

Course-Section: ECON 101 0101
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS
 Instructor: COOMBER, WILLIA
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 488
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	2	1	1	4	10	4.06	1103/1639	3.93	4.12	4.27	4.08	4.06	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	1	1	2	3	10	4.18	937/1639	3.85	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.18	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	2	1	2	3	10	4.00	973/1397	3.96	4.17	4.28	4.18	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	4	1	1	2	5	5	3.86	1192/1583	3.68	3.94	4.19	4.01	3.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	2	1	1	4	8	3.94	869/1532	3.78	3.95	4.01	3.88	3.94	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	1	2	1	2	4	5	3.64	1129/1504	3.42	3.74	4.05	3.78	3.64	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	3	2	4	7	3.76	1273/1612	3.99	4.25	4.16	4.10	3.76	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	6	7	2	3.73	1591/1635	4.35	4.58	4.65	4.56	3.73	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	1	0	3	4	2	3.60	1270/1579	3.59	3.89	4.08	3.95	3.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	3	1	11	4.53	770/1518	4.22	4.42	4.43	4.38	4.53	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	2	0	12	4.71	961/1520	4.55	4.65	4.70	4.61	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	597/1517	3.88	4.14	4.27	4.20	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	2	1	2	9	4.29	875/1550	4.03	4.25	4.22	4.17	4.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	2	1	2	0	1	8	4.08	586/1295	3.47	3.71	3.94	3.84	4.08	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	494/1398	3.67	3.87	4.07	3.85	4.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	793/1391	3.89	4.15	4.30	4.07	4.29	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	647/1388	4.06	4.19	4.28	4.01	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	1	1	1	0	0	3	3.60	682/ 958	3.01	3.63	3.93	3.71	3.60	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ECON 101 0301
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS
 Instructor: CARROLL, KATHLE
 Enrollment: 76
 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 489
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	4	7	8	17	4.06	1103/1639	3.93	4.12	4.27	4.08	4.06	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	3	9	9	15	4.00	1090/1639	3.85	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	2	4	3	10	17	4.00	973/1397	3.96	4.17	4.28	4.18	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	8	1	3	6	12	6	3.68	1317/1583	3.68	3.94	4.19	4.01	3.68	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	3	0	4	11	11	6	3.59	1189/1532	3.78	3.95	4.01	3.88	3.59	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	18	1	1	7	4	4	3.53	1200/1504	3.42	3.74	4.05	3.78	3.53	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	1	1	4	8	21	4.34	706/1612	3.99	4.25	4.16	4.10	4.34	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	1	0	0	34	4.91	595/1635	4.35	4.58	4.65	4.56	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	1	3	4	13	7	3.79	1148/1579	3.59	3.89	4.08	3.95	3.79	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	2	0	5	27	4.68	588/1518	4.22	4.42	4.43	4.38	4.68	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	2	2	30	4.82	750/1520	4.55	4.65	4.70	4.61	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	2	2	3	10	17	4.12	1016/1517	3.88	4.14	4.27	4.20	4.12	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	3	5	10	15	4.03	1067/1550	4.03	4.25	4.22	4.17	4.03	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	22	2	1	3	3	3	3.33	1067/1295	3.47	3.71	3.94	3.84	3.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	3	3	5	9	3.86	908/1398	3.67	3.87	4.07	3.85	3.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	1	2	3	7	7	3.85	1094/1391	3.89	4.15	4.30	4.07	3.85	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	1	3	2	6	8	3.85	1056/1388	4.06	4.19	4.28	4.01	3.85	
4. Were special techniques successful	19	14	2	0	0	2	2	3.33	****/ 958	3.01	3.63	3.93	3.71	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	38	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 224	****	5.00	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	38	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 219	****	5.00	4.44	4.44	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General	5	Under-grad	39	Non-major	37
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	5						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ECON 101 0401
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS
 Instructor: MITCH, DAVID F
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 490
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	10	10	8	3.93	1229/1639	3.93	4.12	4.27	4.08	3.93	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	7	13	8	4.04	1067/1639	3.85	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.04	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	20	4.61	417/1397	3.96	4.17	4.28	4.18	4.61	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	3	3	8	11	4.08	953/1583	3.68	3.94	4.19	4.01	4.08	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	7	8	9	3.81	981/1532	3.78	3.95	4.01	3.88	3.81	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	3	6	5	10	3.59	1159/1504	3.42	3.74	4.05	3.78	3.59	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	4	10	12	4.14	934/1612	3.99	4.25	4.16	4.10	4.14	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	3	24	4.79	840/1635	4.35	4.58	4.65	4.56	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	7	13	3	3.75	1170/1579	3.59	3.89	4.08	3.95	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	4	11	11	4.19	1148/1518	4.22	4.42	4.43	4.38	4.19	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	5	21	4.81	802/1520	4.55	4.65	4.70	4.61	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	4	4	6	12	4.00	1083/1517	3.88	4.14	4.27	4.20	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	1	9	14	4.22	920/1550	4.03	4.25	4.22	4.17	4.22	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	14	2	2	4	0	3	3.00	1158/1295	3.47	3.71	3.94	3.84	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	3	1	3	2	4	3.23	1213/1398	3.67	3.87	4.07	3.85	3.23	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	2	1	1	4	4	3.58	1197/1391	3.89	4.15	4.30	4.07	3.58	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	1	1	4	2	4	3.58	1162/1388	4.06	4.19	4.28	4.01	3.58	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	2	3	1	3	1	2	2.80	888/ 958	3.01	3.63	3.93	3.71	2.80	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	5.00	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	5.00	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	5.00	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	5.00	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.75	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.79	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****	

Course-Section: ECON 101 0401
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS
 Instructor: MITCH, DAVID F
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 490
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	7	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	4	Under-grad	28	Non-major	27
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	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 101 0501
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS
 Instructor: DICKSON, LISA
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 491
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	5	7	18	4.35	797/1639	3.93	4.12	4.27	4.08	4.35	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	3	10	16	4.29	822/1639	3.85	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	1	7	10	11	3.87	1105/1397	3.96	4.17	4.28	4.18	3.87	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	1	1	4	13	8	3.96	1069/1583	3.68	3.94	4.19	4.01	3.96	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	3	8	7	8	3.67	1136/1532	3.78	3.95	4.01	3.88	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	3	9	10	5	3.37	1284/1504	3.42	3.74	4.05	3.78	3.37	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	4	7	18	4.32	731/1612	3.99	4.25	4.16	4.10	4.32	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	23	8	4.26	1350/1635	4.35	4.58	4.65	4.56	4.26	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	6	14	5	3.96	955/1579	3.59	3.89	4.08	3.95	3.96	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	2	9	18	4.47	863/1518	4.22	4.42	4.43	4.38	4.47	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	4	26	4.87	648/1520	4.55	4.65	4.70	4.61	4.87	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	5	11	13	4.20	947/1517	3.88	4.14	4.27	4.20	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	3	4	2	21	4.37	805/1550	4.03	4.25	4.22	4.17	4.37	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	19	2	0	2	5	2	3.45	1006/1295	3.47	3.71	3.94	3.84	3.45	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	4	6	8	4.11	735/1398	3.67	3.87	4.07	3.85	4.11	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	1	4	6	9	4.15	895/1391	3.89	4.15	4.30	4.07	4.15	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	2	9	9	4.35	771/1388	4.06	4.19	4.28	4.01	4.35	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	10	2	1	4	3	0	2.80	888/ 958	3.01	3.63	3.93	3.71	2.80	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 4	A 7	Required for Majors 5	Graduate 0 Major 3
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 10		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 2	C 5	General 0	Under-grad 32 Non-major 29
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 2	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 20	
			? 2		

Course-Section: ECON 101 0701
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS
 Instructor: CARPENTER, ROBE
 Enrollment: 79
 Questionnaires: 52

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 492
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	1	3	12	22	14	3.87	1281/1639	3.93	4.12	4.27	4.08	3.87	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	8	17	24	4.19	915/1639	3.85	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.19	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	10	15	24	4.15	888/1397	3.96	4.17	4.28	4.18	4.15	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	29	2	3	5	5	7	3.55	1390/1583	3.68	3.94	4.19	4.01	3.55	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	1	0	5	16	25	4.36	478/1532	3.78	3.95	4.01	3.88	4.36	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	43	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	****/1504	3.42	3.74	4.05	3.78	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	2	9	14	25	4.24	837/1612	3.99	4.25	4.16	4.10	4.24	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	2	25	17	6	3.49	1603/1635	4.35	4.58	4.65	4.56	3.49	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	3	0	1	10	15	6	3.81	1125/1579	3.59	3.89	4.08	3.95	3.81	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	3	11	34	4.65	629/1518	4.22	4.42	4.43	4.38	4.65	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	8	40	4.76	872/1520	4.55	4.65	4.70	4.61	4.76	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	2	11	18	16	4.02	1071/1517	3.88	4.14	4.27	4.20	4.02	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	7	16	25	4.33	841/1550	4.03	4.25	4.22	4.17	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	1	4	7	16	17	3.98	655/1295	3.47	3.71	3.94	3.84	3.98	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	5	3	9	10	13	3.58	1083/1398	3.67	3.87	4.07	3.85	3.58	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	3	3	8	9	18	3.88	1082/1391	3.89	4.15	4.30	4.07	3.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	2	0	5	13	21	4.24	841/1388	4.06	4.19	4.28	4.01	4.24	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	31	1	1	4	0	4	3.50	****/ 958	3.01	3.63	3.93	3.71	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	40	11	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 224	****	5.00	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	42	0	3	1	5	0	1	2.50	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	41	9	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 219	****	5.00	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	41	9	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 215	****	5.00	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	42	8	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 198	****	5.00	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	41	6	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/ 85	****	4.75	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	41	8	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	41	10	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	41	7	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	41	9	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	46	0	2	1	2	0	1	2.50	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	45	0	2	1	1	2	1	2.86	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	45	1	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	45	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	45	6	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	44	0	1	1	3	2	1	3.13	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	44	4	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	44	3	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	44	7	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	44	6	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: ECON 101 0701
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS
 Instructor: CARPENTER, ROBE
 Enrollment: 79
 Questionnaires: 52

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 492
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	3	A	6	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	18						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	5	C	12	General	1	Under-grad	52	Non-major	49
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	27				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 101 0901
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS
 Instructor: KAIKAI, ALPHA
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 40

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 493
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	3	1	6	17	13	3.90	1252/1639	3.93	4.12	4.27	4.08	3.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	3	6	18	11	3.83	1313/1639	3.85	4.09	4.22	4.17	3.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	5	18	13	3.95	1029/1397	3.96	4.17	4.28	4.18	3.95	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	16	1	1	7	6	9	3.88	1178/1583	3.68	3.94	4.19	4.01	3.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	4	4	13	16	4.11	700/1532	3.78	3.95	4.01	3.88	4.11	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	19	0	2	6	9	4	3.71	1083/1504	3.42	3.74	4.05	3.78	3.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	6	13	19	4.20	882/1612	3.99	4.25	4.16	4.10	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	34	4	4.08	1466/1635	4.35	4.58	4.65	4.56	4.08	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	2	1	3	5	16	4	3.66	1239/1579	3.59	3.89	4.08	3.95	3.66	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	4	18	16	4.26	1094/1518	4.22	4.42	4.43	4.38	4.26	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	2	4	12	21	4.33	1318/1520	4.55	4.65	4.70	4.61	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	2	6	16	14	4.03	1071/1517	3.88	4.14	4.27	4.20	4.03	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	5	14	17	4.13	1010/1550	4.03	4.25	4.22	4.17	4.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	27	3	2	1	3	3	3.08	1150/1295	3.47	3.71	3.94	3.84	3.08	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	2	7	10	8	3.79	943/1398	3.67	3.87	4.07	3.85	3.79	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	0	6	10	11	4.07	950/1391	3.89	4.15	4.30	4.07	4.07	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	4	9	15	4.39	746/1388	4.06	4.19	4.28	4.01	4.39	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	18	1	2	3	2	2	3.20	818/ 958	3.01	3.63	3.93	3.71	3.20	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	36	2	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 224	****	5.00	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/ 219	****	5.00	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	37	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/ 215	****	5.00	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	37	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/ 198	****	5.00	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	36	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 85	****	4.75	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	36	1	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	38	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	37	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	37	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	37	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	37	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	37	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	37	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	37	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	37	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: ECON 101 0901
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS
 Instructor: KAIKAI, ALPHA
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 40

