4.08	4.13	4.36	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	55/1500	4.95	4.31	4.18	4.13	4.95	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.53	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	333/1497	4.58	3.92	4.11	4.13	4.58	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	192/1440	4.90	4.43	4.45	4.46	4.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.65	4.71	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	170/1436	4.86	4.19	4.29	4.30	4.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	227/1432	4.86	4.27	4.29	4.29	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	119/1221	4.76	3.78	3.93	3.94	4.76	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	124/1280	4.92	3.76	4.10	4.14	4.92	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	290/1277	4.83	4.03	4.34	4.38	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	461/1269	4.67	4.07	4.31	4.39	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	4	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	157/ 854	4.63	3.77	4.02	4.00	4.63	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 5	C 3	General 2	Under-grad 22 Non-major 21
84-150	11	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 8	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 19	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ECON 311 0101
 Title INTERM MICROECON ANALY
 Instructor: BRADLEY, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 520
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	1060/1522	3.71	4.17	4.30	4.34	4.09	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	5	3	3.82	1238/1522	3.64	4.16	4.26	4.25	3.82	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	2	4	3.91	1027/1285	3.82	4.22	4.30	4.30	3.91	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1174/1476	3.37	4.00	4.22	4.26	3.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	3	2	3	3.36	1243/1412	3.56	3.88	4.06	4.03	3.36	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	1	0	2	0	2.75	1338/1381	2.75	3.82	4.08	4.13	2.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	1	7	4.09	940/1500	4.05	4.31	4.18	4.13	4.09	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	963/1517	4.59	4.53	4.65	4.62	4.64	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	2	5	1	3.67	1204/1497	3.51	3.92	4.11	4.13	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	565/1440	4.32	4.43	4.45	4.46	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	494/1448	4.69	4.65	4.71	4.71	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	1	1	7	4.09	1008/1436	3.63	4.19	4.29	4.30	4.09	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	1	1	6	3.91	1126/1432	3.70	4.27	4.29	4.29	3.91	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	1011/1221	3.22	3.78	3.93	3.94	3.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	1081/1280	3.02	3.76	4.10	4.14	3.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	1197/1277	3.43	4.03	4.34	4.38	3.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	1207/1269	3.46	4.07	4.31	4.39	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	726/ 854	3.33	3.77	4.02	4.00	3.33	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	11
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 1		Non-major 8
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	8
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ECON 311 0201
 Title INTERM MICROECON ANALY
 Instructor: BRADLEY, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 521
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	3	5	1	5	3.57	1376/1522	3.71	4.17	4.30	4.34	3.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	3	4	4	3.64	1309/1522	3.64	4.16	4.26	4.25	3.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	1	5	4	3.50	1160/1285	3.82	4.22	4.30	4.30	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	3	0	0	1	2.75	1448/1476	3.37	4.00	4.22	4.26	2.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	3	2	6	3.85	940/1412	3.56	3.88	4.06	4.03	3.85	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1381	2.75	3.82	4.08	4.13	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	6	4	3.93	1068/1500	4.05	4.31	4.18	4.13	3.93	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	623/1517	4.59	4.53	4.65	4.62	4.85	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	1	2	6	2	3.58	1246/1497	3.51	3.92	4.11	4.13	3.58	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	1	6	6	4.14	1124/1440	4.32	4.43	4.45	4.46	4.14	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	935/1448	4.69	4.65	4.71	4.71	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	1	1	4	4	3.38	1320/1436	3.63	4.19	4.29	4.30	3.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	1	3	7	3.79	1178/1432	3.70	4.27	4.29	4.29	3.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	12	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1221	3.22	3.78	3.93	3.94	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	3	1	1	1	2	2.75	1240/1280	3.02	3.76	4.10	4.14	2.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	4	2	1	3.25	1193/1277	3.43	4.03	4.34	4.38	3.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	2	1	1	3	3.38	1149/1269	3.46	4.07	4.31	4.39	3.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 854	3.33	3.77	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 228	****	4.00	4.35	4.29	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	4.30	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	4.39	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.68	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.75	****	

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	2	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 5	General	3
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	11
			? 0		

Course-Section: ECON 311 0301
 Title INTERM MICROECON ANALY
 Instructor: LORD, WILLIAM
 Enrollment: 76
 Questionnaires: 38

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 522
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	6	7	18	5	3.47	1413/1522	3.71	4.17	4.30	4.34	3.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	2	16	9	8	3.45	1388/1522	3.64	4.16	4.26	4.25	3.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	11	11	15	4.05	910/1285	3.82	4.22	4.30	4.30	4.05	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	27	1	0	5	2	3	3.55	1306/1476	3.37	4.00	4.22	4.26	3.55	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	3	2	11	9	7	3.47	1189/1412	3.56	3.88	4.06	4.03	3.47	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	33	0	3	0	1	1	3.00	****/1381	2.75	3.82	4.08	4.13	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	3	7	9	18	4.14	903/1500	4.05	4.31	4.18	4.13	4.14	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	1	24	11	4.28	1257/1517	4.59	4.53	4.65	4.62	4.28	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	2	2	5	9	11	3	3.27	1367/1497	3.51	3.92	4.11	4.13	3.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	4	3	10	18	4.11	1142/1440	4.32	4.43	4.45	4.46	4.11	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	6	8	23	4.46	1199/1448	4.69	4.65	4.71	4.71	4.46	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	3	4	13	7	9	3.42	1311/1436	3.63	4.19	4.29	4.30	3.42	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	4	7	15	6	3.42	1301/1432	3.70	4.27	4.29	4.29	3.42	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	6	4	8	6	8	3.19	1033/1221	3.22	3.78	3.93	3.94	3.19	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	26	0	3	1	3	4	1	2.92	1222/1280	3.02	3.76	4.10	4.14	2.92	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	26	0	0	2	2	4	4	3.83	1038/1277	3.43	4.03	4.34	4.38	3.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	26	0	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	875/1269	3.46	4.07	4.31	4.39	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	26	7	0	3	1	1	0	2.60	****/ 854	3.33	3.77	4.02	4.00	****	

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 1 Major 13
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 12		
56-83	10	2.00-2.99 7	C 10	General 1	Under-grad 37 Non-major 25
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 5	D 1		
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 9	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 1		
			I 0	Other 33	
			? 3		

