

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	5	17	4.56	554/1576	4.08	4.24	4.30	4.11	4.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	5	17	4.56	528/1576	4.16	4.28	4.27	4.18	4.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	9	15	4.56	521/1342	4.23	4.28	4.32	4.19	4.56	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	281/1520	4.02	4.12	4.25	4.09	4.72	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	3	5	11	4.42	483/1465	3.90	4.08	4.12	4.02	4.42	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	12	0	0	4	2	6	4.17	777/1434	3.89	4.05	4.14	3.94	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	6	2	17	4.44	624/1547	4.21	4.34	4.19	4.10	4.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	6	17	4.74	795/1574	4.16	4.54	4.64	4.59	4.74	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	395/1554	4.04	4.04	4.10	4.01	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	6	15	4.57	798/1488	4.51	4.59	4.47	4.41	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1493	4.71	4.72	4.73	4.65	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	5	2	15	4.35	881/1486	4.23	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.35	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	474/1489	4.32	4.35	4.32	4.22	4.68	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	11	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	463/1277	3.86	3.82	4.03	3.91	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	568/1279	3.80	3.94	4.17	3.96	4.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	2	3	2	6	3.92	990/1270	4.00	4.00	4.35	4.09	3.92	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	1	3	1	7	4.17	870/1269	4.11	4.16	4.35	4.09	4.17	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	8	1	0	0	3	0	3.25	****/ 878	3.40	3.53	4.05	3.91	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	0	7	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.11	4.11	4.20	4.15	4.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	5	1	0	3.17	****/ 375	3.31	3.22	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	8	1	0	3.11	244/ 326	3.10	3.09	4.03	3.64	3.11	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	8	0	0	3.00	313/ 382	3.14	3.20	4.08	3.86	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	General	2	Under-grad	26	Non-major	25
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	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	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		

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	3	3	7	9	3.87	1274/1576	4.08	4.24	4.30	4.11	3.87
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	6	10	4.04	1113/1576	4.16	4.28	4.27	4.18	4.04
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	5	12	4.22	865/1342	4.23	4.28	4.32	4.19	4.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	16	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	1199/1520	4.02	4.12	4.25	4.09	3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	15	1	0	2	0	4	3.86	1028/1465	3.90	4.08	4.12	4.02	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	19	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1434	3.89	4.05	4.14	3.94	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	1	6	13	4.36	727/1547	4.21	4.34	4.19	4.10	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	19	2	4.00	1459/1574	4.16	4.54	4.64	4.59	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	7	10	3	3.67	1227/1554	4.04	4.04	4.10	4.01	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	3	8	10	4.23	1134/1488	4.51	4.59	4.47	4.41	4.23
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	0	4	17	4.64	1089/1493	4.71	4.72	4.73	4.65	4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	4	3	13	4.18	1010/1486	4.23	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	5	1	15	4.36	856/1489	4.32	4.35	4.32	4.22	4.36
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	0	3	6	9	4.16	615/1277	3.86	3.82	4.03	3.91	4.16
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	2	0	1	4	2	3.44	1089/1279	3.80	3.94	4.17	3.96	3.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	1	1	3	3	3.67	1091/1270	4.00	4.00	4.35	4.09	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	1036/1269	4.11	4.16	4.35	4.09	3.75
4. Were special techniques successful	14	7	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 878	3.40	3.53	4.05	3.91	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	3	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	****/ 379	4.11	4.11	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	3	0	0	5	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	3.31	3.22	4.01	3.78	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	2	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 326	3.10	3.09	4.03	3.64	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	3	0	0	6	1	0	3.14	297/ 382	3.14	3.20	4.08	3.86	3.14

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 4
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 4	Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C 3	Major 21
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D 0	General 3
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Under-grad 23
				P 0	Non-major 21
					Electives 0
					#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