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 493
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	3	A	11	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	8	General	3	Under-grad	40	Non-major	40
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	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	20				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 101 1001
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS
 Instructor: KAIKAI, ALPHA
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 494
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	1	4	4.13	1042/1639	3.93	4.12	4.27	4.08	4.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1281/1639	3.85	4.09	4.22	4.17	3.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	795/1397	3.96	4.17	4.28	4.18	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	4	0	3	3.86	1192/1583	3.68	3.94	4.19	4.01	3.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	553/1532	3.78	3.95	4.01	3.88	4.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	1171/1504	3.42	3.74	4.05	3.78	3.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	364/1612	3.99	4.25	4.16	4.10	4.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	1428/1635	4.35	4.58	4.65	4.56	4.14	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	889/1579	3.59	3.89	4.08	3.95	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	919/1518	4.22	4.42	4.43	4.38	4.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	1188/1520	4.55	4.65	4.70	4.61	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	2	2	3.75	1260/1517	3.88	4.14	4.27	4.20	3.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1077/1550	4.03	4.25	4.22	4.17	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	806/1295	3.47	3.71	3.94	3.84	3.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	965/1398	3.67	3.87	4.07	3.85	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	616/1391	3.89	4.15	4.30	4.07	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	387/1388	4.06	4.19	4.28	4.01	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	904/ 958	3.01	3.63	3.93	3.71	2.67	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ECON 101 1101
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS
 Instructor: DICKSON, LISA
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 495
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	4	0	0	2	4	5	15	4.27	880/1639	3.93	4.12	4.27	4.08	4.27	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	1	3	7	15	4.38	709/1639	3.85	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	1	1	1	9	14	4.31	749/1397	3.96	4.17	4.28	4.18	4.31	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	5	0	4	2	7	8	3.90	1158/1583	3.68	3.94	4.19	4.01	3.90	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	3	1	2	6	5	8	3.77	1023/1532	3.78	3.95	4.01	3.88	3.77	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	5	4	2	4	7	4	3.24	1347/1504	3.42	3.74	4.05	3.78	3.24	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	1	2	1	3	19	4.42	603/1612	3.99	4.25	4.16	4.10	4.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	22	3	4.12	1441/1635	4.35	4.58	4.65	4.56	4.12	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	4	11	9	4.08	841/1579	3.59	3.89	4.08	3.95	4.08	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	3	4	19	4.62	670/1518	4.22	4.42	4.43	4.38	4.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	5	20	4.80	802/1520	4.55	4.65	4.70	4.61	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	4	7	13	4.28	854/1517	3.88	4.14	4.27	4.20	4.28	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	7	18	4.65	468/1550	4.03	4.25	4.22	4.17	4.65	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	17	1	0	3	1	3	3.63	917/1295	3.47	3.71	3.94	3.84	3.63	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	1	4	2	6	3.79	943/1398	3.67	3.87	4.07	3.85	3.79	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	5	2	8	4.20	863/1391	3.89	4.15	4.30	4.07	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	624/1388	4.06	4.19	4.28	4.01	4.53	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	10	1	0	3	0	1	3.00	****/ 958	3.01	3.63	3.93	3.71	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	7	General	2	Under-grad	30	Non-major	29
84-150	3	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				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 101 1501
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS
 Instructor: COBB, VINCENT
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 496
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	5	0	5	6	2	3.00	1599/1639	3.93	4.12	4.27	4.08	3.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	6	2	7	1	2	2.50	1628/1639	3.85	4.09	4.22	4.17	2.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	5	1	6	5	1	2.78	1389/1397	3.96	4.17	4.28	4.18	2.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	4	1	4	3	3	3.00	1532/1583	3.68	3.94	4.19	4.01	3.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	5	2	3	4	3	2.88	1463/1532	3.78	3.95	4.01	3.88	2.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	6	2	3	4	3	2.78	1452/1504	3.42	3.74	4.05	3.78	2.78	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	5	1	4	4	4	3.06	1515/1612	3.99	4.25	4.16	4.10	3.06	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	958/1635	4.35	4.58	4.65	4.56	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	4	3	5	2	0	2.36	1564/1579	3.59	3.89	4.08	3.95	2.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	6	2	1	5	4	2.94	1488/1518	4.22	4.42	4.43	4.38	2.94	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	2	3	1	5	7	3.67	1478/1520	4.55	4.65	4.70	4.61	3.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	4	3	4	4	2	2.82	1480/1517	3.88	4.14	4.27	4.20	2.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	4	1	5	4	3	3.06	1436/1550	4.03	4.25	4.22	4.17	3.06	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	9	2	2	1	2	2	3.00	1158/1295	3.47	3.71	3.94	3.84	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	3	0	1	3	1	2.88	1316/1398	3.67	3.87	4.07	3.85	2.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	719/1391	3.89	4.15	4.30	4.07	4.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	3	2	2	3.50	1185/1388	4.06	4.19	4.28	4.01	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 958	3.01	3.63	3.93	3.71	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.75	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.16	3.90	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ECON 101 1701
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS
 Instructor: APPIAH, ELIZABE
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 497
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	4	7	6	4.12	1055/1639	3.93	4.12	4.27	4.08	4.12	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	2	7	3	5	3.65	1421/1639	3.85	4.09	4.22	4.17	3.65	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	3	7	7	4.24	813/1397	3.96	4.17	4.28	4.18	4.24	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	2	2	3	6	4	3.47	1418/1583	3.68	3.94	4.19	4.01	3.47	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	1	5	4	5	3.69	1120/1532	3.78	3.95	4.01	3.88	3.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	2	1	0	5	8	1	3.53	1194/1504	3.42	3.74	4.05	3.78	3.53	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	1	2	4	5	4	3.56	1375/1612	3.99	4.25	4.16	4.10	3.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	766/1635	4.35	4.58	4.65	4.56	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	2	6	5	1	3.36	1383/1579	3.59	3.89	4.08	3.95	3.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	2	4	4	7	3.94	1285/1518	4.22	4.42	4.43	4.38	3.94	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	1305/1520	4.55	4.65	4.70	4.61	4.35	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	2	3	8	3	3.59	1317/1517	3.88	4.14	4.27	4.20	3.59	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	1	5	2	7	3.65	1281/1550	4.03	4.25	4.22	4.17	3.65	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	1	4	2	3	3	3.23	1109/1295	3.47	3.71	3.94	3.84	3.23	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	0	0	4	2	3.50	1106/1398	3.67	3.87	4.07	3.85	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	2	1	2	2	1	2.88	1351/1391	3.89	4.15	4.30	4.07	2.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	2	1	4	1	3.50	1185/1388	4.06	4.19	4.28	4.01	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	1	1	3	3	0	3.00	841/ 958	3.01	3.63	3.93	3.71	3.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 224	****	5.00	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 219	****	5.00	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 215	****	5.00	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 198	****	5.00	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.75	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: ECON 101 1701
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS
 Instructor: APPIAH, ELIZABE
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 497
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	2	A	6	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	4	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	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	4				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	2	2	4	2	7	3.59	1462/1639	3.93	4.12	4.27	4.08	3.59	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	3	6	2	5	3.41	1517/1639	3.85	4.09	4.22	4.17	3.41	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	3	3	2	2	7	3.41	1296/1397	3.96	4.17	4.28	4.18	3.41	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	2	3	3	3	4	3.27	1482/1583	3.68	3.94	4.19	4.01	3.27	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	3	5	2	5	3.44	1282/1532	3.78	3.95	4.01	3.88	3.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	5	1	5	3	3.27	1337/1504	3.42	3.74	4.05	3.78	3.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	5	3	2	5	3.18	1494/1612	3.99	4.25	4.16	4.10	3.18	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	0	1	15	4.76	869/1635	4.35	4.58	4.65	4.56	4.76	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	2	1	3	5	1	3.17	1448/1579	3.59	3.89	4.08	3.95	3.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	2	4	4	6	3.71	1385/1518	4.22	4.42	4.43	4.38	3.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	2	3	10	4.38	1292/1520	4.55	4.65	4.70	4.61	4.38	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	3	4	1	6	3.38	1393/1517	3.88	4.14	4.27	4.20	3.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	6	1	7	3.65	1281/1550	4.03	4.25	4.22	4.17	3.65	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	2	1	3	3	5	3.57	943/1295	3.47	3.71	3.94	3.84	3.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	4	5	2	3.46	1128/1398	3.67	3.87	4.07	3.85	3.46	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	4	2	2	3	3.00	1321/1391	3.89	4.15	4.30	4.07	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	3	3	1	5	3.46	1201/1388	4.06	4.19	4.28	4.01	3.46	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	2	0	4	2	1	3.00	841/ 958	3.01	3.63	3.93	3.71	3.00	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.11	4.01	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	4.69	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	10	
?	1			

Course-Section: ECON 101H 0101
 Title PRIN OF MICROECON-HONO
 Instructor: MCCONNELL, VIRG
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 499
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	1	6	4.86	214/1639	4.86	4.12	4.27	4.08	4.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	650/1639	4.43	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	196/1397	4.86	4.17	4.28	4.18	4.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	281/1583	4.71	3.94	4.19	4.01	4.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	293/1532	4.57	3.95	4.01	3.88	4.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	466/1504	4.43	3.74	4.05	3.78	4.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	418/1612	4.57	4.25	4.16	4.10	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.58	4.65	4.56	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	783/1579	4.14	3.89	4.08	3.95	4.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	529/1518	4.71	4.42	4.43	4.38	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.65	4.70	4.61	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	800/1517	4.33	4.14	4.27	4.20	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	401/1550	4.71	4.25	4.22	4.17	4.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	511/1398	4.40	3.87	4.07	3.85	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	863/1391	4.20	4.15	4.30	4.07	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	872/1388	4.20	4.19	4.28	4.01	4.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	725/ 958	3.50	3.63	3.93	3.71	3.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ECON 102 0101
 Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS
 Instructor: THOMAS, MARK S
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 500
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	7	4	7	3.80	1326/1639	3.77	4.12	4.27	4.08	3.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	3	9	4.00	1090/1639	3.79	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	4	3	9	3.80	1151/1397	3.88	4.17	4.28	4.18	3.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	5	5	8	4.00	1010/1583	3.73	3.94	4.19	4.01	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	1	3	3	6	3.86	950/1532	3.75	3.95	4.01	3.88	3.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	2	1	3	1	5	3.50	1212/1504	3.42	3.74	4.05	3.78	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	2	3	12	4.26	802/1612	3.82	4.25	4.16	4.10	4.26	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	15	3	4.11	1454/1635	4.33	4.58	4.65	4.56	4.11	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	7	5	3	3.73	1185/1579	3.56	3.89	4.08	3.95	3.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	5	13	4.50	807/1518	4.21	4.42	4.43	4.38	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	4	4	10	4.21	1371/1520	4.50	4.65	4.70	4.61	4.21	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	5	6	8	4.05	1054/1517	3.91	4.14	4.27	4.20	4.05	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	5	4	9	3.90	1161/1550	4.00	4.25	4.22	4.17	3.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	0	6	3	9	4.00	623/1295	3.65	3.71	3.94	3.84	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	2	1	2	0	5	3.50	1106/1398	3.61	3.87	4.07	3.85	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	1	2	1	5	3.80	1124/1391	3.65	4.15	4.30	4.07	3.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	1	3	0	5	3.70	1112/1388	3.65	4.19	4.28	4.01	3.70	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	4	2	0	1	0	2	3.00	841/ 958	3.00	3.63	3.93	3.71	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ECON 102 0201
 Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS
 Instructor: THOMAS, MARK S
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 501
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	3	4	3	3.54	1484/1639	3.77	4.12	4.27	4.08	3.54	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	3	5	3.85	1300/1639	3.79	4.09	4.22	4.17	3.85	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	3	4	3.69	1204/1397	3.88	4.17	4.28	4.18	3.69	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	0	6	4	4.00	1010/1583	3.73	3.94	4.19	4.01	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	4	5	2	3.46	1264/1532	3.75	3.95	4.01	3.88	3.46	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	1	0	5	1	3.50	1212/1504	3.42	3.74	4.05	3.78	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	756/1612	3.82	4.25	4.16	4.10	4.31	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	10	2	4.08	1466/1635	4.33	4.58	4.65	4.56	4.08	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	4	2	1	3.57	1284/1579	3.56	3.89	4.08	3.95	3.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	670/1518	4.21	4.42	4.43	4.38	4.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	1	4	6	4.17	1383/1520	4.50	4.65	4.70	4.61	4.17	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	2	4	6	4.08	1042/1517	3.91	4.14	4.27	4.20	4.08	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	1	5	5	3.85	1193/1550	4.00	4.25	4.22	4.17	3.85	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	2	2	6	4.09	581/1295	3.65	3.71	3.94	3.84	4.09	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	1207/1398	3.61	3.87	4.07	3.85	3.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	1	0	2	0	2.75	1364/1391	3.65	4.15	4.30	4.07	2.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	1185/1388	3.65	4.19	4.28	4.01	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 958	3.00	3.63	3.93	3.71	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	5.00	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 215	****	5.00	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	5.00	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.75	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: ECON 102 0201
 Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS
 Instructor: THOMAS, MARK S
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 501
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	2	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
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	6				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	2	6	14	5	3.81	1318/1639	3.77	4.12	4.27	4.08	3.81	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	10	10	5	3.63	1432/1639	3.79	4.09	4.22	4.17	3.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	4	5	10	7	3.67	1219/1397	3.88	4.17	4.28	4.18	3.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	1	2	3	11	5	3.77	1247/1583	3.73	3.94	4.19	4.01	3.77	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	9	1	2	6	4	5	3.56	1212/1532	3.75	3.95	4.01	3.88	3.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	10	2	2	4	6	3	3.35	1291/1504	3.42	3.74	4.05	3.78	3.35	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	2	3	6	9	6	3.54	1387/1612	3.82	4.25	4.16	4.10	3.54	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	7	19	1	3.78	1587/1635	4.33	4.58	4.65	4.56	3.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	0	9	6	3	3.67	1232/1579	3.56	3.89	4.08	3.95	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	4	11	10	4.24	1110/1518	4.21	4.42	4.43	4.38	4.24	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	7	16	4.56	1144/1520	4.50	4.65	4.70	4.61	4.56	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	5	10	9	4.08	1036/1517	3.91	4.14	4.27	4.20	4.08	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	3	9	12	4.28	875/1550	4.00	4.25	4.22	4.17	4.28	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	2	5	12	4	3.78	819/1295	3.65	3.71	3.94	3.84	3.78	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	770/1398	3.61	3.87	4.07	3.85	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	0	2	1	3	1	3.43	1241/1391	3.65	4.15	4.30	4.07	3.43	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	1	0	1	4	1	3.57	1165/1388	3.65	4.19	4.28	4.01	3.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	21	3	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	****/ 958	3.00	3.63	3.93	3.71	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 224	****	5.00	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 219	****	5.00	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 215	****	5.00	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	5.00	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	4.75	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: ECON 102 0301
 Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS
 Instructor: COOMBER, WILLIA
 Enrollment: 44
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 502
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	3	Under-grad	28	Non-major	27
84-150	0	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	1						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 102 0401
 Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS
 Instructor: COOMBER, WILLIA
 Enrollment: 43
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 503
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	12	7	3	3.59	1458/1639	3.77	4.12	4.27	4.08	3.59	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	9	8	4	3.68	1399/1639	3.79	4.09	4.22	4.17	3.68	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	8	6	7	3.82	1144/1397	3.88	4.17	4.28	4.18	3.82	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	3	7	5	4	3.40	1449/1583	3.73	3.94	4.19	4.01	3.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	3	8	4	2	3.29	1346/1532	3.75	3.95	4.01	3.88	3.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	2	10	2	3	3.22	1351/1504	3.42	3.74	4.05	3.78	3.22	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	11	4	3	3.33	1455/1612	3.82	4.25	4.16	4.10	3.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	4	14	3	3.95	1533/1635	4.33	4.58	4.65	4.56	3.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	5	12	2	3.84	1102/1579	3.56	3.89	4.08	3.95	3.84	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	7	5	9	4.10	1206/1518	4.21	4.42	4.43	4.38	4.10	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	4	14	4.52	1173/1520	4.50	4.65	4.70	4.61	4.52	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	5	7	7	3.90	1182/1517	3.91	4.14	4.27	4.20	3.90	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	5	6	8	3.90	1161/1550	4.00	4.25	4.22	4.17	3.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	3	2	5	6	3.88	753/1295	3.65	3.71	3.94	3.84	3.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	5	2	1	3.50	1106/1398	3.61	3.87	4.07	3.85	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	0	3	2	2	3.50	1220/1391	3.65	4.15	4.30	4.07	3.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	1	5	0	2	3.38	1235/1388	3.65	4.19	4.28	4.01	3.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	3	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	****/ 958	3.00	3.63	3.93	3.71	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ECON 102 0601
 Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS
 Instructor: FALCON, JAIME
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 504
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	1	4	10	13	4.25	890/1639	3.77	4.12	4.27	4.08	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	4	8	16	4.43	650/1639	3.79	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	3	6	18	4.56	467/1397	3.88	4.17	4.28	4.18	4.56	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	3	3	6	16	4.25	792/1583	3.73	3.94	4.19	4.01	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	9	15	4.41	441/1532	3.75	3.95	4.01	3.88	4.41	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	3	6	6	13	4.04	807/1504	3.42	3.74	4.05	3.78	4.04	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	5	21	4.68	305/1612	3.82	4.25	4.16	4.10	4.68	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	13	15	4.54	1114/1635	4.33	4.58	4.65	4.56	4.54	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	4	3	13	4.45	450/1579	3.56	3.89	4.08	3.95	4.45	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	3	5	19	4.59	696/1518	4.21	4.42	4.43	4.38	4.59	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	1	25	4.89	597/1520	4.50	4.65	4.70	4.61	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	3	5	19	4.59	486/1517	3.91	4.14	4.27	4.20	4.59	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	1	6	18	4.48	664/1550	4.00	4.25	4.22	4.17	4.48	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	14	0	1	3	2	6	4.08	586/1295	3.65	3.71	3.94	3.84	4.08	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	625/1398	3.61	3.87	4.07	3.85	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	1	0	5	6	4.33	752/1391	3.65	4.15	4.30	4.07	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	647/1388	3.65	4.19	4.28	4.01	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	18	7	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/ 958	3.00	3.63	3.93	3.71	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 12	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 2	C 4	General 5	Under-grad 30 Non-major 30
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 6	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 11	
			? 0		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	7	14	4.59	518/1639	3.77	4.12	4.27	4.08	4.59	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	8	11	4.36	735/1639	3.79	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	15	4.64	392/1397	3.88	4.17	4.28	4.18	4.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	3	5	7	4.27	781/1583	3.73	3.94	4.19	4.01	4.27	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	3	8	9	4.30	535/1532	3.75	3.95	4.01	3.88	4.30	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	11	6	4.35	529/1504	3.42	3.74	4.05	3.78	4.35	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	4	15	4.55	449/1612	3.82	4.25	4.16	4.10	4.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	17	5	4.23	1374/1635	4.33	4.58	4.65	4.56	4.23	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	4	9	7	4.15	772/1579	3.56	3.89	4.08	3.95	4.15	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	213/1518	4.21	4.42	4.43	4.38	4.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	546/1520	4.50	4.65	4.70	4.61	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	4	16	4.64	439/1517	3.91	4.14	4.27	4.20	4.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	325/1550	4.00	4.25	4.22	4.17	4.77	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	14	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	****/1295	3.65	3.71	3.94	3.84	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	2	3	7	4.15	702/1398	3.61	3.87	4.07	3.85	4.15	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	4	2	7	4.23	831/1391	3.65	4.15	4.30	4.07	4.23	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	752/1388	3.65	4.19	4.28	4.01	4.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	10	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 958	3.00	3.63	3.93	3.71	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 224	****	5.00	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 219	****	5.00	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	5.00	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	5.00	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.75	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: ECON 102 0701
 Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS
 Instructor: GINDLING, THOMA
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 505
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	2	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 102 0801
 Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS
 Instructor: APPIAH, ELIZABE
 Enrollment: 65
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 506
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	4	11	8	3	3.21	1575/1639	3.77	4.12	4.27	4.08	3.21	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	5	10	9	2	3.14	1570/1639	3.79	4.09	4.22	4.17	3.14	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	6	8	9	2	3.04	1360/1397	3.88	4.17	4.28	4.18	3.04	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	4	7	5	5	2	2.74	1569/1583	3.73	3.94	4.19	4.01	2.74	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	2	3	5	8	4	3.41	1300/1532	3.75	3.95	4.01	3.88	3.41	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	7	7	4	5	2	1	2.26	1490/1504	3.42	3.74	4.05	3.78	2.26	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	9	6	7	4	1	2.33	1586/1612	3.82	4.25	4.16	4.10	2.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	25	4.93	529/1635	4.33	4.58	4.65	4.56	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	1	4	10	4	0	2.89	1514/1579	3.56	3.89	4.08	3.95	2.89	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	7	10	4	4	3.04	1479/1518	4.21	4.42	4.43	4.38	3.04	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	6	8	12	4.15	1388/1520	4.50	4.65	4.70	4.61	4.15	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	7	5	10	4	1	2.52	1500/1517	3.91	4.14	4.27	4.20	2.52	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	6	8	5	3	2.88	1465/1550	4.00	4.25	4.22	4.17	2.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	11	4	4	5	2	1	2.50	1247/1295	3.65	3.71	3.94	3.84	2.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	3	1	7	2	1	2.79	1326/1398	3.61	3.87	4.07	3.85	2.79	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	3	3	5	3	3.57	1200/1391	3.65	4.15	4.30	4.07	3.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	3	1	3	5	2	3.14	1297/1388	3.65	4.19	4.28	4.01	3.14	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	6	2	1	1	3	1	3.00	841/ 958	3.00	3.63	3.93	3.71	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	4
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 8		Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 8	General	3
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 28
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	14
			? 0		