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	4	4	11	4.14	1012/1522	4.43	4.17	4.30	4.34	4.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	6	6	8	3.95	1135/1522	4.22	4.16	4.26	4.25	3.95	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	5	6	7	3.85	1046/1285	4.20	4.22	4.30	4.30	3.85	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	1	2	6	5	4.07	971/1476	4.08	4.00	4.22	4.26	4.07	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	7	1	10	4.05	728/1412	4.18	3.88	4.06	4.03	4.05	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	2	5	2	6	3.63	1119/1381	3.99	3.82	4.08	4.13	3.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	4	5	10	4.10	940/1500	4.41	4.31	4.18	4.13	4.10	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	1	18	4.85	600/1517	4.58	4.53	4.65	4.62	4.85	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	1	6	5	3	3.50	1277/1497	4.02	3.92	4.11	4.13	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	6	3	10	4.05	1167/1440	4.44	4.43	4.45	4.46	4.05	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	1157/1448	4.60	4.65	4.71	4.71	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	2	4	5	8	3.85	1177/1436	4.21	4.19	4.29	4.30	3.85	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	4	3	9	3.75	1191/1432	4.34	4.27	4.29	4.29	3.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	10	2	4	0	0	4	3.00	1064/1221	4.14	3.78	3.93	3.94	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	690/1280	4.17	3.76	4.10	4.14	4.08	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	5	3	3	3.67	1094/1277	3.94	4.03	4.34	4.38	3.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	3	3	3	3	3.50	1117/1269	3.97	4.07	4.31	4.39	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	5	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	547/ 854	3.83	3.77	4.02	4.00	3.86	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 215	****	4.50	4.36	4.21	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 228	****	4.00	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 217	****	4.00	4.51	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.35	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 205	****	4.75	4.23	4.26	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 65	****	5.00	4.49	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	4.88	4.45	4.34	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 7	Required for Majors 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 9	
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 3	General 1
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D 0	Under-grad 21
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Non-major 19
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	Other 15
					#### - 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	2	11	10	4.35	802/1522	4.43	4.17	4.30	4.34	4.35	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	13	10	4.43	654/1522	4.22	4.16	4.26	4.25	4.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	9	10	4.32	722/1285	4.20	4.22	4.30	4.30	4.32	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	1	0	6	3	4.10	956/1476	4.08	4.00	4.22	4.26	4.10	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	12	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	760/1412	4.18	3.88	4.06	4.03	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	16	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	413/1381	3.99	3.82	4.08	4.13	4.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	5	4	12	4.33	700/1500	4.41	4.31	4.18	4.13	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	2	20	4.78	749/1517	4.58	4.53	4.65	4.62	4.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	1	4	8	6	3.85	1073/1497	4.02	3.92	4.11	4.13	3.85	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	4	6	9	4.26	1039/1440	4.44	4.43	4.45	4.46	4.26	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	1036/1448	4.60	4.65	4.71	4.71	4.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	3	6	9	4.21	916/1436	4.21	4.19	4.29	4.30	4.21	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	6	12	4.53	611/1432	4.34	4.27	4.29	4.29	4.53	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	226/1221	4.14	3.78	3.93	3.94	4.59	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	442/1280	4.17	3.76	4.10	4.14	4.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	827/1277	3.94	4.03	4.34	4.38	4.22	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	848/1269	3.97	4.07	4.31	4.39	4.11	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	2	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	314/ 854	3.83	3.77	4.02	4.00	4.29	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	4.50	4.36	4.21	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 228	****	4.00	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.00	4.51	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.35	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	4.75	4.23	4.26	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	5.00	4.49	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.88	4.45	4.34	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.11	3.33	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	4.39	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.68	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.26	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.12	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.75	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	****	****	

Course-Section: ECON 312 0201
 Title INTERM MACROECON ANALY
 Instructor: THOMAS, MARK S
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 524
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	B	9						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	21
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	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	17				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 312 0301
 Title INTERM MACROECON ANALY
 Instructor: PARK, KIYOUNG
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 525
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	582/1522	4.43	4.17	4.30	4.34	4.53	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	7	4.29	834/1522	4.22	4.16	4.26	4.25	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	690/1285	4.20	4.22	4.30	4.30	4.35	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	792/1476	4.08	4.00	4.22	4.26	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	1	1	3	7	4.08	715/1412	4.18	3.88	4.06	4.03	4.08	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	1	1	2	1	4	3.67	1097/1381	3.99	3.82	4.08	4.13	3.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	211/1500	4.41	4.31	4.18	4.13	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	11	5	4.31	1233/1517	4.58	4.53	4.65	4.62	4.31	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	493/1497	4.02	3.92	4.11	4.13	4.42	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	492/1440	4.44	4.43	4.45	4.46	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	0	3	11	4.53	1131/1448	4.60	4.65	4.71	4.71	4.53	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	720/1436	4.21	4.19	4.29	4.30	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	682/1432	4.34	4.27	4.29	4.29	4.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	232/1221	4.14	3.78	3.93	3.94	4.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	718/1280	4.17	3.76	4.10	4.14	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	672/1277	3.94	4.03	4.34	4.38	4.43	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	532/1269	3.97	4.07	4.31	4.39	4.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	3	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/ 854	3.83	3.77	4.02	4.00	****	

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	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 312 0401
 Title INTERM MACROECON ANALY
 Instructor: CARPENTER, ROBE
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 526
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	404/1522	4.43	4.17	4.30	4.34	4.70	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	3	4.18	945/1522	4.22	4.16	4.26	4.25	4.18	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	752/1285	4.20	4.22	4.30	4.30	4.27		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	1136/1476	4.08	4.00	4.22	4.26	3.89	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	283/1412	4.18	3.88	4.06	4.03	4.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	604/1381	3.99	3.82	4.08	4.13	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	556/1500	4.41	4.31	4.18	4.13	4.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	1193/1517	4.58	4.53	4.65	4.62	4.36	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	7	3	4.30	602/1497	4.02	3.92	4.11	4.13	4.30	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	512/1440	4.44	4.43	4.45	4.46	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	916/1448	4.60	4.65	4.71	4.71	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	762/1436	4.21	4.19	4.29	4.30	4.36	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	490/1432	4.34	4.27	4.29	4.29	4.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	359/1221	4.14	3.78	3.93	3.94	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	657/1280	4.17	3.76	4.10	4.14	4.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	1164/1277	3.94	4.03	4.34	4.38	3.43	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	1	3	2	3.71	1053/1269	3.97	4.07	4.31	4.39	3.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	726/ 854	3.83	3.77	4.02	4.00	3.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 215	****	4.50	4.36	4.21	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 228	****	4.00	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 217	****	4.00	4.51	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.35	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	4.75	4.23	4.26	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	5.00	4.49	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	4.88	4.45	4.34	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.11	3.33	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	4.39	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.68	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.26	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.12	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.75	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	****	****	