I	0	Other	10
?	0		

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 511
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	2	3	5	5	3.69	1374/1576	4.08	4.24	4.30	4.11	3.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	8	1	5	3.50	1392/1576	4.16	4.28	4.27	4.18	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	5	6	3.88	1080/1342	4.23	4.28	4.32	4.19	3.88	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	0	1	1	6	4.22	891/1520	4.02	4.12	4.25	4.09	4.22	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	424/1465	3.90	4.08	4.12	4.02	4.47	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	1	1	1	1	4	3.75	1093/1434	3.89	4.05	4.14	3.94	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	1	2	4	6	3.56	1320/1547	4.21	4.34	4.19	4.10	3.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	14	2	4.13	1411/1574	4.16	4.54	4.64	4.59	4.13	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	4	4	1	3.67	1227/1554	4.04	4.04	4.10	4.01	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	920/1488	4.51	4.59	4.47	4.41	4.46	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	1142/1493	4.71	4.72	4.73	4.65	4.58	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	1	5	1	5	3.62	1303/1486	4.23	4.33	4.32	4.26	3.62	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	2	3	2	3	3.17	1398/1489	4.32	4.35	4.32	4.22	3.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	1	1	4	1	4	3.55	1001/1277	3.86	3.82	4.03	3.91	3.55	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	1	4	3	3.89	906/1279	3.80	3.94	4.17	3.96	3.89	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	784/1270	4.00	4.00	4.35	4.09	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	0	4	4	4.11	900/1269	4.11	4.16	4.35	4.09	4.11	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	5	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 878	3.40	3.53	4.05	3.91	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 379	4.11	4.11	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	209/ 375	3.31	3.22	4.01	3.78	3.50	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	7	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.10	3.09	4.03	3.64	3.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 382	3.14	3.20	4.08	3.86	****	

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 511
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	6	14	4.57	541/1576	4.08	4.24	4.30	4.11	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	476/1576	4.16	4.28	4.27	4.18	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	6	14	4.57	510/1342	4.23	4.28	4.32	4.19	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1520	4.02	4.12	4.25	4.09	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	1	5	12	4.25	647/1465	3.90	4.08	4.12	4.02	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	1033/1434	3.89	4.05	4.14	3.94	3.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	3	15	4.60	411/1547	4.21	4.34	4.19	4.10	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	17	3	4.10	1427/1574	4.16	4.54	4.64	4.59	4.10	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	8	6	4.43	504/1554	4.04	4.04	4.10	4.01	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	248/1488	4.51	4.59	4.47	4.41	4.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	557/1493	4.71	4.72	4.73	4.65	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	5	13	4.48	720/1486	4.23	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.48	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	5	15	4.62	565/1489	4.32	4.35	4.32	4.22	4.62	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	13	0	1	1	0	5	4.29	506/1277	3.86	3.82	4.03	3.91	4.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	745/1279	3.80	3.94	4.17	3.96	4.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	582/1270	4.00	4.00	4.35	4.09	4.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	803/1269	4.11	4.16	4.35	4.09	4.29	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	3	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 878	3.40	3.53	4.05	3.91	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	7	1	4.13	200/ 379	4.11	4.11	4.20	4.15	4.13	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	7	1	0	3.13	276/ 375	3.31	3.22	4.01	3.78	3.13	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	9	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.10	3.09	4.03	3.64	3.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	5	1	0	3.17	291/ 382	3.14	3.20	4.08	3.86	3.17	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	3	Under-grad	21	Non-major	20
84-150	1	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	10				
				?	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	4	2	10	4.38	818/1576	4.08	4.24	4.30	4.11	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	528/1576	4.16	4.28	4.27	4.18	4.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	298/1342	4.23	4.28	4.32	4.19	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	1041/1520	4.02	4.12	4.25	4.09	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	708/1465	3.90	4.08	4.12	4.02	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	13	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1434	3.89	4.05	4.14	3.94	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	4	4	7	4.20	900/1547	4.21	4.34	4.19	4.10	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	4	11	1	3.81	1535/1574	4.16	4.54	4.64	4.59	3.81	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	298/1554	4.04	4.04	4.10	4.01	4.63	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	401/1488	4.51	4.59	4.47	4.41	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	810/1493	4.71	4.72	4.73	4.65	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	0	5	9	4.47	735/1486	4.23	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.47	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	240/1489	4.32	4.35	4.32	4.22	4.87	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	12	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1277	3.86	3.82	4.03	3.91	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	3	0	1	3.00	1186/1279	3.80	3.94	4.17	3.96	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	1	0	2	1	3.20	1187/1270	4.00	4.00	4.35	4.09	3.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1086/1269	4.11	4.16	4.35	4.09	3.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	4	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 878	3.40	3.53	4.05	3.91	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.29	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 379	4.11	4.11	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	1	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 375	3.31	3.22	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	1	0	0	6	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.10	3.09	4.03	3.64	3.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	1	0	0	6	1	0	3.14	297/ 382	3.14	3.20	4.08	3.86	3.14	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	1	3	5	13	4.08	1100/1576	4.08	4.24	4.30	4.11	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	5	13	4.21	988/1576	4.16	4.28	4.27	4.18	4.21	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	5	5	11	3.96	1020/1342	4.23	4.28	4.32	4.19	3.96	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	1	1	3	5	5	3.80	1232/1520	4.02	4.12	4.25	4.09	3.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	6	8	7	3.71	1138/1465	3.90	4.08	4.12	4.02	3.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	3	2	2	5	4	3.31	1297/1434	3.89	4.05	4.14	3.94	3.31	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	7	15	4.50	527/1547	4.21	4.34	4.19	4.10	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	3	20	1	3.92	1515/1574	4.16	4.54	4.64	4.59	3.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	0	13	6	4.20	772/1554	4.04	4.04	4.10	4.01	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	2	2	17	4.48	907/1488	4.51	4.59	4.47	4.41	4.48	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	2	19	4.74	947/1493	4.71	4.72	4.73	4.65	4.74	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	4	15	4.50	678/1486	4.23	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	1	2	17	4.55	649/1489	4.32	4.35	4.32	4.22	4.55	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	14	2	0	1	3	3	3.56	997/1277	3.86	3.82	4.03	3.91	3.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	2	2	8	4.31	625/1279	3.80	3.94	4.17	3.96	4.31	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	401/1270	4.00	4.00	4.35	4.09	4.77	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	432/1269	4.11	4.16	4.35	4.09	4.77	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	8	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/ 878	3.40	3.53	4.05	3.91	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	0	7	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.11	4.11	4.20	4.15	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	1	0	0	5	0	1	3.33	232/ 375	3.31	3.22	4.01	3.78	3.33	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	****/ 326	3.10	3.09	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	1	0	0	7	0	1	3.25	269/ 382	3.14	3.20	4.08	3.86	3.25	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	5	Under-grad	24	Non-major	24
84-150	0	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	6
?	0		