Course-Section: ECON 102 0901
 Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS
 Instructor: COBB, VINCENT
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 507
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	2	3	0	5	3.33	1546/1639	3.77	4.12	4.27	4.08	3.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	3	1	4	3.25	1553/1639	3.79	4.09	4.22	4.17	3.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	2	6	3.83	1131/1397	3.88	4.17	4.28	4.18	3.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	3	0	1	2	4	3.40	1449/1583	3.73	3.94	4.19	4.01	3.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	2	1	2	3	3.75	1046/1532	3.75	3.95	4.01	3.88	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	2	1	4	3.17	1371/1504	3.42	3.74	4.05	3.78	3.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	2	3	3	3.55	1383/1612	3.82	4.25	4.16	4.10	3.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1635	4.33	4.58	4.65	4.56	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	2	1	1	1	0	2.20	1568/1579	3.56	3.89	4.08	3.95	2.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	3	1	5	3.73	1378/1518	4.21	4.42	4.43	4.38	3.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	1115/1520	4.50	4.65	4.70	4.61	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	1	2	1	4	3.40	1384/1517	3.91	4.14	4.27	4.20	3.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	1	5	3.91	1161/1550	4.00	4.25	4.22	4.17	3.91	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	1101/1295	3.65	3.71	3.94	3.84	3.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	3	1	2	3.43	1150/1398	3.61	3.87	4.07	3.85	3.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	2	0	0	3	3	3.63	1187/1391	3.65	4.15	4.30	4.07	3.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	2	0	2	2	1	3.00	1320/1388	3.65	4.19	4.28	4.01	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 958	3.00	3.63	3.93	3.71	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	5.00	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.11	4.01	****	

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

Course-Section: ECON 121 0101
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I
 Instructor: ST MARTIN, JEAN
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 508
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	6	14	4.48	656/1639	4.41	4.12	4.27	4.08	4.48	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	6	17	4.74	273/1639	4.52	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.74	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	5	17	4.70	342/1397	4.50	4.17	4.28	4.18	4.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	5	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	270/1583	4.20	3.94	4.19	4.01	4.72	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	2	0	2	4	3	11	4.15	663/1532	4.27	3.95	4.01	3.88	4.15	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	8	0	1	4	3	6	4.00	824/1504	3.90	3.74	4.05	3.78	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	2	4	16	4.64	352/1612	4.63	4.25	4.16	4.10	4.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	1	9	11	4.48	1165/1635	4.78	4.58	4.65	4.56	4.48	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	2	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	352/1579	4.38	3.89	4.08	3.95	4.53	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	19	4.78	397/1518	4.67	4.42	4.43	4.38	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	273/1520	4.79	4.65	4.70	4.61	4.96	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	263/1517	4.53	4.14	4.27	4.20	4.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	276/1550	4.59	4.25	4.22	4.17	4.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	14	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	561/1295	3.84	3.71	3.94	3.84	4.13	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	1	0	4	7	4.15	702/1398	4.14	3.87	4.07	3.85	4.15	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	594/1391	4.30	4.15	4.30	4.07	4.54	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	624/1388	4.26	4.19	4.28	4.01	4.54	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	6	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	87/ 958	4.19	3.63	3.93	3.71	4.86	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 224	****	5.00	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 219	****	5.00	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 215	****	5.00	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 198	****	5.00	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 85	****	4.75	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: ECON 121 0101
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I
 Instructor: ST MARTIN, JEAN
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 508
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	5	General	2	Under-grad	25	Non-major	22
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	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	14				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 121 0201
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I
 Instructor: ST MARTIN, JEAN
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 509
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	6	17	4.54	582/1639	4.41	4.12	4.27	4.08	4.54	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	6	18	4.62	404/1639	4.52	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.62	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	10	14	4.46	574/1397	4.50	4.17	4.28	4.18	4.46	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	1	2	7	10	4.30	741/1583	4.20	3.94	4.19	4.01	4.30	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	8	3	3	3	4	5	3.28	1353/1532	4.27	3.95	4.01	3.88	3.28	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	9	0	1	4	3	8	4.13	747/1504	3.90	3.74	4.05	3.78	4.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	0	2	22	4.80	166/1612	4.63	4.25	4.16	4.10	4.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	13	12	4.48	1155/1635	4.78	4.58	4.65	4.56	4.48	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	175/1579	4.38	3.89	4.08	3.95	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	21	4.84	301/1518	4.67	4.42	4.43	4.38	4.84	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	597/1520	4.79	4.65	4.70	4.61	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	4	20	4.76	287/1517	4.53	4.14	4.27	4.20	4.76	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	5	20	4.80	288/1550	4.59	4.25	4.22	4.17	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	14	0	1	4	1	5	3.91	731/1295	3.84	3.71	3.94	3.84	3.91	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	294/1398	4.14	3.87	4.07	3.85	4.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	579/1391	4.30	4.15	4.30	4.07	4.56	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	546/1388	4.26	4.19	4.28	4.01	4.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	18	5	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 958	4.19	3.63	3.93	3.71	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 3	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 27 Non-major 25
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 7	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 15	
			? 1		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	2	2	9	11	4.21	939/1639	4.41	4.12	4.27	4.08	4.21	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	7	14	4.46	600/1639	4.52	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.46	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	7	15	4.50	517/1397	4.50	4.17	4.28	4.18	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	3	5	14	4.50	476/1583	4.20	3.94	4.19	4.01	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	1	6	15	4.64	256/1532	4.27	3.95	4.01	3.88	4.64	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	1	3	6	8	4.17	701/1504	3.90	3.74	4.05	3.78	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	4	18	4.67	317/1612	4.63	4.25	4.16	4.10	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	0	23	4.92	595/1635	4.78	4.58	4.65	4.56	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	461/1579	4.38	3.89	4.08	3.95	4.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	271/1518	4.67	4.42	4.43	4.38	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	961/1520	4.79	4.65	4.70	4.61	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	0	4	17	4.64	439/1517	4.53	4.14	4.27	4.20	4.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	3	16	4.67	457/1550	4.59	4.25	4.22	4.17	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	5	3	2	3	3	5	3.31	1076/1295	3.84	3.71	3.94	3.84	3.31	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	5	4	8	4.00	770/1398	4.14	3.87	4.07	3.85	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	1	5	4	7	3.83	1106/1391	4.30	4.15	4.30	4.07	3.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	6	3	8	3.94	998/1388	4.26	4.19	4.28	4.01	3.94	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	12	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	****/ 958	4.19	3.63	3.93	3.71	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 219	****	5.00	4.44	4.44	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.79	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	1	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 13						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	2	Under-grad	24	Non-major	24
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	18				
			? 0						

Course-Section: ECON 121 0601
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I
 Instructor: COLE, RICHARD
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 511
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	6	6	7	3.95	1195/1639	4.41	4.12	4.27	4.08	3.95	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	5	7	8	4.15	959/1639	4.52	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.15	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	1	10	9	4.29	767/1397	4.50	4.17	4.28	4.18	4.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	3	1	2	3	8	4	3.67	1324/1583	4.20	3.94	4.19	4.01	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	0	9	9	4.25	580/1532	4.27	3.95	4.01	3.88	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	4	1	0	5	7	3	3.69	1104/1504	3.90	3.74	4.05	3.78	3.69	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	281/1612	4.63	4.25	4.16	4.10	4.70	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	968/1635	4.78	4.58	4.65	4.56	4.70	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	2	9	4	4.13	795/1579	4.38	3.89	4.08	3.95	4.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	3	6	10	4.20	1141/1518	4.67	4.42	4.43	4.38	4.20	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	2	7	10	4.30	1338/1520	4.79	4.65	4.70	4.61	4.30	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	6	5	9	4.15	982/1517	4.53	4.14	4.27	4.20	4.15	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	4	5	10	4.15	982/1550	4.59	4.25	4.22	4.17	4.15	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	7	4	1	1	4	2	2.92	1195/1295	3.84	3.71	3.94	3.84	2.92	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	3	3	3	4	2	2.93	1300/1398	4.14	3.87	4.07	3.85	2.93	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	2	1	2	8	2	3.47	1230/1391	4.30	4.15	4.30	4.07	3.47	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	1	5	3	5	3.67	1130/1388	4.26	4.19	4.28	4.01	3.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	10	3	0	1	1	0	2.00	****/ 958	4.19	3.63	3.93	3.71	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.11	4.01	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	4.12	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.05	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	4.69	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 11		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 23
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	14
			? 0		