Course-Section: ECON 312 0401
 Title INTERM MACROECON ANALY
 Instructor: CARPENTER, ROBE
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 526
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 4						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	1	Under-grad	11	Non-major	7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	8				
			? 0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	2	3	13	9	3.96	1161/1522	3.96	4.17	4.30	4.34	3.96	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	6	10	11	4.07	1042/1522	4.07	4.16	4.26	4.25	4.07	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	2	9	15	4.41	650/1285	4.41	4.22	4.30	4.30	4.41	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	7	1	2	2	6	10	4.05	987/1476	4.05	4.00	4.22	4.26	4.05	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	6	1	4	3	5	7	3.65	1083/1412	3.65	3.88	4.06	4.03	3.65	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	5	2	0	3	8	8	3.95	872/1381	3.95	3.82	4.08	4.13	3.95	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	0	0	1	9	15	4.56	425/1500	4.56	4.31	4.18	4.13	4.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	1	0	1	14	11	4.26	1268/1517	4.26	4.53	4.65	4.62	4.26	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	1	0	6	10	3	3.70	1181/1497	3.70	3.92	4.11	4.13	3.70	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	3	5	18	4.44	877/1440	4.44	4.43	4.45	4.46	4.44	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	5	8	13	4.22	1310/1448	4.22	4.65	4.71	4.71	4.22	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	1	10	15	4.41	720/1436	4.41	4.19	4.29	4.30	4.41	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	5	7	14	4.22	907/1432	4.22	4.27	4.29	4.29	4.22	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	2	1	3	9	10	3.96	641/1221	3.96	3.78	3.93	3.94	3.96	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	3	2	3	3	4	3.20	1150/1280	3.20	3.76	4.10	4.14	3.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	0	4	5	5	3.87	1027/1277	3.87	4.03	4.34	4.38	3.87	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	0	5	6	3	3.67	1074/1269	3.67	4.07	4.31	4.39	3.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	6	1	1	0	2	4	3.88	538/ 854	3.88	3.77	4.02	4.00	3.88	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 228	****	4.00	4.35	4.29	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	4.39	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	28	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.68	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	28	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.75	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 13		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	29
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	D 1		Major 3
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 1	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	21
			? 0		

Course-Section: ECON 374 0101
 Title FUND FINANCIAL MGMT
 Instructor: LAMDIN, DOUGLAS
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 528
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	3	18	4.56	537/1522	4.59	4.17	4.30	4.34	4.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	19	4.64	383/1522	4.60	4.16	4.26	4.25	4.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	18	4.64	386/1285	4.62	4.22	4.30	4.30	4.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	566/1476	4.58	4.00	4.22	4.26	4.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	5	1	7	2	4	2.95	1341/1412	3.47	3.88	4.06	4.03	2.95	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	1	3	5	9	4.22	633/1381	3.99	3.82	4.08	4.13	4.22	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	5	20	4.80	160/1500	4.84	4.31	4.18	4.13	4.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	6	18	4.75	802/1517	4.34	4.53	4.65	4.62	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	1	2	8	9	4.25	654/1497	4.38	3.92	4.11	4.13	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	0	3	21	4.72	532/1440	4.76	4.43	4.45	4.46	4.72	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	0	24	4.88	548/1448	4.87	4.65	4.71	4.71	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	4	4	16	4.36	762/1436	4.50	4.19	4.29	4.30	4.36	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	2	7	14	4.38	784/1432	4.52	4.27	4.29	4.29	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	10	2	1	1	5	6	3.80	759/1221	4.09	3.78	3.93	3.94	3.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	8	2	2	3.31	1117/1280	3.90	3.76	4.10	4.14	3.31	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	2	0	2	3	5	3.75	1066/1277	4.23	4.03	4.34	4.38	3.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	1	2	4	4	3.75	1030/1269	4.32	4.07	4.31	4.39	3.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	8	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/ 854	****	3.77	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	4.50	4.36	4.21	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	4.00	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.00	4.51	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.35	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	4.75	4.23	4.26	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	5.00	4.49	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.88	4.45	4.34	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.11	3.33	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	4.39	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.68	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.26	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.12	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.75	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	****	****	

Course-Section: ECON 374 0101
 Title FUND FINANCIAL MGMT
 Instructor: LAMDIN, DOUGLAS
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 528
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	18	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	25	Non-major	23
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	23				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 374 0201
 Title FUND FINANCIAL MGMT
 Instructor: PARK, KIYOUNG
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 529
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	472/1522	4.59	4.17	4.30	4.34	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	477/1522	4.60	4.16	4.26	4.25	4.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	425/1285	4.62	4.22	4.30	4.30	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	265/1476	4.58	4.00	4.22	4.26	4.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	3	5	6	4.00	760/1412	3.47	3.88	4.06	4.03	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	1	1	0	3	3	3.75	1046/1381	3.99	3.82	4.08	4.13	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	124/1500	4.84	4.31	4.18	4.13	4.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	14	1	3.94	1431/1517	4.34	4.53	4.65	4.62	3.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	385/1497	4.38	3.92	4.11	4.13	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	353/1440	4.76	4.43	4.45	4.46	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	602/1448	4.87	4.65	4.71	4.71	4.87	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	436/1436	4.50	4.19	4.29	4.30	4.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	454/1432	4.52	4.27	4.29	4.29	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	4	0	9	4.38	373/1221	4.09	3.78	3.93	3.94	4.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	0	1	8	4.50	390/1280	3.90	3.76	4.10	4.14	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	442/1277	4.23	4.03	4.34	4.38	4.70	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	223/1269	4.32	4.07	4.31	4.39	4.90	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	6	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 854	****	3.77	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	4.50	4.36	4.21	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 228	****	4.00	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 217	****	4.00	4.51	4.45	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	17	Non-major	15
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 385 0101
 Title ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
 Instructor: GINDLING, THOMA
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 530
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	3	7	16	4.37	767/1522	4.37	4.17	4.30	4.34	4.37	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	8	17	4.44	639/1522	4.44	4.16	4.26	4.25	4.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	0	5	19	4.41	650/1285	4.41	4.22	4.30	4.30	4.41	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	2	1	5	15	4.43	582/1476	4.43	4.00	4.22	4.26	4.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	3	11	9	3.81	964/1412	3.81	3.88	4.06	4.03	3.81	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	4	12	9	3.96	858/1381	3.96	3.82	4.08	4.13	3.96	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	2	6	17	4.50	483/1500	4.50	4.31	4.18	4.13	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	11	15	4.44	1128/1517	4.44	4.53	4.65	4.62	4.44	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	3	9	9	4.14	794/1497	4.14	3.92	4.11	4.13	4.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	5	20	4.80	353/1440	4.80	4.43	4.45	4.46	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	548/1448	4.88	4.65	4.71	4.71	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	2	8	15	4.38	741/1436	4.38	4.19	4.29	4.30	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	7	17	4.50	632/1432	4.50	4.27	4.29	4.29	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	20	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	****/1221	****	3.78	3.93	3.94	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	644/1280	4.17	3.76	4.10	4.14	4.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	375/1277	4.75	4.03	4.34	4.38	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	381/1269	4.75	4.07	4.31	4.39	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	7	2	0	0	0	3	3.40	****/ 854	****	3.77	4.02	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 13	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 1 Major 9
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 3	C 2	General 6	Under-grad 26 Non-major 18
84-150	11	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 16	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ECON 405 0101
 Title BENEFIT-COST EVALUATIO
 Instructor: FARROW, SCOTT
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 531
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	8	11	4.30	849/1522	4.30	4.17	4.30	4.42	4.30	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	4	10	6	3.83	1233/1522	3.83	4.16	4.26	4.34	3.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	11	6	3.91	1018/1285	3.91	4.22	4.30	4.42	3.91	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	10	6	3.91	1115/1476	3.91	4.00	4.22	4.31	3.91	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	7	13	4.39	439/1412	4.39	3.88	4.06	4.11	4.39	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	5	6	9	4.00	806/1381	4.00	3.82	4.08	4.21	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	6	7	10	4.17	860/1500	4.17	4.31	4.18	4.25	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	577/1517	4.87	4.53	4.65	4.71	4.87	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	1	3	10	5	3.85	1073/1497	3.85	3.92	4.11	4.21	3.85	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	4	7	10	4.18	1100/1440	4.18	4.43	4.45	4.52	4.18	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	916/1448	4.73	4.65	4.71	4.75	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	5	9	6	3.82	1193/1436	3.82	4.19	4.29	4.32	3.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	4	7	9	4.05	1018/1432	4.05	4.27	4.29	4.34	4.05	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	2	4	3	7	2	3.17	1038/1221	3.17	3.78	3.93	4.04	3.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	1	4	4	3	3.54	1018/1280	3.54	3.76	4.10	4.28	3.54	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	911/1277	4.08	4.03	4.34	4.50	4.08	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	791/1269	4.23	4.07	4.31	4.49	4.23	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	4	1	2	1	2	3	3.44	692/ 854	3.44	3.77	4.02	4.31	3.44	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	4.50	4.36	4.47	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 228	****	4.00	4.35	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.00	4.51	4.55	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	4.75	4.23	3.85	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	5.00	4.49	4.65	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.88	4.45	4.58	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.11	4.14	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.51	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	4.22	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.03	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.13	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.33	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.92	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	4.25	****	