Course-Section: ECON 101 0701
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS
 Instructor: KAIKAI, ALPHA
 Enrollment: 43
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 515
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	12	4.04	1130/1576	4.08	4.24	4.30	4.11	4.04	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	6	4	15	4.27	929/1576	4.16	4.28	4.27	4.18	4.27	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	3	3	10	10	4.04	961/1342	4.23	4.28	4.32	4.19	4.04	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	15	1	2	3	2	3	3.36	1410/1520	4.02	4.12	4.25	4.09	3.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	1	10	6	6	3.52	1235/1465	3.90	4.08	4.12	4.02	3.52	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	19	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	****/1434	3.89	4.05	4.14	3.94	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	0	0	4	6	14	4.42	673/1547	4.21	4.34	4.19	4.10	4.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	6	18	1	3.80	1537/1574	4.16	4.54	4.64	4.59	3.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	2	0	1	2	9	6	4.11	860/1554	4.04	4.04	4.10	4.01	4.11	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	4	6	14	4.42	982/1488	4.51	4.59	4.47	4.41	4.42	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	4	18	4.67	1053/1493	4.71	4.72	4.73	4.65	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	2	4	6	12	4.17	1025/1486	4.23	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	2	6	14	4.25	955/1489	4.32	4.35	4.32	4.22	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	16	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	****/1277	3.86	3.82	4.03	3.91	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	641/1279	3.80	3.94	4.17	3.96	4.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	716/1270	4.00	4.00	4.35	4.09	4.43	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	803/1269	4.11	4.16	4.35	4.09	4.29	
4. Were special techniques successful	20	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 878	3.40	3.53	4.05	3.91	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	0	10	1	4.09	210/ 379	4.11	4.11	4.20	4.15	4.09	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	6	2	0	3.25	245/ 375	3.31	3.22	4.01	3.78	3.25	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	5	0	1	3.33	****/ 326	3.10	3.09	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	13	1	0	3.07	309/ 382	3.14	3.20	4.08	3.86	3.07	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A 13	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 8			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C 2	General 7	Under-grad 27	Non-major 27
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	7	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 15		
				? 2			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	5	11	4.37	829/1576	4.08	4.24	4.30	4.11	4.37	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	11	4.53	581/1576	4.16	4.28	4.27	4.18	4.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	10	4.42	683/1342	4.23	4.28	4.32	4.19	4.42	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	2	0	2	4	8	4.00	1041/1520	4.02	4.12	4.25	4.09	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	4	4	8	3.84	1035/1465	3.90	4.08	4.12	4.02	3.84	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	305/1434	3.89	4.05	4.14	3.94	4.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	4	12	4.32	774/1547	4.21	4.34	4.19	4.10	4.32	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1574	4.16	4.54	4.64	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	2	8	5	4.00	924/1554	4.04	4.04	4.10	4.01	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	263/1488	4.51	4.59	4.47	4.41	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1493	4.71	4.72	4.73	4.65	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	1	6	11	4.37	861/1486	4.23	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.37	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	13	4.53	672/1489	4.32	4.35	4.32	4.22	4.53	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	10	2	1	0	1	4	3.50	1020/1277	3.86	3.82	4.03	3.91	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	2	2	3	7	4.07	780/1279	3.80	3.94	4.17	3.96	4.07	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	2	3	2	6	3.71	1070/1270	4.00	4.00	4.35	4.09	3.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	644/1269	4.11	4.16	4.35	4.09	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	6	1	1	1	1	4	3.75	631/ 878	3.40	3.53	4.05	3.91	3.75	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.29	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 379	4.11	4.11	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.52	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 375	3.31	3.22	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 326	3.10	3.09	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 382	3.14	3.20	4.08	3.86	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	7	
?	0			