Course-Section: ECON 121 0701
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I
 Instructor: MEDICUS, SUZANN
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 512
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	12	4.80	257/1639	4.41	4.12	4.27	4.08	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	349/1639	4.52	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	302/1397	4.50	4.17	4.28	4.18	4.73	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	741/1583	4.20	3.94	4.19	4.01	4.30	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	203/1532	4.27	3.95	4.01	3.88	4.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	964/1504	3.90	3.74	4.05	3.78	3.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	317/1612	4.63	4.25	4.16	4.10	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1635	4.78	4.58	4.65	4.56	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	382/1579	4.38	3.89	4.08	3.95	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	529/1518	4.67	4.42	4.43	4.38	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1520	4.79	4.65	4.70	4.61	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	700/1517	4.53	4.14	4.27	4.20	4.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	231/1550	4.59	4.25	4.22	4.17	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	167/1295	3.84	3.71	3.94	3.84	4.70	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	386/1398	4.14	3.87	4.07	3.85	4.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	279/1391	4.30	4.15	4.30	4.07	4.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	815/1388	4.26	4.19	4.28	4.01	4.29	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	349/ 958	4.19	3.63	3.93	3.71	4.25	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		Major 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 2	C 1	General 1	Under-grad 16
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		Non-major 16
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 10	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ECON 121 0801
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I
 Instructor: MEDICUS, SUZANN
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 513
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	10	14	4.36	797/1639	4.41	4.12	4.27	4.08	4.36	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	10	16	4.50	517/1639	4.52	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	10	17	4.57	447/1397	4.50	4.17	4.28	4.18	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	2	3	7	6	3.94	1098/1583	4.20	3.94	4.19	4.01	3.94	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	15	11	4.37	469/1532	4.27	3.95	4.01	3.88	4.37	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	11	1	2	3	6	3	3.53	1194/1504	3.90	3.74	4.05	3.78	3.53	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	2	11	13	4.30	767/1612	4.63	4.25	4.16	4.10	4.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	26	4.96	265/1635	4.78	4.58	4.65	4.56	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	1	3	11	5	4.00	889/1579	4.38	3.89	4.08	3.95	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	5	20	4.73	491/1518	4.67	4.42	4.43	4.38	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	4	22	4.85	699/1520	4.79	4.65	4.70	4.61	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	4	6	16	4.46	648/1517	4.53	4.14	4.27	4.20	4.46	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	5	19	4.62	511/1550	4.59	4.25	4.22	4.17	4.62	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	2	2	3	4	13	4.00	623/1295	3.84	3.71	3.94	3.84	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	539/1398	4.14	3.87	4.07	3.85	4.36	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	516/1391	4.30	4.15	4.30	4.07	4.64	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	693/1388	4.26	4.19	4.28	4.01	4.45	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	2	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	456/ 958	4.19	3.63	3.93	3.71	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 2	A 4	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 13		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 28 Non-major 27
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 3	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 18	
			? 2		

Course-Section: ECON 121 0901
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I
 Instructor: HARDY, TIMOTHY
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 514
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	593/1639	4.41	4.12	4.27	4.08	4.52	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	12	4.48	567/1639	4.52	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.48	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	6	11	4.29	767/1397	4.50	4.17	4.28	4.18	4.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	1	4	6	6	4.00	1010/1583	4.20	3.94	4.19	4.01	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	7	12	4.48	366/1532	4.27	3.95	4.01	3.88	4.48	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	1	2	4	6	3.93	920/1504	3.90	3.74	4.05	3.78	3.93	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	1	17	4.62	376/1612	4.63	4.25	4.16	4.10	4.62	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	331/1635	4.78	4.58	4.65	4.56	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	0	1	7	9	4.28	634/1579	4.38	3.89	4.08	3.95	4.28	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	745/1518	4.67	4.42	4.43	4.38	4.55	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	802/1520	4.79	4.65	4.70	4.61	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	4	13	4.50	597/1517	4.53	4.14	4.27	4.20	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	5	10	4.20	944/1550	4.59	4.25	4.22	4.17	4.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	1	3	5	7	3.94	687/1295	3.84	3.71	3.94	3.84	3.94	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	3	3	9	4.25	625/1398	4.14	3.87	4.07	3.85	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	2	2	3	9	4.19	871/1391	4.30	4.15	4.30	4.07	4.19	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	2	4	9	4.31	795/1388	4.26	4.19	4.28	4.01	4.31	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	0	3	2	2	4	3.64	670/ 958	4.19	3.63	3.93	3.71	3.64	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 224	****	5.00	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 219	****	5.00	4.44	4.44	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 85	****	4.75	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: ECON 121 0901
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I
 Instructor: HARDY, TIMOTHY
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 514
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	670/1639	3.69	4.12	4.27	4.08	4.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	774/1639	3.62	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	367/1397	3.58	4.17	4.28	4.18	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	654/1583	3.55	3.94	4.19	4.01	4.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	535/1532	4.14	3.95	4.01	3.88	4.31	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	5	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	329/1504	3.67	3.74	4.05	3.78	4.56	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	418/1612	4.08	4.25	4.16	4.10	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	1273/1635	4.67	4.58	4.65	4.56	4.36	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	623/1579	3.37	3.89	4.08	3.95	4.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	770/1518	3.85	4.42	4.43	4.38	4.54	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	1166/1520	4.37	4.65	4.70	4.61	4.54	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	560/1517	3.54	4.14	4.27	4.20	4.54	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	545/1550	3.43	4.25	4.22	4.17	4.58	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	8	1	0	3	0	1	3.00	1158/1295	2.88	3.71	3.94	3.84	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	770/1398	3.48	3.87	4.07	3.85	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	543/1391	4.37	4.15	4.30	4.07	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	944/1388	4.25	4.19	4.28	4.01	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 958	2.40	3.63	3.93	3.71	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 224	****	5.00	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 219	****	5.00	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 215	****	5.00	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 198	****	5.00	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.75	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: ECON 122 0101
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING II
 Instructor: MCBRIDE, CHUCK
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 515
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	1	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	12
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	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	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 122 0201
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING II
 Instructor: COAKLEY, DONALD
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 516
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	3	3	7	3	2	2.89	1619/1639	3.69	4.12	4.27	4.08	2.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	8	6	0	2	2.56	1625/1639	3.62	4.09	4.22	4.17	2.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	7	4	5	1	2.89	1380/1397	3.58	4.17	4.28	4.18	2.89	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	3	1	1	2	1	2.63	1574/1583	3.55	3.94	4.19	4.01	2.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	4	5	6	3.72	1081/1532	4.14	3.95	4.01	3.88	3.72	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	1	1	1	4	1	3.38	1278/1504	3.67	3.74	4.05	3.78	3.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	5	3	6	2	3.06	1515/1612	4.08	4.25	4.16	4.10	3.06	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	397/1635	4.67	4.58	4.65	4.56	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	2	7	5	1	0	2.33	1565/1579	3.37	3.89	4.08	3.95	2.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	4	4	4	6	0	2.67	1502/1518	3.85	4.42	4.43	4.38	2.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	3	2	9	4	3.78	1462/1520	4.37	4.65	4.70	4.61	3.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	8	5	3	0	2.50	1501/1517	3.54	4.14	4.27	4.20	2.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	8	3	4	2	1	2.17	1514/1550	3.43	4.25	4.22	4.17	2.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	6	1	6	1	2	2.50	1247/1295	2.88	3.71	3.94	3.84	2.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	4	0	2	2	1	2.56	1353/1398	3.48	3.87	4.07	3.85	2.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	2	0	0	3	4	3.78	1137/1391	4.37	4.15	4.30	4.07	3.78	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	2	4	2	3.78	1088/1388	4.25	4.19	4.28	4.01	3.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	7	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 958	2.40	3.63	3.93	3.71	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 7	General	1
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	D 4		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	15
			? 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	1	5	4	3	3.50	1497/1639	3.69	4.12	4.27	4.08	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	2	3	6	3.86	1294/1639	3.62	4.09	4.22	4.17	3.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	2	1	3	4	3.07	1356/1397	3.58	4.17	4.28	4.18	3.07	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	1	6	4	3.85	1198/1583	3.55	3.94	4.19	4.01	3.85	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	553/1532	4.14	3.95	4.01	3.88	4.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	5	4	3.79	1026/1504	3.67	3.74	4.05	3.78	3.79	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	0	1	11	4.50	490/1612	4.08	4.25	4.16	4.10	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	529/1635	4.67	4.58	4.65	4.56	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	2	7	1	3.64	1251/1579	3.37	3.89	4.08	3.95	3.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	2	2	9	4.29	1069/1518	3.85	4.42	4.43	4.38	4.29	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	1060/1520	4.37	4.65	4.70	4.61	4.64	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	2	5	6	4.07	1042/1517	3.54	4.14	4.27	4.20	4.07	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	4	3	4	3.50	1328/1550	3.43	4.25	4.22	4.17	3.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	2	2	3	6	3.79	819/1295	2.88	3.71	3.94	3.84	3.79	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	3	5	2	3.64	1052/1398	3.48	3.87	4.07	3.85	3.64	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	4	2	5	4.09	940/1391	4.37	4.15	4.30	4.07	4.09	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	693/1388	4.25	4.19	4.28	4.01	4.45	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	6	1	2	1	1	0	2.40	928/ 958	2.40	3.63	3.93	3.71	2.40	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 224	****	5.00	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.11	4.01	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.39	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.05	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	4.67	****	