Course-Section: ECON 405 0101
 Title BENEFIT-COST EVALUATIO
 Instructor: FARROW, SCOTT
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 531
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 1	A 5	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 4 Major 5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 15		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 5	C 2	General 6	Under-grad 19 Non-major 18
84-150	10	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 16	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ECON 408 0101
 Title: MANAGERIAL ECONOMICS
 Instructor: DICKSON, LISA
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 532
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	19	4.69	404/1522	4.69	4.17	4.30	4.42	4.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	18	4.65	371/1522	4.65	4.16	4.26	4.34	4.65	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	20	4.73	298/1285	4.73	4.22	4.30	4.42	4.73	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	8	2	1	0	3	11	4.18	881/1476	4.18	4.00	4.22	4.31	4.18	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	3	3	5	10	3.78	989/1412	3.78	3.88	4.06	4.11	3.78	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	2	5	2	10	4.05	779/1381	4.05	3.82	4.08	4.21	4.05	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	7	18	4.65	325/1500	4.65	4.31	4.18	4.25	4.65	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	15	4.58	1019/1517	4.58	4.53	4.65	4.71	4.58	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	3	11	7	4.19	718/1497	4.19	3.92	4.11	4.21	4.19	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	22	4.85	288/1440	4.85	4.43	4.45	4.52	4.85	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	24	4.92	395/1448	4.92	4.65	4.71	4.75	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	6	18	4.64	436/1436	4.64	4.19	4.29	4.32	4.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	21	4.77	338/1432	4.77	4.27	4.29	4.34	4.77	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	17	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	556/1221	4.13	3.78	3.93	4.04	4.13	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	179/1280	4.82	3.76	4.10	4.28	4.82	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.03	4.34	4.50	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	321/1269	4.82	4.07	4.31	4.49	4.82	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	7	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 854	****	3.77	4.02	4.31	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	8	C	1	General	3	Under-grad	25	Non-major	22
84-150	14	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	21				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 410A 0101
 Title GLOBAL AGING
 Instructor: GRIBBIN, JOSEPH
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 533
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.17	4.30	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.16	4.26	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	189/1285	4.86	4.22	4.30	4.42	4.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	140/1476	4.88	4.00	4.22	4.31	4.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1412	5.00	3.88	4.06	4.11	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	102/1381	4.86	3.82	4.08	4.21	4.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1500	5.00	4.31	4.18	4.25	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.53	4.65	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1497	5.00	3.92	4.11	4.21	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.43	4.45	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.65	4.71	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.19	4.29	4.32	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.27	4.29	4.34	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1221	5.00	3.78	3.93	4.04	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1280	5.00	3.76	4.10	4.28	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	254/1277	4.88	4.03	4.34	4.50	4.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.07	4.31	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 854	5.00	3.77	4.02	4.31	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	5.00	4.58	4.67	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 77	5.00	5.00	4.52	4.60	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 65	5.00	5.00	4.49	4.65	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	30/ 78	4.88	4.88	4.45	4.58	4.88	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	5.00	4.11	4.14	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Title PERSONAL FINANCIAL ECO
 Instructor: ANORUO, EMMANUE
 Enrollment: 49
 Questionnaires: 26

Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	4	8	11	4.00	1122/1522	4.00	4.17	4.30	4.42	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	8	14	4.27	864/1522	4.27	4.16	4.26	4.34	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	6	15	4.31	731/1285	4.31	4.22	4.30	4.42	4.31
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	3	7	9	4.32	724/1476	4.32	4.00	4.22	4.31	4.32
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	1	3	5	10	4.10	697/1412	4.10	3.88	4.06	4.11	4.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	6	5	8	4.11	753/1381	4.11	3.82	4.08	4.21	4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	3	3	16	4.28	750/1500	4.28	4.31	4.18	4.25	4.28
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	14	11	4.44	1128/1517	4.44	4.53	4.65	4.71	4.44
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	0	5	7	7	3.95	966/1497	3.95	3.92	4.11	4.21	3.95
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	2	4	18	4.52	774/1440	4.52	4.43	4.45	4.52	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	4	2	18	4.44	1207/1448	4.44	4.65	4.71	4.75	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	3	7	13	4.29	835/1436	4.29	4.19	4.29	4.32	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	6	4	14	4.20	928/1432	4.20	4.27	4.29	4.34	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	0	2	5	14	4.41	359/1221	4.41	3.78	3.93	4.04	4.41
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	2	8	4.45	433/1280	4.45	3.76	4.10	4.28	4.45
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	0	0	0	10	4.64	498/1277	4.64	4.03	4.34	4.50	4.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	485/1269	4.64	4.07	4.31	4.49	4.64
4. Were special techniques successful	15	5	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	****/ 854	****	3.77	4.02	4.31	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	4.50	4.36	4.47	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	4.00	4.35	4.32	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.00	4.51	4.55	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.20	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	4.75	4.23	3.85	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	4.60	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	5.00	4.49	4.65	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.88	4.45	4.58	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.11	4.14	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.51	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	4.22	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.03	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.13	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.11	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.92	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	4.25	****