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	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
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	12				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 122 0601
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING II
 Instructor: COAKLEY, DONALD
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 518
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	1	6	3	1	3.17	1583/1639	3.69	4.12	4.27	4.08	3.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	2	5	1	2	2.92	1603/1639	3.62	4.09	4.22	4.17	2.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	3	3	3	1	2.83	1385/1397	3.58	4.17	4.28	4.18	2.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	3	1	1	2	0	2.29	1576/1583	3.55	3.94	4.19	4.01	2.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	1	5	4	4.00	774/1532	4.14	3.95	4.01	3.88	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	2	0	2	4	0	3.00	1415/1504	3.67	3.74	4.05	3.78	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	1	2	2	5	3.82	1245/1612	4.08	4.25	4.16	4.10	3.82	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1635	4.67	4.58	4.65	4.56	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	2	1	4	2	0	2.67	1541/1579	3.37	3.89	4.08	3.95	2.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	2	3	1	4	3.25	1459/1518	3.85	4.42	4.43	4.38	3.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	1400/1520	4.37	4.65	4.70	4.61	4.08	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	7	2	2	1	2.75	1488/1517	3.54	4.14	4.27	4.20	2.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	1	2	4	1	2.75	1476/1550	3.43	4.25	4.22	4.17	2.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	3	2	1	2	0	2.25	1265/1295	2.88	3.71	3.94	3.84	2.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	3	2	0	0	2.40	1364/1398	3.48	3.87	4.07	3.85	2.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	332/1391	4.37	4.15	4.30	4.07	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	872/1388	4.25	4.19	4.28	4.01	4.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	4	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 958	2.40	3.63	3.93	3.71	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ECON 122 0801
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING II
 Instructor: MCBRIDE, CHUCK
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 519
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	712/1639	3.69	4.12	4.27	4.08	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	633/1639	3.62	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	9	7	4.44	617/1397	3.58	4.17	4.28	4.18	4.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	347/1583	3.55	3.94	4.19	4.01	4.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	441/1532	4.14	3.95	4.01	3.88	4.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	3	2	2	4	3.64	1135/1504	3.67	3.74	4.05	3.78	3.64	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	5	9	4.47	546/1612	4.08	4.25	4.16	4.10	4.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	13	2	4.13	1434/1635	4.67	4.58	4.65	4.56	4.13	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	5	3	4	3.92	1039/1579	3.37	3.89	4.08	3.95	3.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	1	10	4.50	807/1518	3.85	4.42	4.43	4.38	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	837/1520	4.37	4.65	4.70	4.61	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	3	4	5	3.86	1211/1517	3.54	4.14	4.27	4.20	3.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	2	2	8	4.14	991/1550	3.43	4.25	4.22	4.17	4.14	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	10	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/1295	2.88	3.71	3.94	3.84	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	217/1398	3.48	3.87	4.07	3.85	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	543/1391	4.37	4.15	4.30	4.07	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	328/1388	4.25	4.19	4.28	4.01	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 958	2.40	3.63	3.93	3.71	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	4	12	4.44	698/1639	4.46	4.12	4.27	4.28	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	5	10	4.28	840/1639	4.43	4.09	4.22	4.20	4.28	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	5	11	4.39	678/1397	4.40	4.17	4.28	4.26	4.39	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	1	7	7	4.19	862/1583	4.26	3.94	4.19	4.24	4.19	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	5	10	4.28	562/1532	4.22	3.95	4.01	4.05	4.28	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	5	8	4.00	824/1504	3.89	3.74	4.05	4.12	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	1	3	12	4.47	532/1612	4.55	4.25	4.16	4.12	4.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.58	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	1	9	4	4.07	853/1579	4.10	3.89	4.08	4.07	4.07	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	330/1518	4.77	4.42	4.43	4.39	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	750/1520	4.86	4.65	4.70	4.68	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	572/1517	4.49	4.14	4.27	4.23	4.53	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	414/1550	4.49	4.25	4.22	4.20	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	2	2	5	6	3.81	798/1295	3.78	3.71	3.94	3.95	3.81	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	3	3	5	3.77	958/1398	3.93	3.87	4.07	4.13	3.77	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	2	0	3	2	6	3.77	1141/1391	4.01	4.15	4.30	4.35	3.77	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	2	0	3	3	5	3.69	1116/1388	4.01	4.19	4.28	4.34	3.69	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	7	0	1	2	0	3	3.83	563/ 958	3.83	3.63	3.93	3.97	3.83	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	5.00	4.10	4.06	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.11	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	5.00	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	5.00	4.35	4.21	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	5.00	4.18	4.04	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.75	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	4.59	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.65	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.16	4.08	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.05	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	4.52	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.56	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: ECON 301 0101
 Title INTERMED ACCOUNTING I
 Instructor: CROTEAU, MARCIA
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 520
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	18	Non-major	17
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 301 0201
 Title INTERMED ACCOUNTING I
 Instructor: CROTEAU, MARCIA
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 521
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	12	4.47	656/1639	4.46	4.12	4.27	4.28	4.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	8	11	4.58	445/1639	4.43	4.09	4.22	4.20	4.58	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	10	4.42	632/1397	4.40	4.17	4.28	4.26	4.42	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	6	9	4.33	697/1583	4.26	3.94	4.19	4.24	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	7	8	4.16	663/1532	4.22	3.95	4.01	4.05	4.16	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	7	4	6	3.78	1034/1504	3.89	3.74	4.05	4.12	3.78	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	352/1612	4.55	4.25	4.16	4.12	4.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.58	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	3	6	5	4.14	783/1579	4.10	3.89	4.08	4.07	4.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	510/1518	4.77	4.42	4.43	4.39	4.72	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	597/1520	4.86	4.65	4.70	4.68	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	3	12	4.44	674/1517	4.49	4.14	4.27	4.23	4.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	5	9	4.28	882/1550	4.49	4.25	4.22	4.20	4.28	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	1	4	5	5	3.75	838/1295	3.78	3.71	3.94	3.95	3.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	742/1398	3.93	3.87	4.07	4.13	4.08	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	816/1391	4.01	4.15	4.30	4.35	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	0	5	6	4.33	783/1388	4.01	4.19	4.28	4.34	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	8	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 958	3.83	3.63	3.93	3.97	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 224	****	5.00	4.10	4.06	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.11	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 219	****	5.00	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 215	****	5.00	4.35	4.21	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 198	****	5.00	4.18	4.04	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 85	****	4.75	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	4.59	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.65	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.16	4.08	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.05	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	4.52	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.56	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: ECON 301 0201
 Title INTERMED ACCOUNTING I
 Instructor: CROTEAU, MARCIA
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 521
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	5	C	7	General	1	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	5	11	17	4.36	788/1639	4.31	4.12	4.27	4.28	4.36	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	15	15	4.36	735/1639	4.30	4.09	4.22	4.20	4.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	3	10	18	4.33	722/1397	4.45	4.17	4.28	4.26	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	18	2	1	2	5	5	3.67	1324/1583	3.95	3.94	4.19	4.24	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	18	2	1	4	2	5	3.50	1241/1532	3.81	3.95	4.01	4.05	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	20	1	1	2	4	4	3.75	1051/1504	4.01	3.74	4.05	4.12	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	5	9	17	4.31	743/1612	4.59	4.25	4.16	4.12	4.31	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	31	4.97	265/1635	4.74	4.58	4.65	4.66	4.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	1	6	11	9	3.93	1022/1579	4.01	3.89	4.08	4.07	3.93	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	5	25	4.72	529/1518	4.68	4.42	4.43	4.39	4.72	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	5	26	4.75	890/1520	4.65	4.65	4.70	4.68	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	8	11	11	4.03	1065/1517	4.22	4.14	4.27	4.23	4.03	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	10	20	4.53	603/1550	4.46	4.25	4.22	4.20	4.53	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	20	4	2	1	1	3	2.73	1222/1295	3.85	3.71	3.94	3.95	2.73	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	3	2	1	3	5	3.36	1177/1398	3.67	3.87	4.07	4.13	3.36	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	1	1	5	3	5	3.67	1177/1391	3.91	4.15	4.30	4.35	3.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	1	2	6	1	5	3.47	1201/1388	3.96	4.19	4.28	4.34	3.47	
4. Were special techniques successful	20	9	3	0	0	1	1	2.40	****/ 958	3.29	3.63	3.93	3.97	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	33	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 224	****	5.00	4.10	4.06	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	33	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.11	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	33	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 219	****	5.00	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	33	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 215	****	5.00	4.35	4.21	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	33	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 198	****	5.00	4.18	4.04	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 85	****	4.75	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	4.59	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.65	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.16	4.08	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.05	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	4.52	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.56	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: ECON 311 0101
 Title INTERM MICROECON ANALY
 Instructor: COATES, DENNIS
 Enrollment: 76
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 522
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	0	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	5	C	15	General	1	Under-grad	34	Non-major	27
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D	2						
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	30				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ECON 311 0201
 Title INTERM MICROECON ANALY
 Instructor: MA, BING
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 523
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	5	11	4.26	880/1639	4.31	4.12	4.27	4.28	4.26	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	8	8	4.21	895/1639	4.30	4.09	4.22	4.20	4.21	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	13	4.53	497/1397	4.45	4.17	4.28	4.26	4.53	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	2	1	2	4	3.89	1171/1583	3.95	3.94	4.19	4.24	3.89	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	580/1532	3.81	3.95	4.01	4.05	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	13	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	701/1504	4.01	3.74	4.05	4.12	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	118/1612	4.59	4.25	4.16	4.12	4.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	0	4	13	4.56	1101/1635	4.74	4.58	4.65	4.66	4.56	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	8	4	4.14	783/1579	4.01	3.89	4.08	4.07	4.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	397/1518	4.68	4.42	4.43	4.39	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	1006/1520	4.65	4.65	4.70	4.68	4.68	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	7	10	4.37	768/1517	4.22	4.14	4.27	4.23	4.37	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	4	13	4.47	677/1550	4.46	4.25	4.22	4.20	4.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	11	1	0	0	0	7	4.50	265/1295	3.85	3.71	3.94	3.95	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	3	0	2	3	6	3.64	1045/1398	3.67	3.87	4.07	4.13	3.64	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	2	0	2	3	8	4.00	983/1391	3.91	4.15	4.30	4.35	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	2	5	7	4.13	902/1388	3.96	4.19	4.28	4.34	4.13	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	8	1	0	4	0	2	3.29	798/ 958	3.29	3.63	3.93	3.97	3.29	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.05	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	4.52	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ECON 311 0301
 Title INTERM MICROECON ANALY
 Instructor: MA, BING
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 524
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	2	5	17	4.30	850/1639	4.31	4.12	4.27	4.28	4.30	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	1	4	3	18	4.33	774/1639	4.30	4.09	4.22	4.20	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	4	5	17	4.50	517/1397	4.45	4.17	4.28	4.26	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	13	0	0	4	2	8	4.29	761/1583	3.95	3.94	4.19	4.24	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	8	3	1	2	6	7	3.68	1120/1532	3.81	3.95	4.01	4.05	3.68	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	18	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	758/1504	4.01	3.74	4.05	4.12	4.11	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	0	1	6	19	4.56	439/1612	4.59	4.25	4.16	4.12	4.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	1	0	0	4	21	4.69	968/1635	4.74	4.58	4.65	4.66	4.69	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	2	1	0	4	9	6	3.95	972/1579	4.01	3.89	4.08	4.07	3.95	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	2	2	21	4.52	794/1518	4.68	4.42	4.43	4.39	4.52	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	3	3	20	4.52	1180/1520	4.65	4.65	4.70	4.68	4.52	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	2	2	5	16	4.27	875/1517	4.22	4.14	4.27	4.23	4.27	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	2	1	1	21	4.37	796/1550	4.46	4.25	4.22	4.20	4.37	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	17	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	398/1295	3.85	3.71	3.94	3.95	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	1	3	2	8	4.00	770/1398	3.67	3.87	4.07	4.13	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	1	5	1	8	4.07	954/1391	3.91	4.15	4.30	4.35	4.07	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	2	2	1	10	4.27	828/1388	3.96	4.19	4.28	4.34	4.27	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	9	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	****/ 958	3.29	3.63	3.93	3.97	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.11	4.08	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	B 10		Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 6	General	2
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 29
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	18
			? 0		

Course-Section: ECON 312 0101
 Title INTERM MACROECON ANALY
 Instructor: CINYABUGUMA, MA
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 525
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	1	1	2	5	3.90	1252/1639	4.01	4.12	4.27	4.28	3.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	1	2	4	3.60	1444/1639	4.03	4.09	4.22	4.20	3.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	1	3	4	3.80	1151/1397	4.05	4.17	4.28	4.26	3.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	761/1583	4.22	3.94	4.19	4.24	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	535/1532	4.30	3.95	4.01	4.05	4.30	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	0	3	1	3	3.63	1141/1504	3.73	3.74	4.05	4.12	3.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	0	2	0	6	3.80	1253/1612	4.02	4.25	4.16	4.12	3.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	662/1635	4.55	4.58	4.65	4.66	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	2	1	1	1	2.83	1521/1579	3.42	3.89	4.08	4.07	2.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	1	1	2	3	3.63	1400/1518	4.17	4.42	4.43	4.39	3.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	1345/1520	4.49	4.65	4.70	4.68	4.29	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	2	0	0	4	3.57	1321/1517	3.81	4.14	4.27	4.23	3.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	1	0	4	3.71	1254/1550	3.93	4.25	4.22	4.20	3.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	978/1295	3.40	3.71	3.94	3.95	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1398	4.01	3.87	4.07	4.13	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1391	4.13	4.15	4.30	4.35	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1388	4.14	4.19	4.28	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	155/ 958	4.67	3.63	3.93	3.97	4.67	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ECON 312 0301
 Title INTERM MACROECON ANALY
 Instructor: ROSE, MORGAN
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 526
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	712/1639	4.01	4.12	4.27	4.28	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	327/1639	4.03	4.09	4.22	4.20	4.69	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	400/1397	4.05	4.17	4.28	4.26	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	625/1583	4.22	3.94	4.19	4.24	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	409/1532	4.30	3.95	4.01	4.05	4.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	0	0	5	4	4.10	770/1504	3.73	3.74	4.05	4.12	4.10	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	6	8	4.31	743/1612	4.02	4.25	4.16	4.12	4.31	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	6	4.38	1257/1635	4.55	4.58	4.65	4.66	4.38	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	7	5	4.13	795/1579	3.42	3.89	4.08	4.07	4.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	149/1518	4.17	4.42	4.43	4.39	4.94	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	1087/1520	4.49	4.65	4.70	4.68	4.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	758/1517	3.81	4.14	4.27	4.23	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	10	4.38	796/1550	3.93	4.25	4.22	4.20	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	436/1295	3.40	3.71	3.94	3.95	4.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	369/1398	4.01	3.87	4.07	4.13	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	543/1391	4.13	4.15	4.30	4.35	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	387/1388	4.14	4.19	4.28	4.34	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 958	4.67	3.63	3.93	3.97	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 8		Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	3
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 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	11
			? 1		

Course-Section: ECON 312 0401
 Title INTERM MACROECON ANALY
 Instructor: ROSE, MORGAN
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 527
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	5	5	6	3.68	1403/1639	4.01	4.12	4.27	4.28	3.68	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	5	6	6	3.79	1338/1639	4.03	4.09	4.22	4.20	3.79	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	4	6	6	3.74	1185/1397	4.05	4.17	4.28	4.26	3.74	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	1	4	2	6	4.00	1010/1583	4.22	3.94	4.19	4.24	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	1	5	9	4.18	648/1532	4.30	3.95	4.01	4.05	4.18	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	1	4	4	4	3.47	1230/1504	3.73	3.74	4.05	4.12	3.47	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	6	2	9	3.95	1122/1612	4.02	4.25	4.16	4.12	3.95	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	11	7	4.39	1250/1635	4.55	4.58	4.65	4.66	4.39	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	1	6	5	1	3.29	1409/1579	3.42	3.89	4.08	4.07	3.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	3	7	6	3.94	1285/1518	4.17	4.42	4.43	4.39	3.94	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	1151/1520	4.49	4.65	4.70	4.68	4.56	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	3	2	9	2	3.47	1358/1517	3.81	4.14	4.27	4.23	3.47	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	3	3	3	7	3.71	1259/1550	3.93	4.25	4.22	4.20	3.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	11	2	1	0	2	0	2.40	1259/1295	3.40	3.71	3.94	3.95	2.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	3	2	1	3	0	2.44	1361/1398	4.01	3.87	4.07	4.13	2.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	2	4	2	0	2.78	1363/1391	4.13	4.15	4.30	4.35	2.78	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	3	0	4	1	1	2.67	1365/1388	4.14	4.19	4.28	4.34	2.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	6	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 958	4.67	3.63	3.93	3.97	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 6	C 5	General 0	Under-grad 19 Non-major 13
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 1	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 16	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ECON 320 0101
 Title QUANT MTHDS:MANAGEMENT
 Instructor: PALMATEER, JASO
 Enrollment: 75
 Questionnaires: 44

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 528
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	8	19	16	4.11	1055/1639	4.11	4.12	4.27	4.28	4.11	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	14	25	4.45	600/1639	4.45	4.09	4.22	4.20	4.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	14	27	4.52	497/1397	4.52	4.17	4.28	4.26	4.52	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	2	3	15	20	4.32	712/1583	4.32	3.94	4.19	4.24	4.32	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	1	2	6	14	11	3.94	856/1532	3.94	3.95	4.01	4.05	3.94	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	1	8	10	16	4.17	690/1504	4.17	3.74	4.05	4.12	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	12	30	4.61	376/1612	4.61	4.25	4.16	4.12	4.61	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	2	9	15	17	4.09	1458/1635	4.09	4.58	4.65	4.66	4.09	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	3	0	0	1	19	8	4.25	657/1579	4.25	3.89	4.08	4.07	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	12	27	4.57	720/1518	4.57	4.42	4.43	4.39	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	1	17	23	4.45	1230/1520	4.45	4.65	4.70	4.68	4.45	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	16	24	4.50	597/1517	4.50	4.14	4.27	4.23	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	6	12	24	4.43	742/1550	4.43	4.25	4.22	4.20	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	2	4	16	18	4.25	459/1295	4.25	3.71	3.94	3.95	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	2	0	1	9	12	4.21	669/1398	4.21	3.87	4.07	4.13	4.21	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	0	2	1	10	10	4.22	847/1391	4.22	4.15	4.30	4.35	4.22	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	1	1	1	9	12	4.25	834/1388	4.25	4.19	4.28	4.34	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	20	1	2	0	1	12	8	4.04	448/ 958	4.04	3.63	3.93	3.97	4.04	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	5.00	4.10	4.06	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.11	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	5.00	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	5.00	4.35	4.21	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	5.00	4.18	4.04	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	43	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.75	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	43	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	4.59	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.65	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.16	4.08	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.05	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	43	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	4.52	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.56	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	43	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: ECON 320 0101
 Title QUANT MTHDS:MANAGEMENT
 Instructor: PALMATEER, JASO
 Enrollment: 75
 Questionnaires: 44

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 528
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	19	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	18						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	7	C	2	General	3	Under-grad	44	Non-major	35
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	10	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	34				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 374 0101
 Title FUND FINANCIAL MGMT
 Instructor: ANORUO, EMMANUE
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 529
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	7	7	4.24	909/1639	3.99	4.12	4.27	4.28	4.24	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	10	4.35	748/1639	4.22	4.09	4.22	4.20	4.35	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	560/1397	4.40	4.17	4.28	4.26	4.47	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	2	2	3	3	3.70	1296/1583	3.45	3.94	4.19	4.24	3.70	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	774/1532	3.50	3.95	4.01	4.05	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	1	3	3	1	3.50	1212/1504	3.08	3.74	4.05	4.12	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	589/1612	4.39	4.25	4.16	4.12	4.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	884/1635	4.50	4.58	4.65	4.66	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	1	6	1	4.00	889/1579	3.70	3.89	4.08	4.07	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	770/1518	4.13	4.42	4.43	4.39	4.54	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	437/1520	4.28	4.65	4.70	4.68	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	833/1517	4.06	4.14	4.27	4.23	4.31	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	787/1550	3.97	4.25	4.22	4.20	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	185/1295	4.38	3.71	3.94	3.95	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	738/1398	3.88	3.87	4.07	4.13	4.09	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	586/1391	4.11	4.15	4.30	4.35	4.55	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	423/1388	4.36	4.19	4.28	4.34	4.73	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	9	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 958	****	3.63	3.93	3.97	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	5.00	4.10	4.06	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.11	4.08	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.05	4.31	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 10	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 17
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	14
			? 0		