Course-Section: ECON 410B 0101
 Title PERSONAL FINANCIAL ECO
 Instructor: ANORUO, EMMANUE
 Enrollment: 49
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 534
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	26	Non-major	24
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	20				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	6	8	10	4.04	1094/1522	4.04	4.17	4.30	4.42	4.04	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	6	9	7	3.88	1206/1522	3.88	4.16	4.26	4.34	3.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	2	7	13	4.20	809/1285	4.20	4.22	4.30	4.42	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	12	5	3.80	1174/1476	3.80	4.00	4.22	4.31	3.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	3	7	6	6	3.36	1243/1412	3.36	3.88	4.06	4.11	3.36	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	3	1	7	5	5	3.38	1206/1381	3.38	3.82	4.08	4.21	3.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	6	8	4	7	3.48	1309/1500	3.48	4.31	4.18	4.25	3.48	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	532/1517	4.88	4.53	4.65	4.71	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	9	7	5	3.73	1167/1497	3.73	3.92	4.11	4.21	3.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	7	9	7	3.80	1287/1440	3.80	4.43	4.45	4.52	3.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	4	19	4.68	989/1448	4.68	4.65	4.71	4.75	4.68	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	12	6	4	3.40	1315/1436	3.40	4.19	4.29	4.32	3.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	6	9	9	4.00	1036/1432	4.00	4.27	4.29	4.34	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	12	2	2	6	0	3	3.00	1064/1221	3.00	3.78	3.93	4.04	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	1	4	3	3	3.50	1031/1280	3.50	3.76	4.10	4.28	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	804/1277	4.25	4.03	4.34	4.50	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	586/1269	4.50	4.07	4.31	4.49	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	6	1	1	2	1	1	3.00	****/ 854	****	3.77	4.02	4.31	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 215	****	4.50	4.36	4.47	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 228	****	4.00	4.35	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 217	****	4.00	4.51	4.55	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 205	****	4.75	4.23	3.85	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	5.00	4.49	4.65	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 78	****	4.88	4.45	4.58	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.11	4.14	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.51	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	4.22	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.03	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.13	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.33	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.92	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	4.25	****	

Course-Section: ECON 411 0101
 Title TOPICS IN MICROECONOMI
 Instructor: MITCH, DAVID F
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 535
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	8	C	1	General	4	Under-grad	25	Non-major	16
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 421 0101
 Title INTRO TO ECONOMETRICS
 Instructor: DASGUPTA, NANDI
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 536
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	290/1522	4.77	4.17	4.30	4.42	4.77	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	5	14	4.50	545/1522	4.50	4.16	4.26	4.34	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	1	18	4.68	347/1285	4.68	4.22	4.30	4.42	4.68	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	2	4	5	9	4.05	982/1476	4.05	4.00	4.22	4.31	4.05	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	2	6	3	8	3.89	900/1412	3.89	3.88	4.06	4.11	3.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	0	5	6	7	3.95	885/1381	3.95	3.82	4.08	4.21	3.95	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	3	5	13	4.32	720/1500	4.32	4.31	4.18	4.25	4.32	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	16	5	4.18	1307/1517	4.18	4.53	4.65	4.71	4.18	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	370/1497	4.53	3.92	4.11	4.21	4.53	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	2	16	4.70	565/1440	4.70	4.43	4.45	4.52	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	0	0	19	4.85	629/1448	4.85	4.65	4.71	4.75	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	1	4	14	4.50	601/1436	4.50	4.19	4.29	4.32	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	466/1432	4.65	4.27	4.29	4.34	4.65	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	14	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	983/1221	3.33	3.78	3.93	4.04	3.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1280	****	3.76	4.10	4.28	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1277	****	4.03	4.34	4.50	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/1269	****	4.07	4.31	4.49	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	19	3	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 854	****	3.77	4.02	4.31	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 14	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 1 Major 3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 1	General 2	Under-grad 22 Non-major 20
84-150	8	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 19	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ECON 451 0101
 Title LABOR ECONOMICS
 Instructor: GOLDFARB, MARSH
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 537
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	15	4.57	537/1522	4.57	4.17	4.30	4.42	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	15	4.57	477/1522	4.57	4.16	4.26	4.34	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	9	12	4.43	614/1285	4.43	4.22	4.30	4.42	4.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	1	0	0	3	7	4.36	671/1476	4.36	4.00	4.22	4.31	4.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	4	5	12	4.27	547/1412	4.27	3.88	4.06	4.11	4.27	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	13	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	434/1381	4.40	3.82	4.08	4.21	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	5	2	16	4.48	527/1500	4.48	4.31	4.18	4.25	4.48	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	438/1517	4.91	4.53	4.65	4.71	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	0	2	8	6	4.06	865/1497	4.06	3.92	4.11	4.21	4.06	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	17	4.77	412/1440	4.77	4.43	4.45	4.52	4.77	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	4	17	4.68	977/1448	4.68	4.65	4.71	4.75	4.68	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	8	14	4.64	446/1436	4.64	4.19	4.29	4.32	4.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	430/1432	4.68	4.27	4.29	4.34	4.68	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	1	2	2	2	7	3.86	727/1221	3.86	3.78	3.93	4.04	3.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	2	2	9	4.36	515/1280	4.36	3.76	4.10	4.28	4.36	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	3	0	10	4.36	729/1277	4.36	4.03	4.34	4.50	4.36	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	3	0	11	4.57	532/1269	4.57	4.07	4.31	4.49	4.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	4	0	0	3	0	7	4.40	252/ 854	4.40	3.77	4.02	4.31	4.40	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 215	****	4.50	4.36	4.47	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 228	****	4.00	4.35	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.00	4.51	4.55	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 205	****	4.75	4.23	3.85	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 65	****	5.00	4.49	4.65	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.88	4.45	4.58	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.11	4.14	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.51	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	4.22	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.03	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.13	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.33	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.92	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	4.25	****	