Course-Section: ECON 374 0201
 Title FUND FINANCIAL MGMT
 Instructor: THOMAS, MARK S
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 530
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	1	3	5	3.75	1358/1639	3.99	4.12	4.27	4.28	3.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	1029/1639	4.22	4.09	4.22	4.20	4.08	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	722/1397	4.40	4.17	4.28	4.26	4.33		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	1497/1583	3.45	3.94	4.19	4.24	3.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	2	1	1	1	2	3.00	1421/1532	3.50	3.95	4.01	4.05	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	1471/1504	3.08	3.74	4.05	4.12	2.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	718/1612	4.39	4.25	4.16	4.12	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	3	4.25	1350/1635	4.50	4.58	4.65	4.66	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	1	1	3	3	2	3.40	1364/1579	3.70	3.89	4.08	4.07	3.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	2	3	4	3.73	1378/1518	4.13	4.42	4.43	4.39	3.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	2	0	1	5	3	3.64	1481/1520	4.28	4.65	4.70	4.68	3.64	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	3	0	4	4	3.82	1235/1517	4.06	4.14	4.27	4.23	3.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	1	3	4	3.55	1315/1550	3.97	4.25	4.22	4.20	3.55	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	1	4	5	4.09	581/1295	4.38	3.71	3.94	3.95	4.09	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1030/1398	3.88	3.87	4.07	4.13	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1177/1391	4.11	4.15	4.30	4.35	3.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	944/1388	4.36	4.19	4.28	4.34	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 958	****	3.63	3.93	3.97	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	10
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	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	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 382 0101
 Title ASIAN ECONOMIC HIST
 Instructor: MITCH, DAVID F
 Enrollment: 47
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 531
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	1	0	5	13	4.40	754/1639	4.40	4.12	4.27	4.28	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	4	12	4.30	813/1639	4.30	4.09	4.22	4.20	4.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	5	13	4.38	678/1397	4.38	4.17	4.28	4.26	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	4	6	9	3.95	1084/1583	3.95	3.94	4.19	4.24	3.95	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	2	4	12	4.05	744/1532	4.05	3.95	4.01	4.05	4.05	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	5	11	4.14	724/1504	4.14	3.74	4.05	4.12	4.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	3	5	11	4.30	756/1612	4.30	4.25	4.16	4.12	4.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	1	0	1	18	4.62	1056/1635	4.62	4.58	4.65	4.66	4.62	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	2	0	2	8	4	3.75	1170/1579	3.75	3.89	4.08	4.07	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	2	5	10	4.28	1077/1518	4.28	4.42	4.43	4.39	4.28	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	0	0	2	15	4.67	1033/1520	4.67	4.65	4.70	4.68	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	2	4	4	8	4.00	1083/1517	4.00	4.14	4.27	4.23	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	0	5	12	4.37	805/1550	4.37	4.25	4.22	4.20	4.37	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	4	0	2	3	9	3.72	858/1295	3.72	3.71	3.94	3.95	3.72	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	532/1398	4.38	3.87	4.07	4.13	4.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	1	1	1	5	3.89	1076/1391	3.89	4.15	4.30	4.35	3.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	2	1	1	5	4.00	944/1388	4.00	4.19	4.28	4.34	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	4	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/ 958	****	3.63	3.93	3.97	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 224	****	5.00	4.10	4.06	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.11	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 219	****	5.00	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 215	****	5.00	4.35	4.21	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 198	****	5.00	4.18	4.04	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.75	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	4.59	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.65	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.16	4.08	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.05	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	4.52	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.56	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: ECON 382 0101
 Title ASIAN ECONOMIC HIST
 Instructor: MITCH, DAVID F
 Enrollment: 47
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 531
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	21	Non-major	12
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 405 0101
 Title BENEFIT-COST EVALUATIO
 Instructor: MUTTER, RYAN L
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 532
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	14	4.57	550/1639	4.57	4.12	4.27	4.42	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	15	4.52	496/1639	4.52	4.09	4.22	4.29	4.52	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	18	4.70	342/1397	4.70	4.17	4.28	4.38	4.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	476/1583	4.50	3.94	4.19	4.31	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	6	8	6	3.74	1069/1532	3.74	3.95	4.01	4.07	3.74	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	544/1504	4.33	3.74	4.05	4.20	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	7	14	4.48	532/1612	4.48	4.25	4.16	4.18	4.48	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	331/1635	4.96	4.58	4.65	4.72	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	7	11	4.53	362/1579	4.53	3.89	4.08	4.21	4.53	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	20	4.86	271/1518	4.86	4.42	4.43	4.51	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	546/1520	4.91	4.65	4.70	4.75	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	7	13	4.50	597/1517	4.50	4.14	4.27	4.34	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	325/1550	4.77	4.25	4.22	4.24	4.77	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	18	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/1295	****	3.71	3.94	4.01	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	8	5	4.29	599/1398	4.29	3.87	4.07	4.23	4.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	3	1	10	4.50	616/1391	4.50	4.15	4.30	4.48	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	521/1388	4.64	4.19	4.28	4.50	4.64	

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
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		Graduate 7
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 2	C 1	General	7
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		Under-grad 16
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00 12	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	13
			? 2		

Course-Section: ECON 408 0101
 Title: MANAGERIAL ECONOMICS
 Instructor: DASGUPTA, NANDI
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 533
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	2	11	4.53	582/1639	4.53	4.12	4.27	4.42	4.53	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	199/1639	4.80	4.09	4.22	4.29	4.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	13	4.73	302/1397	4.73	4.17	4.28	4.38	4.73		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	355/1583	4.63	3.94	4.19	4.31	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	4	0	7	4.00	774/1532	4.00	3.95	4.01	4.07	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	2	0	0	0	3	3.40	1259/1504	3.40	3.74	4.05	4.20	3.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	317/1612	4.67	4.25	4.16	4.18	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	11	3	4.13	1434/1635	4.13	4.58	4.65	4.72	4.13	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	342/1579	4.55	3.89	4.08	4.21	4.55	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	271/1518	4.87	4.42	4.43	4.51	4.87	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	382/1520	4.93	4.65	4.70	4.75	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	239/1517	4.80	4.14	4.27	4.34	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	219/1550	4.87	4.25	4.22	4.24	4.87	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	545/1295	4.14	3.71	3.94	4.01	4.14	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	494/1398	4.43	3.87	4.07	4.23	4.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	564/1391	4.57	4.15	4.30	4.48	4.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	593/1388	4.57	4.19	4.28	4.50	4.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	380/ 958	4.20	3.63	3.93	4.24	4.20	

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	0	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	3
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 15
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	9
			? 0		

Course-Section: ECON 410B 0101
 Title RISK MNGMT FINANCIAL I
 Instructor: CARPENTER, ROBE
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 534
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	5	11	4.59	529/1639	4.59	4.12	4.27	4.42	4.59	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	5	8	4.31	800/1639	4.31	4.09	4.22	4.29	4.31	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	437/1397	4.59	4.17	4.28	4.38	4.59	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1583	****	3.94	4.19	4.31	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	8	5	4.06	737/1532	4.06	3.95	4.01	4.07	4.06	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	469/1612	4.53	4.25	4.16	4.18	4.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	6	8	2	3.65	1597/1635	3.65	4.58	4.65	4.72	3.65	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	262/1579	4.64	3.89	4.08	4.21	4.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	575/1518	4.69	4.42	4.43	4.51	4.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	382/1520	4.94	4.65	4.70	4.75	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	523/1517	4.56	4.14	4.27	4.34	4.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	208/1550	4.88	4.25	4.22	4.24	4.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	8	6	4.33	398/1295	4.33	3.71	3.94	4.01	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	560/1398	4.33	3.87	4.07	4.23	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	887/1391	4.17	4.15	4.30	4.48	4.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	496/1388	4.67	4.19	4.28	4.50	4.67	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	8	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	15
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	3	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	15				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 415 0101
 Title PRPRTY RIGHTS,ORGAN,MG
 Instructor: CARROLL, KATHLE
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 535
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	2	1	6	4.20	951/1639	4.20	4.12	4.27	4.42	4.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	6	2	4.00	1090/1639	4.00	4.09	4.22	4.29	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	4	2	3	3.60	1248/1397	3.60	4.17	4.28	4.38	3.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	1010/1583	4.00	3.94	4.19	4.31	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	4	2	3.50	1241/1532	3.50	3.95	4.01	4.07	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	5	3	3.90	945/1504	3.90	3.74	4.05	4.20	3.90	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	0	5	4	4.10	976/1612	4.10	4.25	4.16	4.18	4.10	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	968/1635	4.70	4.58	4.65	4.72	4.70	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	1	3	2	3.71	1200/1579	3.71	3.89	4.08	4.21	3.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	1053/1518	4.30	4.42	4.43	4.51	4.30	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	992/1520	4.70	4.65	4.70	4.75	4.70	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	4	2	3.78	1252/1517	3.78	4.14	4.27	4.34	3.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	2	4	3.80	1215/1550	3.80	4.25	4.22	4.24	3.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	1158/1295	3.00	3.71	3.94	4.01	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	770/1398	4.00	3.87	4.07	4.23	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	0	3	3	4.00	983/1391	4.00	4.15	4.30	4.48	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	1056/1388	3.86	4.19	4.28	4.50	3.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	6	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 958	****	3.63	3.93	4.24	****	

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 4		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	1
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 11
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
			? 1		

Course-Section: ECON 417 0101
 Title ECON STRATEGIC INTERAC
 Instructor: DASGUPTA, NANDI
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 536
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	0	0	5	11	4.47	656/1639	4.47	4.12	4.27	4.42	4.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	184/1639	4.82	4.09	4.22	4.29	4.82	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	271/1397	4.76	4.17	4.28	4.38	4.76	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	9	6	4.31	726/1583	4.31	3.94	4.19	4.31	4.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	0	1	4	9	4.33	506/1532	4.33	3.95	4.01	4.07	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	678/1504	4.18	3.74	4.05	4.20	4.18	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	4	9	4.24	837/1612	4.24	4.25	4.16	4.18	4.24	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	16	1	4.06	1475/1635	4.06	4.58	4.65	4.72	4.06	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	175/1579	4.75	3.89	4.08	4.21	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	128/1518	4.94	4.42	4.43	4.51	4.94	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	328/1520	4.94	4.65	4.70	4.75	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	222/1517	4.82	4.14	4.27	4.34	4.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	1	15	4.76	338/1550	4.76	4.25	4.22	4.24	4.76	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	9	2	2	0	1	2	2.86	1206/1295	2.86	3.71	3.94	4.01	2.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	369/1398	4.60	3.87	4.07	4.23	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	543/1391	4.60	4.15	4.30	4.48	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	328/1388	4.80	4.19	4.28	4.50	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	1	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 958	****	3.63	3.93	4.24	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	3
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	11
			? 1		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	3	4	5	7	3.84	1296/1639	3.84	4.12	4.27	4.42	3.84	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	8	4	7	3.80	1326/1639	3.80	4.09	4.22	4.29	3.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	6	3	9	3.90	1086/1397	3.90	4.17	4.28	4.38	3.90	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	3	4	3	4	3.57	1378/1583	3.57	3.94	4.19	4.31	3.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	1	4	2	5	3.69	1112/1532	3.69	3.95	4.01	4.07	3.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	3	3	6	1	4	3.00	1415/1504	3.00	3.74	4.05	4.20	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	3	5	9	3.90	1175/1612	3.90	4.25	4.16	4.18	3.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	3	15	2	3.95	1533/1635	3.95	4.58	4.65	4.72	3.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	0	5	4	6	3.88	1079/1579	3.88	3.89	4.08	4.21	3.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	4	12	4.47	849/1518	4.47	4.42	4.43	4.51	4.47	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	17	4.84	699/1520	4.84	4.65	4.70	4.75	4.84	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	1	4	4	8	3.79	1248/1517	3.79	4.14	4.27	4.34	3.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	3	3	11	4.16	982/1550	4.16	4.25	4.22	4.24	4.16	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	14	2	0	1	0	1	2.50	****/1295	****	3.71	3.94	4.01	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1398	****	3.87	4.07	4.23	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1391	****	4.15	4.30	4.48	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1388	****	4.19	4.28	4.50	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	1	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 958	****	3.63	3.93	4.24	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 224	****	5.00	4.10	4.49	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.11	4.26	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 219	****	5.00	4.44	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 215	****	5.00	4.35	4.28	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 198	****	5.00	4.18	4.21	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.75	4.58	4.83	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	4.49	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.59	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.16	4.02	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	4.84	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.05	4.58	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	4.73	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.56	4.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.85	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	4.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	4.85	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	4.50	****	

Course-Section: ECON 421 0101
 Title INTRO TO ECONOMETRICS
 Instructor: DASGUPTA, NANDI
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 537
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	1	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	19	Non-major	16
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	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	15				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 463 0101
 Title THEORY OF PUBLIC FINAN
 Instructor: MORRIS, RUSSELL
 Enrollment: 43
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 538
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	4	11	6	3.87	1281/1639	3.87	4.12	4.27	4.42	3.87	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	6	9	4.00	1090/1639	4.00	4.09	4.22	4.29	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	6	12	4.26	785/1397	4.26	4.17	4.28	4.38	4.26	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	1	3	5	2	3.73	1282/1583	3.73	3.94	4.19	4.31	3.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	8	8	5	3.70	1112/1532	3.70	3.95	4.01	4.07	3.70	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	2	8	3	3	3.44	1244/1504	3.44	3.74	4.05	4.20	3.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	5	14	4.43	589/1612	4.43	4.25	4.16	4.18	4.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	331/1635	4.96	4.58	4.65	4.72	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	5	14	1	3.71	1200/1579	3.71	3.89	4.08	4.21	3.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	3	9	9	4.18	1148/1518	4.18	4.42	4.43	4.51	4.18	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	5	14	4.50	1188/1520	4.50	4.65	4.70	4.75	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	6	8	6	3.82	1235/1517	3.82	4.14	4.27	4.34	3.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	4	4	12	4.14	1000/1550	4.14	4.25	4.22	4.24	4.14	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	3	0	3	6	3	3.40	1035/1295	3.40	3.71	3.94	4.01	3.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	5	4	3	3.62	1066/1398	3.62	3.87	4.07	4.23	3.62	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	380/1391	4.77	4.15	4.30	4.48	4.77	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	624/1388	4.54	4.19	4.28	4.50	4.54	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	9	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	****/ 958	****	3.63	3.93	4.24	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	5.00	4.10	4.49	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.11	4.26	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	5.00	4.44	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	5.00	4.35	4.28	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	5.00	4.18	4.21	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.75	4.58	4.83	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	4.49	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.59	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.16	4.02	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	4.84	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.05	4.58	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	4.73	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.56	4.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.85	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	4.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	4.85	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	4.50	****	