Course-Section: ECON 451 0101
 Title LABOR ECONOMICS
 Instructor: GOLDFARB, MARSH
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 537
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	1	Major	12
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	22	Non-major	11
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	7	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	16				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 453 0101
 Title HOUSEHOLD ECONOMICS
 Instructor: LORD, WILLIAM
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 538
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	4	5	6	2	3.22	1468/1522	3.22	4.17	4.30	4.42	3.22	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	3	6	6	3.83	1227/1522	3.83	4.16	4.26	4.34	3.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	4	9	4.17	833/1285	4.17	4.22	4.30	4.42	4.17	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	15	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1476	****	4.00	4.22	4.31	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	3	5	6	1	3.33	1257/1412	3.33	3.88	4.06	4.11	3.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	15	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/1381	****	3.82	4.08	4.21	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	2	5	9	4.06	961/1500	4.06	4.31	4.18	4.25	4.06	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	14	3	4.11	1349/1517	4.11	4.53	4.65	4.71	4.11	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	2	0	9	4	1	3.13	1405/1497	3.13	3.92	4.11	4.21	3.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	1	10	5	4.00	1186/1440	4.00	4.43	4.45	4.52	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	4	12	4.50	1157/1448	4.50	4.65	4.71	4.75	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	9	6	1	3.33	1334/1436	3.33	4.19	4.29	4.32	3.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	6	3	6	3.56	1256/1432	3.56	4.27	4.29	4.34	3.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	9	1	2	1	2	3	3.44	933/1221	3.44	3.78	3.93	4.04	3.44	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	4	3	1	3.33	1106/1280	3.33	3.76	4.10	4.28	3.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	930/1277	4.00	4.03	4.34	4.50	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	798/1269	4.22	4.07	4.31	4.49	4.22	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	5	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/ 854	****	3.77	4.02	4.31	****	

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	0	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 6	General	1
84-150	13	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	17
			? 1		

Course-Section: ECON 463 0101
 Title THEORY OF PUBLIC FINAN
 Instructor: COATES, DENNIS
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 539
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	605/1522	4.50	4.17	4.30	4.42	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	407/1522	4.63	4.16	4.26	4.34	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	220/1285	4.81	4.22	4.30	4.42	4.81	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	336/1476	4.64	4.00	4.22	4.31	4.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	2	1	4	6	3.67	1077/1412	3.67	3.88	4.06	4.11	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	3	3	7	3.75	1046/1381	3.75	3.82	4.08	4.21	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	124/1500	4.88	4.31	4.18	4.25	4.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	555/1517	4.88	4.53	4.65	4.71	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	506/1497	4.40	3.92	4.11	4.21	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	336/1440	4.81	4.43	4.45	4.52	4.81	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	15	4.88	575/1448	4.88	4.65	4.71	4.75	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	295/1436	4.75	4.19	4.29	4.32	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	430/1432	4.69	4.27	4.29	4.34	4.69	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	606/1221	4.00	3.78	3.93	4.04	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	3	3	4	3.82	869/1280	3.82	3.76	4.10	4.28	3.82	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	498/1277	4.64	4.03	4.34	4.50	4.64	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	628/1269	4.45	4.07	4.31	4.49	4.45	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	7	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	426/ 854	4.00	3.77	4.02	4.31	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	1	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	7	General	2	Under-grad	15	Non-major	12
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D	2						
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	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 467 0101
 Title HEALTH ECONOMICS
 Instructor: COOPER, PHILIP
 Enrollment: 45
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 540
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	1	4	11	4.28	879/1522	4.28	4.17	4.30	4.42	4.28	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	5	11	4.33	787/1522	4.33	4.16	4.26	4.34	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	4	12	4.39	666/1285	4.39	4.22	4.30	4.42	4.39	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	1	0	0	3	3	4.00	1009/1476	4.00	4.00	4.22	4.31	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	0	1	4	9	4.13	680/1412	4.13	3.88	4.06	4.11	4.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	0	2	3	7	3.93	911/1381	3.93	3.82	4.08	4.21	3.93	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	201/1500	4.76	4.31	4.18	4.25	4.76	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	1	0	0	0	16	4.76	784/1517	4.76	4.53	4.65	4.71	4.76	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	0	3	9	2	3.73	1160/1497	3.73	3.92	4.11	4.21	3.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	1	4	11	4.28	1031/1440	4.28	4.43	4.45	4.52	4.28	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	0	3	14	4.61	1060/1448	4.61	4.65	4.71	4.75	4.61	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	0	8	7	4.12	995/1436	4.12	4.19	4.29	4.32	4.12	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	1	2	12	4.22	907/1432	4.22	4.27	4.29	4.34	4.22	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	14	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/1221	****	3.78	3.93	4.04	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	390/1280	4.50	3.76	4.10	4.28	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	1	0	2	6	4.10	903/1277	4.10	4.03	4.34	4.50	4.10	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	671/1269	4.40	4.07	4.31	4.49	4.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	6	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/ 854	****	3.77	4.02	4.31	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	4.00	4.35	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.00	4.51	4.55	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.20	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	5.00	4.49	4.65	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.11	4.14	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.51	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	4.22	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.03	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.33	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.92	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	4.25	****	

Course-Section: ECON 467 0101
 Title HEALTH ECONOMICS
 Instructor: COOPER, PHILIP
 Enrollment: 45
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 540
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	18	Non-major	10
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	2	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	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 471 0101
 Title MONEY & CAPITAL MARKET
 Instructor: CARPENTER, ROBE
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 541
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	1	0	5	12	7	3.96	1161/1522	3.96	4.17	4.30	4.42	3.96	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	1	9	7	6	3.56	1339/1522	3.56	4.16	4.26	4.34	3.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	1	1	1	3	9	9	4.04	915/1285	4.04	4.22	4.30	4.42	4.04	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	13	1	0	3	3	4	3.82	1169/1476	3.82	4.00	4.22	4.31	3.82	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	3	4	7	8	3.67	1077/1412	3.67	3.88	4.06	4.11	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	8	4	1	4	4	4	3.18	1263/1381	3.18	3.82	4.08	4.21	3.18	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	2	4	6	12	4.04	966/1500	4.04	4.31	4.18	4.25	4.04	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	2	9	9	4	3.63	1483/1517	3.63	4.53	4.65	4.71	3.63	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	6	10	4	3.90	1034/1497	3.90	3.92	4.11	4.21	3.90	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	2	11	10	4.21	1088/1440	4.21	4.43	4.45	4.52	4.21	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	7	17	4.71	954/1448	4.71	4.65	4.71	4.75	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	2	2	7	13	4.29	835/1436	4.29	4.19	4.29	4.32	4.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	9	12	4.33	820/1432	4.33	4.27	4.29	4.34	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	8	1	4	2	4	4	3.40	956/1221	3.40	3.78	3.93	4.04	3.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	1	1	6	5	3.93	803/1280	3.93	3.76	4.10	4.28	3.93	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	2	0	2	2	8	4.00	930/1277	4.00	4.03	4.34	4.50	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	0	2	1	10	4.36	707/1269	4.36	4.07	4.31	4.49	4.36	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	9	2	0	0	0	3	3.40	****/ 854	****	3.77	4.02	4.31	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	4.50	4.36	4.47	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	4.00	4.35	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.00	4.51	4.55	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	4.75	4.23	3.85	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 65	****	5.00	4.49	4.65	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 78	****	4.88	4.45	4.58	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.11	4.14	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.51	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	4.22	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.03	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.13	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.33	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.92	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	4.25	****	

Course-Section: ECON 471 0101
 Title MONEY & CAPITAL MARKET
 Instructor: CARPENTER, ROBE
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 541
 JUN 26, 2007
 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 8	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 1 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 11		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 1	C 2	General 1	Under-grad 26 Non-major 27
84-150	10	3.00-3.49 9	D 0		
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 20	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ECON 475 0101
 Title FINANCIAL INVSTMT ANA
 Instructor: LAMDIN, DOUGLAS
 Enrollment: 55
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 542
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	0	3	8	18	4.40	733/1522	4.40	4.17	4.30	4.42	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	7	20	4.57	477/1522	4.57	4.16	4.26	4.34	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	6	22	4.67	366/1285	4.67	4.22	4.30	4.42	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	1	0	1	9	16	4.44	566/1476	4.44	4.00	4.22	4.31	4.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	10	1	2	2	4	11	4.10	697/1412	4.10	3.88	4.06	4.11	4.10	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	2	0	4	8	12	4.08	768/1381	4.08	3.82	4.08	4.21	4.08	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	29	4.94	76/1500	4.94	4.31	4.18	4.25	4.94	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	2	0	0	0	8	20	4.71	873/1517	4.71	4.53	4.65	4.71	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	1	5	10	10	4.00	898/1497	4.00	3.92	4.11	4.21	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	6	24	4.80	353/1440	4.80	4.43	4.45	4.52	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	26	4.83	683/1448	4.83	4.65	4.71	4.75	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	9	19	4.57	527/1436	4.57	4.19	4.29	4.32	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	6	21	4.57	569/1432	4.57	4.27	4.29	4.34	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	0	0	3	6	14	4.48	303/1221	4.48	3.78	3.93	4.04	4.48	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	3	0	1	3	5	3.58	996/1280	3.58	3.76	4.10	4.28	3.58	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	867/1277	4.17	4.03	4.34	4.50	4.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	501/1269	4.62	4.07	4.31	4.49	4.62	
4. Were special techniques successful	19	6	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	****/ 854	****	3.77	4.02	4.31	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	5.00	4.49	4.65	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	4.88	4.45	4.58	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.11	4.14	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 12	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 1 Major 2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 12		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 7	C 3	General 2	Under-grad 30 Non-major 29
84-150	21	3.00-3.49 10	D 0		
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 26	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ECON 478 0101
 Title REAL ESTATE ECON AND F
 Instructor: GETTER, DARYL
 Enrollment: 44
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 543
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies							Instructor		Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect	
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	2	20	4.68	424/1522	4.68	4.17	4.30	4.42	4.68	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	2	21	4.76	244/1522	4.76	4.16	4.26	4.34	4.76	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	2	19	4.56	467/1285	4.56	4.22	4.30	4.42	4.56	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	4	4	14	4.45	551/1476	4.45	4.00	4.22	4.31	4.45	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	15	1	0	2	0	7	4.20	621/1412	4.20	3.88	4.06	4.11	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	5	0	1	2	4	12	4.42	413/1381	4.42	3.82	4.08	4.21	4.42	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	1	1	21	4.75	211/1500	4.75	4.31	4.18	4.25	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	195/1517	4.96	4.53	4.65	4.71	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	0	3	17	4.71	223/1497	4.71	3.92	4.11	4.21	4.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	304/1440	4.83	4.43	4.45	4.52	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	21	4.88	575/1448	4.88	4.65	4.71	4.75	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	3	18	4.63	457/1436	4.63	4.19	4.29	4.32	4.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	3	18	4.70	418/1432	4.70	4.27	4.29	4.34	4.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	9	2	2	0	1	9	3.93	677/1221	3.93	3.78	3.93	4.04	3.93	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	605/1280	4.22	3.76	4.10	4.28	4.22	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	560/1277	4.56	4.03	4.34	4.50	4.56	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	721/1269	4.33	4.07	4.31	4.49	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	18	4	0	2	0	0	2	3.50	****/ 854	****	3.77	4.02	4.31	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	9	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	26	Non-major	25
84-150	15	3.00-3.49	7	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	21				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 482 0101
 Title INTERNATIONAL FINANCE
 Instructor: MCINTYRE, KEVIN
 Enrollment: 44
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 544
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	8	20	4.66	443/1522	4.66	4.17	4.30	4.42	4.66	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	9	17	4.38	738/1522	4.38	4.16	4.26	4.34	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	9	17	4.45	602/1285	4.45	4.22	4.30	4.42	4.45	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	11	1	3	3	1	9	3.82	1164/1476	3.82	4.00	4.22	4.31	3.82	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	2	6	6	9	3.72	1037/1412	3.72	3.88	4.06	4.11	3.72	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	8	3	0	3	4	9	3.84	984/1381	3.84	3.82	4.08	4.21	3.84	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	1	7	18	4.46	541/1500	4.46	4.31	4.18	4.25	4.46	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	26	4.90	509/1517	4.90	4.53	4.65	4.71	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	2	1	9	10	4.23	685/1497	4.23	3.92	4.11	4.21	4.23	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	8	21	4.72	512/1440	4.72	4.43	4.45	4.52	4.72	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	6	23	4.79	783/1448	4.79	4.65	4.71	4.75	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	4	7	16	4.36	772/1436	4.36	4.19	4.29	4.32	4.36	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	9	17	4.48	657/1432	4.48	4.27	4.29	4.34	4.48	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	18	1	1	0	3	6	4.09	575/1221	4.09	3.78	3.93	4.04	4.09	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	0	1	4	7	4.00	718/1280	4.00	3.76	4.10	4.28	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	0	2	2	9	4.29	781/1277	4.29	4.03	4.34	4.50	4.29	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	532/1269	4.57	4.07	4.31	4.49	4.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	9	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	****/ 854	****	3.77	4.02	4.31	****	

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 2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 12		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 4	General 2	Under-grad 29 Non-major 27
84-150	16	3.00-3.49 10	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 8	F 2	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 25	
			? 2		