Course-Section: ECON 463 0101
 Title THEORY OF PUBLIC FINAN
 Instructor: MORRIS, RUSSELL
 Enrollment: 43
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 538
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type		Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	23	Non-major	16
84-150	17	3.00-3.49	7	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	20				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	1	1	4	10	19	4.29	860/1639	4.10	4.12	4.27	4.42	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	2	0	6	11	16	4.11	1003/1639	3.74	4.09	4.22	4.29	4.11	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	1	3	14	16	4.23	822/1397	3.98	4.17	4.28	4.38	4.23	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	10	2	1	4	6	12	4.00	1010/1583	4.00	3.94	4.19	4.31	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	2	4	15	12	4.03	759/1532	3.61	3.95	4.01	4.07	4.03	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	15	1	1	2	7	9	4.10	770/1504	4.05	3.74	4.05	4.20	4.10	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	1	0	1	3	12	17	4.36	681/1612	4.13	4.25	4.16	4.18	4.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	10	25	4.71	943/1635	4.86	4.58	4.65	4.72	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	2	0	1	7	11	3	3.73	1193/1579	3.74	3.89	4.08	4.21	3.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	2	1	4	6	22	4.29	1069/1518	4.23	4.42	4.43	4.51	4.29	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	3	6	26	4.66	1047/1520	4.60	4.65	4.70	4.75	4.66	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	3	8	23	4.49	622/1517	4.20	4.14	4.27	4.34	4.49	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	4	4	25	4.46	703/1550	4.09	4.25	4.22	4.24	4.46	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	16	0	1	2	2	13	4.50	265/1295	4.00	3.71	3.94	4.01	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	3	0	1	4	10	4.00	770/1398	3.63	3.87	4.07	4.23	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	2	0	1	1	14	4.39	710/1391	4.44	4.15	4.30	4.48	4.39	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	2	1	0	2	13	4.28	821/1388	3.89	4.19	4.28	4.50	4.28	
4. Were special techniques successful	20	6	0	1	1	2	8	4.42	260/ 958	4.42	3.63	3.93	4.24	4.42	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	5.00	4.10	4.49	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.11	4.26	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	5.00	4.44	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	5.00	4.35	4.28	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	5.00	4.18	4.21	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.75	4.58	4.83	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	4.49	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.59	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.16	4.02	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	4.84	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.05	4.58	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	37	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	4.73	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.56	4.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.85	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	4.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	4.85	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	37	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	4.50	****	

Course-Section: ECON 467 0101
 Title HEALTH ECONOMICS
 Instructor: GOLDFARB, MARSH
 Enrollment: 46
 Questionnaires: 38

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 539
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	10	C	7	General	2	Under-grad	38	Non-major	32
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	25				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 467 0201
 Title HEALTH ECONOMICS
 Instructor: GOLDFARB, MARSH
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 540
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	1	2	1	6	3.91	1252/1639	4.10	4.12	4.27	4.42	3.91	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	2	1	2	4	3.36	1530/1639	3.74	4.09	4.22	4.29	3.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	2	1	1	1	6	3.73	1190/1397	3.98	4.17	4.28	4.38	3.73	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	9	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1583	4.00	3.94	4.19	4.31	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	3	3	2	3.18	1384/1532	3.61	3.95	4.01	4.07	3.18	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	7	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	824/1504	4.05	3.74	4.05	4.20	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	1	1	1	2	5	3.90	1175/1612	4.13	4.25	4.16	4.18	3.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1635	4.86	4.58	4.65	4.72	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	1	1	1	1	4	3.75	1170/1579	3.74	3.89	4.08	4.21	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	1148/1518	4.23	4.42	4.43	4.51	4.18	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	1158/1520	4.60	4.65	4.70	4.75	4.55	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	2	0	2	6	3.91	1182/1517	4.20	4.14	4.27	4.34	3.91	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	1	1	6	3.73	1250/1550	4.09	4.25	4.22	4.24	3.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	978/1295	4.00	3.71	3.94	4.01	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1207/1398	3.63	3.87	4.07	4.23	3.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	616/1391	4.44	4.15	4.30	4.48	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	1185/1388	3.89	4.19	4.28	4.50	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 958	4.42	3.63	3.93	4.24	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 13 Non-major 11
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 10	
			? 2		

Course-Section: ECON 475 0101
 Title FINANCIAL INVSTMNT ANA
 Instructor: COATES, DENNIS
 Enrollment: 45
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 541
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	12	4.58	540/1639	4.58	4.12	4.27	4.42	4.58	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	13	4.47	567/1639	4.47	4.09	4.22	4.29	4.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	302/1397	4.74	4.17	4.28	4.38	4.74	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	4	2	8	4.13	910/1583	4.13	3.94	4.19	4.31	4.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	13	4.53	323/1532	4.53	3.95	4.01	4.07	4.53	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	2	3	12	4.39	506/1504	4.39	3.74	4.05	4.20	4.39	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	186/1612	4.79	4.25	4.16	4.18	4.79	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	18	4.89	676/1635	4.89	4.58	4.65	4.72	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	646/1579	4.27	3.89	4.08	4.21	4.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	397/1518	4.79	4.42	4.43	4.51	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	3	14	4.58	1136/1520	4.58	4.65	4.70	4.75	4.58	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	4	12	4.47	635/1517	4.47	4.14	4.27	4.34	4.47	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	12	4.47	677/1550	4.47	4.25	4.22	4.24	4.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	12	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	329/1295	4.43	3.71	3.94	4.01	4.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	2	2	1	4	3.78	950/1398	3.78	3.87	4.07	4.23	3.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	662/1391	4.44	4.15	4.30	4.48	4.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	609/1388	4.56	4.19	4.28	4.50	4.56	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	6	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 958	****	3.63	3.93	4.24	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 224	****	5.00	4.10	4.49	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ECON 477 0101
 Title DERIVATIVE SECURITIES
 Instructor: GETTER, DARYL
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 542
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	1	6	6	16	4.17	990/1639	4.17	4.12	4.27	4.42	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	2	9	8	9	3.67	1410/1639	3.67	4.09	4.22	4.29	3.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	5	8	4	10	3.43	1290/1397	3.43	4.17	4.28	4.38	3.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	2	2	7	7	8	3.65	1331/1583	3.65	3.94	4.19	4.31	3.65	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	13	3	2	5	2	5	3.24	1367/1532	3.24	3.95	4.01	4.07	3.24	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	10	2	2	4	6	6	3.60	1154/1504	3.60	3.74	4.05	4.20	3.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	1	8	17	4.23	837/1612	4.23	4.25	4.16	4.18	4.23	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	0	29	4.93	463/1635	4.93	4.58	4.65	4.72	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	1	0	6	11	4	3.77	1155/1579	3.77	3.89	4.08	4.21	3.77	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	0	2	10	13	4.31	1053/1518	4.31	4.42	4.43	4.51	4.31	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	1	1	9	15	4.46	1222/1520	4.46	4.65	4.70	4.75	4.46	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	1	7	7	10	3.92	1162/1517	3.92	4.14	4.27	4.34	3.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	5	4	15	4.19	944/1550	4.19	4.25	4.22	4.24	4.19	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	14	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	731/1295	3.91	3.71	3.94	4.01	3.91	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	2	2	5	4	3.85	912/1398	3.85	3.87	4.07	4.23	3.85	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	1	1	1	6	4	3.85	1100/1391	3.85	4.15	4.30	4.48	3.85	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	2	2	3	5	3.92	1025/1388	3.92	4.19	4.28	4.50	3.92	
4. Were special techniques successful	20	6	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	****/ 958	****	3.63	3.93	4.24	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	8	General	4	Under-grad	31	Non-major	31
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	9	D	1						
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	19				
				?	4						

Course-Section: ECON 481 0101
 Title INTERNATIONAL TRADE TH
 Instructor: TAKACS, WENDY E
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 543
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	2	3	18	4.58	529/1639	4.58	4.12	4.27	4.42	4.58	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	17	4.67	349/1639	4.67	4.09	4.22	4.29	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	4	17	4.58	437/1397	4.58	4.17	4.28	4.38	4.58	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	13	1	0	0	2	8	4.45	536/1583	4.45	3.94	4.19	4.31	4.45	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	0	4	5	11	4.05	744/1532	4.05	3.95	4.01	4.07	4.05	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	11	1	0	1	1	10	4.46	416/1504	4.46	3.74	4.05	4.20	4.46	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	5	18	4.71	270/1612	4.71	4.25	4.16	4.18	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	331/1635	4.96	4.58	4.65	4.72	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	3	4	11	4.44	450/1579	4.44	3.89	4.08	4.21	4.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.42	4.43	4.51	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.65	4.70	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	263/1517	4.78	4.14	4.27	4.34	4.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	2	20	4.74	376/1550	4.74	4.25	4.22	4.24	4.74	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	15	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	****/1295	****	3.71	3.94	4.01	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	3	3	2	6	3.60	1074/1398	3.60	3.87	4.07	4.23	3.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	489/1391	4.67	4.15	4.30	4.48	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	411/1388	4.73	4.19	4.28	4.50	4.73	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	11	2	0	0	1	1	2.75	****/ 958	****	3.63	3.93	4.24	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	5.00	4.10	4.49	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.11	4.26	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	5.00	4.44	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	5.00	4.35	4.28	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	5.00	4.18	4.21	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.75	4.58	4.83	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	4.49	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.59	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.16	4.02	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	4.84	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.05	4.58	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	4.73	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.56	4.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.85	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	4.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	4.85	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	4.50	****	

Course-Section: ECON 481 0101
 Title INTERNATIONAL TRADE TH
 Instructor: TAKACS, WENDY E
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 543
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	3	Under-grad	25	Non-major	22
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	5	18	4.54	582/1639	4.54	4.12	4.27	4.42	4.54	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	6	16	4.38	709/1639	4.38	4.09	4.22	4.29	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	3	5	15	4.15	888/1397	4.15	4.17	4.28	4.38	4.15	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	3	1	3	10	4.18	871/1583	4.18	3.94	4.19	4.31	4.18	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	2	1	10	8	3.87	942/1532	3.87	3.95	4.01	4.07	3.87	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	2	1	5	4	8	3.75	1051/1504	3.75	3.74	4.05	4.20	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	5	4	16	4.44	575/1612	4.44	4.25	4.16	4.18	4.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	13	12	4.48	1155/1635	4.48	4.58	4.65	4.72	4.48	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	3	9	9	4.29	623/1579	4.29	3.89	4.08	4.21	4.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	315/1518	4.83	4.42	4.43	4.51	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	21	4.88	622/1520	4.88	4.65	4.70	4.75	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	4	18	4.67	405/1517	4.67	4.14	4.27	4.34	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	3	20	4.75	351/1550	4.75	4.25	4.22	4.24	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	13	2	1	2	0	4	3.33	1067/1295	3.33	3.71	3.94	4.01	3.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	468/1398	4.45	3.87	4.07	4.23	4.45	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	429/1391	4.73	4.15	4.30	4.48	4.73	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	533/1388	4.64	4.19	4.28	4.50	4.64	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	7	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/ 958	****	3.63	3.93	4.24	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.11	4.26	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 219	****	5.00	4.44	4.42	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	4.84	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.05	4.58	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.85	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	6	General	1	Under-grad	26	Non-major	24
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	8	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				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 490 0101
 Title ANALYTIC METHODS IN EC
 Instructor: CINYABUGUMA, MA
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 545
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	7	2	6	3.93	1217/1639	3.73	4.12	4.27	4.42	3.93	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	3	8	4.13	981/1639	4.07	4.09	4.22	4.29	4.13	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	1	3	9	4.20	850/1397	4.07	4.17	4.28	4.38	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	3	0	6	4.33	697/1583	3.78	3.94	4.19	4.31	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	5	3	4	3.92	897/1532	3.71	3.95	4.01	4.07	3.92	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	6	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	747/1504	3.46	3.74	4.05	4.20	4.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	2	5	6	4.14	934/1612	4.19	4.25	4.16	4.18	4.14	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1635	4.56	4.58	4.65	4.72	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	1	3	3	2	3.67	1232/1579	3.76	3.89	4.08	4.21	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	0	5	9	4.40	947/1518	4.48	4.42	4.43	4.51	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	925/1520	4.40	4.65	4.70	4.75	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	5	3	6	3.87	1205/1517	4.15	4.14	4.27	4.34	3.87	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	4	2	8	4.07	1048/1550	4.06	4.25	4.22	4.24	4.07	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	9	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1295	4.50	3.71	3.94	4.01	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	0	1	2	3	3.50	1106/1398	3.50	3.87	4.07	4.23	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	816/1391	4.25	4.15	4.30	4.48	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	758/1388	4.38	4.19	4.28	4.50	4.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	5	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 958	****	3.63	3.93	4.24	****	