Course-Section: ECON 490 0101
 Title ANALYTIC METHODS IN EC
 Instructor: THOMAS, MARK S
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 545
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	1	4	10	6	4.00	1122/1522	4.00	4.17	4.30	4.42	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	2	10	8	4.19	935/1522	4.19	4.16	4.26	4.34	4.19	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	2	3	8	8	4.05	915/1285	4.05	4.22	4.30	4.42	4.05	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	7	2	2	3	4	3	3.29	1374/1476	3.29	4.00	4.22	4.31	3.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	10	2	1	2	2	4	3.45	1195/1412	3.45	3.88	4.06	4.11	3.45	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	4	4	4	1	4	4	3.00	1286/1381	3.00	3.82	4.08	4.21	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	4	9	8	4.19	839/1500	4.19	4.31	4.18	4.25	4.19	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	714/1517	4.81	4.53	4.65	4.71	4.81	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	2	7	4	1	3.29	1361/1497	3.29	3.92	4.11	4.21	3.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	891/1440	4.44	4.43	4.45	4.52	4.44	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	1	0	1	7	7	4.19	1322/1448	4.19	4.65	4.71	4.75	4.19	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	2	2	5	7	4.06	1024/1436	4.06	4.19	4.29	4.32	4.06	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	2	1	6	6	3.88	1139/1432	3.88	4.27	4.29	4.34	3.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	1	1	2	0	3	9	4.13	548/1221	4.13	3.78	3.93	4.04	4.13	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	2	0	0	1	3	3.50	1031/1280	3.50	3.76	4.10	4.28	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	1	1	0	1	3	3.67	1094/1277	3.67	4.03	4.34	4.50	3.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	1	1	0	1	3	3.67	1074/1269	3.67	4.07	4.31	4.49	3.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	18	3	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 854	****	3.77	4.02	4.31	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	4.00	4.35	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.00	4.51	4.55	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	4.75	4.23	3.85	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	5.00	4.49	4.65	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.88	4.45	4.58	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.11	4.14	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.51	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	4.22	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.03	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.13	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.33	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.92	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	4.25	****	

Course-Section: ECON 490 0101
 Title ANALYTIC METHODS IN EC
 Instructor: THOMAS, MARK S
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 545
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	24
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 602 0101
 Title: MACROECONOMIC ANALYSIS
 Instructor: CINYABUGUMA, MA
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 546
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank						

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	0	3	0	2	2.75	1502/1522	2.75	4.17	4.30	4.45	2.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	1	1	1	2	2.75	1500/1522	2.75	4.16	4.26	4.29	2.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	0	1	2	2.75	1268/1285	2.75	4.22	4.30	4.31	2.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	1	1	2	2.88	1436/1476	2.88	4.00	4.22	4.31	2.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	1	1	2	3.00	1327/1412	3.00	3.88	4.06	4.25	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	1	0	2	1	2.38	1363/1381	2.38	3.82	4.08	4.25	2.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	1	2	1	1	2.50	1471/1500	2.50	4.31	4.18	4.22	2.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	555/1517	4.88	4.53	4.65	4.73	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	2	3	1	1	1	0	2.00	1486/1497	2.00	3.92	4.11	4.21	2.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	2	1	2	1	2.75	1423/1440	2.75	4.43	4.45	4.48	2.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	1337/1448	4.13	4.65	4.71	4.80	4.13	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	3	1	3	0	1	2.38	1423/1436	2.38	4.19	4.29	4.37	2.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	0	1	2	2.63	1395/1432	2.63	4.27	4.29	4.33	2.63	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	2	2	0	2.67	1250/1280	2.67	3.76	4.10	4.24	2.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	1183/1277	3.33	4.03	4.34	4.52	3.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	1	2	2	0	2.83	1235/1269	2.83	4.07	4.31	4.51	2.83	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 228	****	4.00	4.35	4.39	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.40	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	4.49	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ECON 612 0101
 Title ECONOMETRICS II
 Instructor: DICKSON, LISA
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 547
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	525/1522	4.57	4.17	4.30	4.45	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	763/1522	4.36	4.16	4.26	4.29	4.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	745/1285	4.29	4.22	4.30	4.31	4.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	650/1476	4.38	4.00	4.22	4.31	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	0	3	3	4	3.38	1234/1412	3.38	3.88	4.06	4.25	3.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	2	8	4.31	556/1381	4.31	3.82	4.08	4.25	4.31	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	680/1500	4.36	4.31	4.18	4.22	4.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	1080/1517	4.50	4.53	4.65	4.73	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	3	8	1	3.83	1089/1497	3.83	3.92	4.11	4.21	3.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	2	5	6	4.07	1159/1440	4.07	4.43	4.45	4.48	4.07	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	802/1448	4.79	4.65	4.71	4.80	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	1	4	7	4.14	972/1436	4.14	4.19	4.29	4.37	4.14	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	558/1432	4.57	4.27	4.29	4.33	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	850/1221	3.63	3.78	3.93	3.83	3.63	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	3	2	5	3.75	907/1280	3.75	3.76	4.10	4.24	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	290/1277	4.83	4.03	4.34	4.52	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	2	0	9	4.33	721/1269	4.33	4.07	4.31	4.51	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	7	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	88/ 854	4.80	3.77	4.02	4.08	4.80	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	89/ 215	4.50	4.50	4.36	4.72	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	178/ 228	4.00	4.00	4.35	4.39	4.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	1	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	189/ 217	4.00	4.00	4.51	4.61	4.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.76	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	33/ 205	4.75	4.75	4.23	4.40	4.75	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.76	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	4.70	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 65	****	5.00	4.49	4.71	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.88	4.45	4.66	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.11	4.38	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.40	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	4.49	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.78	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.71	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.82	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.82	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.68	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.79	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	4.83	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	4.92	****	

Course-Section: ECON 612 0101
 Title ECONOMETRICS II
 Instructor: DICKSON, LISA
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 547
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	4	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	10	Non-major	14
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ECON 699 0101
 Title SEM IN ECON POLICY ANA
 Instructor: MITCH, DAVID
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 548
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	733/1522	4.40	4.17	4.30	4.45	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	702/1522	4.40	4.16	4.26	4.29	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	650/1285	4.40	4.22	4.30	4.31	4.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	629/1476	4.40	4.00	4.22	4.31	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	760/1412	4.00	3.88	4.06	4.25	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	663/1381	4.20	3.82	4.08	4.25	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	988/1500	4.00	4.31	4.18	4.22	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.53	4.65	4.73	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	898/1497	4.00	3.92	4.11	4.21	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	931/1440	4.40	4.43	4.45	4.48	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	1241/1448	4.40	4.65	4.71	4.80	4.40	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	720/1436	4.40	4.19	4.29	4.37	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	758/1432	4.40	4.27	4.29	4.33	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	124/1221	4.75	3.78	3.93	3.83	4.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	585/1280	4.25	3.76	4.10	4.24	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	375/1277	4.75	4.03	4.34	4.52	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	381/1269	4.75	4.07	4.31	4.51	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	106/ 854	4.75	3.77	4.02	4.08	4.75	

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	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 0		Graduate 3
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		Under-grad 2
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	4
			? 0		