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	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 490 0201
 Title ANALYTIC METHODS IN EC
 Instructor: THOMAS, MARK S
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 546
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	0	5	7	3	3.53	1488/1639	3.73	4.12	4.27	4.42	3.53	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	9	5	4.00	1090/1639	4.07	4.09	4.22	4.29	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	7	6	3.94	1040/1397	4.07	4.17	4.28	4.38	3.94	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	3	3	4	2	3.23	1489/1583	3.78	3.94	4.19	4.31	3.23	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	0	2	4	1	3.50	1241/1532	3.71	3.95	4.01	4.07	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	6	4	3	1	2.80	1445/1504	3.46	3.74	4.05	4.20	2.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	4	9	4.24	837/1612	4.19	4.25	4.16	4.18	4.24	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	13	3	4.12	1447/1635	4.56	4.58	4.65	4.72	4.12	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	4	8	2	3.86	1094/1579	3.76	3.89	4.08	4.21	3.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	733/1518	4.48	4.42	4.43	4.51	4.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	3	5	7	4.06	1403/1520	4.40	4.65	4.70	4.75	4.06	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	6	9	4.44	687/1517	4.15	4.14	4.27	4.34	4.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	4	8	4.06	1048/1550	4.06	4.25	4.22	4.24	4.06	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	1	0	2	4	5	4.00	623/1295	4.50	3.71	3.94	4.01	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1398	3.50	3.87	4.07	4.23	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1391	4.25	4.15	4.30	4.48	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1388	4.38	4.19	4.28	4.50	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate 0 Major 5
28-55	1.00-1.99	B 6			
56-83	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	0	Under-grad 17 Non-major 12
84-150	3.00-3.49	D 0			
Grad.	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
		P 0			
		I 0	Other	13	
		? 0			

Course-Section: ECON 600 0101
 Title POLICY CONSQ:ECON ANAL
 Instructor: BRENNAN, TIMOTH
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 547
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	3	8	10	4.13	1029/1639	4.13	4.12	4.27	4.42	4.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	11	7	4.00	1090/1639	4.00	4.09	4.22	4.26	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	3	1	11	6	3.82	1144/1397	3.82	4.17	4.28	4.37	3.82	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	2	1	2	8	5	3.72	1282/1583	3.72	3.94	4.19	4.31	3.72	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	4	10	5	3.86	950/1532	3.86	3.95	4.01	4.10	3.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	8	0	0	1	8	4	4.23	629/1504	4.23	3.74	4.05	4.29	4.23	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	6	12	4.36	681/1612	4.36	4.25	4.16	4.27	4.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.58	4.65	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	4	10	4	3.89	1063/1579	3.89	3.89	4.08	4.17	3.89	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	5	17	4.65	616/1518	4.65	4.42	4.43	4.49	4.65	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	491/1520	4.91	4.65	4.70	4.79	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	4	7	11	4.17	964/1517	4.17	4.14	4.27	4.32	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	6	13	4.41	769/1550	4.41	4.25	4.22	4.23	4.41	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	17	0	0	2	4	0	3.67	894/1295	3.67	3.71	3.94	3.95	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	5	1	7	3	4	3.00	1271/1398	3.00	3.87	4.07	4.22	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	2	3	4	10	4.00	983/1391	4.00	4.15	4.30	4.47	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	3	2	5	10	4.10	918/1388	4.10	4.19	4.28	4.49	4.10	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	19	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 958	****	3.63	3.93	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.75	4.58	4.58	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	4.74	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	3.64	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.05	4.03	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.78	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	4	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	18	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	5	Non-major	23
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	18	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	20				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ECON 601 0101
 Title MICROECONOMIC ANALYSIS
 Instructor: FARROW, ROBERT
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 548
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	3	5	5	3.87	1281/1639	3.87	4.12	4.27	4.42	3.87	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	6	2	3.53	1469/1639	3.53	4.09	4.22	4.26	3.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	2	3	5	2	3.21	1336/1397	3.21	4.17	4.28	4.37	3.21	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	6	4	4.00	1010/1583	4.00	3.94	4.19	4.31	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	3	5	5	3.73	1069/1532	3.73	3.95	4.01	4.10	3.73	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	8	3	3.73	1067/1504	3.73	3.74	4.05	4.29	3.73	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	6	5	4.00	1044/1612	4.00	4.25	4.16	4.27	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	811/1635	4.80	4.58	4.65	4.81	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	2	0	0	6	2	2	3.60	1270/1579	3.60	3.89	4.08	4.17	3.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	10	5	4.33	1021/1518	4.33	4.42	4.43	4.49	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	802/1520	4.80	4.65	4.70	4.79	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	6	6	3	3.80	1241/1517	3.80	4.14	4.27	4.32	3.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	7	5	4.13	1000/1550	4.13	4.25	4.22	4.23	4.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	2	0	4	2	1	3.00	1158/1295	3.00	3.71	3.94	3.95	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	4	5	2	3.67	1030/1398	3.67	3.87	4.07	4.22	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	752/1391	4.33	4.15	4.30	4.47	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	783/1388	4.33	4.19	4.28	4.49	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	6	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	818/ 958	3.20	3.63	3.93	4.01	3.20	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 7		6
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0	Under-grad	9
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other	12
			? 0		

Course-Section: ECON 605 0101
 Title BENEFIT-COST EVALUATIO
 Instructor: MUTTER, R.
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 549
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	5	1	3.88	1274/1639	3.88	4.12	4.27	4.42	3.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	517/1639	4.50	4.09	4.22	4.26	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	282/1397	4.75	4.17	4.28	4.37	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	697/1583	4.33	3.94	4.19	4.31	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	1092/1532	3.71	3.95	4.01	4.10	3.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	2	3	0	3.17	1371/1504	3.17	3.74	4.05	4.29	3.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	955/1612	4.13	4.25	4.16	4.27	4.13	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.58	4.65	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	889/1579	4.00	3.89	4.08	4.17	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	454/1518	4.75	4.42	4.43	4.49	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	622/1520	4.88	4.65	4.70	4.79	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	597/1517	4.50	4.14	4.27	4.32	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	796/1550	4.38	4.25	4.22	4.23	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	978/1295	3.50	3.71	3.94	3.95	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	329/1398	4.67	3.87	4.07	4.22	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.15	4.30	4.47	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.19	4.28	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	725/ 958	3.50	3.63	3.93	4.01	3.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 1
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	2
84-150	3	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	6
			? 0		

Course-Section: ECON 611 0101
 Title ECONOMETRICS I
 Instructor: GINDLING, THOMA
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 550
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	4	11	4.32	832/1639	4.32	4.12	4.27	4.42	4.32	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	10	6	4.16	959/1639	4.16	4.09	4.22	4.26	4.16	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	10	8	4.37	696/1397	4.37	4.17	4.28	4.37	4.37	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	7	8	4.28	771/1583	4.28	3.94	4.19	4.31	4.28	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	7	7	3.95	856/1532	3.95	3.95	4.01	4.10	3.95	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	6	6	6	3.89	951/1504	3.89	3.74	4.05	4.29	3.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	4	12	4.47	532/1612	4.47	4.25	4.16	4.27	4.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	16	3	4.16	1422/1635	4.16	4.58	4.65	4.81	4.16	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	4	6	4	4.00	889/1579	4.00	3.89	4.08	4.17	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	6	11	4.47	849/1518	4.47	4.42	4.43	4.49	4.47	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	837/1520	4.79	4.65	4.70	4.79	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	4	6	7	4.06	1054/1517	4.06	4.14	4.27	4.32	4.06	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	5	9	4.28	882/1550	4.28	4.25	4.22	4.23	4.28	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	2	0	2	6	8	4.00	623/1295	4.00	3.71	3.94	3.95	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	660/1398	4.21	3.87	4.07	4.22	4.21	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	736/1391	4.36	4.15	4.30	4.47	4.36	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	647/1388	4.50	4.19	4.28	4.49	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	7	0	2	2	3	0	3.14	827/ 958	3.14	3.63	3.93	4.01	3.14	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 224	****	5.00	4.10	4.43	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.11	3.96	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ECON 615 0101
 Title PROP RGHTS ORGAN & MGM
 Instructor: CARROLL, K.
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 551
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	1	4.25	890/1639	4.25	4.12	4.27	4.42	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1090/1639	4.00	4.09	4.22	4.26	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	517/1397	4.50	4.17	4.28	4.37	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1010/1583	4.00	3.94	4.19	4.31	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	774/1532	4.00	3.95	4.01	4.10	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	824/1504	4.00	3.74	4.05	4.29	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	814/1612	4.25	4.25	4.16	4.27	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	884/1635	4.75	4.58	4.65	4.81	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	889/1579	4.00	3.89	4.08	4.17	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	454/1518	4.75	4.42	4.43	4.49	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.65	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	886/1517	4.25	4.14	4.27	4.32	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	351/1550	4.75	4.25	4.22	4.23	4.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1030/1398	3.67	3.87	4.07	4.22	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	489/1391	4.67	4.15	4.30	4.47	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	496/1388	4.67	4.19	4.28	4.49	4.67	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ECON 652 0101
 Title ECONOMICS OF HEALTH
 Instructor: GOLDFARB, MARSH
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 552
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	9	4.75	318/1639	4.75	4.12	4.27	4.42	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	7	4.42	667/1639	4.42	4.09	4.22	4.26	4.42	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	477/1397	4.55	4.17	4.28	4.37	4.55	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	697/1583	4.33	3.94	4.19	4.31	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	256/1532	4.64	3.95	4.01	4.10	4.64	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	150/1504	4.80	3.74	4.05	4.29	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	718/1612	4.33	4.25	4.16	4.27	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.58	4.65	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	484/1579	4.42	3.89	4.08	4.17	4.42	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	315/1518	4.83	4.42	4.43	4.49	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.65	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.14	4.27	4.32	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.25	4.22	4.23	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	10	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1295	****	3.71	3.94	3.95	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	770/1398	4.00	3.87	4.07	4.22	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	0	0	1	6	4.00	983/1391	4.00	4.15	4.30	4.47	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	1	0	2	5	4.00	944/1388	4.00	4.19	4.28	4.49	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	7	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 958	****	3.63	3.93	4.01	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.11	3.96	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.75	4.58	4.58	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	4.74	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.50	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	3	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	1

			Required for Majors	1	Graduate
			General	4	Under-grad
			Electives	1	Non-major
			Other	5	
#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant					

Course-Section: ECON 661 0101
 Title MICROECON:PUBLIC FINAN
 Instructor: MORRIS, RUSSELL
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 553
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	1	0	4.00	1138/1639	4.00	4.12	4.27	4.42	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1579/1639	3.00	4.09	4.22	4.26	3.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	973/1397	4.00	4.17	4.28	4.37	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1010/1583	4.00	3.94	4.19	4.31	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	889/1579	4.00	3.89	4.08	4.17	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1237/1518	4.00	4.42	4.43	4.49	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.65	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1083/1517	4.00	4.14	4.27	4.32	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.25	4.22	4.23	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	623/1295	4.00	3.71	3.94	3.95	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1398	5.00	3.87	4.07	4.22	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.15	4.30	4.47	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.19	4.28	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	456/ 958	4.00	3.63	3.93	4.01	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ECON 675 0101
 Title ECON OF FINACIAL ANALY
 Instructor: COATES, D.
 Enrollment: 44
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 554
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	1	3	4.75	318/1639	4.75	4.12	4.27	4.42	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	252/1639	4.75	4.09	4.22	4.26	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.17	4.28	4.37	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	476/1583	4.50	3.94	4.19	4.31	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	236/1532	4.67	3.95	4.01	4.10	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	182/1504	4.75	3.74	4.05	4.29	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1612	5.00	4.25	4.16	4.27	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.58	4.65	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	241/1579	4.67	3.89	4.08	4.17	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.42	4.43	4.49	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	890/1520	4.75	4.65	4.70	4.79	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	299/1517	4.75	4.14	4.27	4.32	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.25	4.22	4.23	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1295	5.00	3.71	3.94	3.95	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	426/1398	4.50	3.87	4.07	4.22	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	393/1391	4.75	4.15	4.30	4.47	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	387/1388	4.75	4.19	4.28	4.49	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 958	5.00	3.63	3.93	4.01	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 224	5.00	5.00	4.10	4.43	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 240	5.00	5.00	4.11	3.96	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 219	5.00	5.00	4.44	4.23	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 215	5.00	5.00	4.35	4.72	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 198	5.00	5.00	4.18	4.74	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	4.75	4.58	4.58	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 82	5.00	5.00	4.52	4.74	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 78	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.52	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.50	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 82	5.00	5.00	4.16	4.37	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	5.00	4.04	3.64	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 53	5.00	5.00	4.05	4.03	5.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 42	5.00	5.00	4.75	4.78	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 37	5.00	5.00	4.58	4.33	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 32	5.00	5.00	4.56	4.59	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 50	5.00	5.00	4.45	4.39	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 32	5.00	5.00	4.51	4.50	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 43	5.00	5.00	4.69	4.61	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 32	5.00	5.00	4.37	4.31	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 21	5.00	5.00	4.52	4.42	5.00	

Course-Section: ECON 675 0101
 Title ECON OF FINACIAL ANALY
 Instructor: COATES, D.
 Enrollment: 44
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 554
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	3	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	1	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 681 0101
 Title ECON OF INTL COMM POLI
 Instructor: TAKACS, W.
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 555
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	4	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.12	4.27	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	252/1639	4.75	4.09	4.22	4.26	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	282/1397	4.75	4.17	4.28	4.37	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1261/1583	3.75	3.94	4.19	4.31	3.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	335/1532	4.50	3.95	4.01	4.10	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1051/1504	3.75	3.74	4.05	4.29	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1612	5.00	4.25	4.16	4.27	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	884/1635	4.75	4.58	4.65	4.81	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	241/1579	4.67	3.89	4.08	4.17	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.42	4.43	4.49	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.65	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	299/1517	4.75	4.14	4.27	4.32	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	351/1550	4.75	4.25	4.22	4.23	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	185/1295	4.67	3.71	3.94	3.95	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	965/1398	3.75	3.87	4.07	4.22	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	983/1391	4.00	4.15	4.30	4.47	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.19	4.28	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 958	5.00	3.63	3.93	4.01	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 224	5.00	5.00	4.10	4.43	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 240	5.00	5.00	4.11	3.96	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 219	5.00	5.00	4.44	4.23	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 215	5.00	5.00	4.35	4.72	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 198	5.00	5.00	4.18	4.74	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	52/ 85	4.50	4.75	4.58	4.58	4.50	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 82	5.00	5.00	4.52	4.74	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 78	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.52	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.50	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 82	5.00	5.00	4.16	4.37	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	5.00	4.04	3.64	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 53	5.00	5.00	4.05	4.03	5.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 42	5.00	5.00	4.75	4.78	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 37	5.00	5.00	4.58	4.33	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 32	5.00	5.00	4.56	4.59	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 50	5.00	5.00	4.45	4.39	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 32	5.00	5.00	4.51	4.50	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 43	5.00	5.00	4.69	4.61	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 32	5.00	5.00	4.37	4.31	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 21	5.00	5.00	4.52	4.42	5.00	

Course-Section: ECON 681 0101
 Title ECON OF INTL COMM POLI
 Instructor: TAKACS, W.
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 555
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	3	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	1	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						