Course-Section: ECON 101 0901
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS
 Instructor: COOMBER, WILLIA
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 517
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	4	1	1	7	4	3.35	1491/1576	4.08	4.24	4.30	4.11	3.35	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	3	7	3	3.41	1433/1576	4.16	4.28	4.27	4.18	3.41	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	1	5	8	3.94	1029/1342	4.23	4.28	4.32	4.19	3.94	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	2	1	4	3	3	3.31	1427/1520	4.02	4.12	4.25	4.09	3.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	5	7	4.12	788/1465	3.90	4.08	4.12	4.02	4.12	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	5	3	3	3.82	1057/1434	3.89	4.05	4.14	3.94	3.82	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	7	5	3.88	1159/1547	4.21	4.34	4.19	4.10	3.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	1	13	2	3.94	1496/1574	4.16	4.54	4.64	4.59	3.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	2	0	0	6	2	4	3.83	1110/1554	4.04	4.04	4.10	4.01	3.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	4	9	4.29	1079/1488	4.51	4.59	4.47	4.41	4.29	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	4	2	11	4.41	1278/1493	4.71	4.72	4.73	4.65	4.41	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	7	3	7	4.00	1101/1486	4.23	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	6	2	7	3.76	1251/1489	4.32	4.35	4.32	4.22	3.76	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	2	3	2	3	5	3.40	1066/1277	3.86	3.82	4.03	3.91	3.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	2	4	1	4	3.23	1148/1279	3.80	3.94	4.17	3.96	3.23	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	5	1	6	3.85	1022/1270	4.00	4.00	4.35	4.09	3.85	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	793/1269	4.11	4.16	4.35	4.09	4.31	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	6	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	425/ 878	3.40	3.53	4.05	3.91	4.14	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	1	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	175/ 379	4.11	4.11	4.20	4.15	4.20	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	1	0	0	5	0	1	3.33	232/ 375	3.31	3.22	4.01	3.78	3.33	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	1	0	0	7	0	1	3.25	213/ 326	3.10	3.09	4.03	3.64	3.25	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	1	0	0	7	0	1	3.25	269/ 382	3.14	3.20	4.08	3.86	3.25	

Course-Section: ECON 101 0901
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS
 Instructor: COOMBER, WILLIA
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 517
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	3	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 101 1001
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS
 Instructor: THOMAS, MARK S
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 518
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	8	17	4.50	637/1576	4.08	4.24	4.30	4.11	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	6	18	4.46	668/1576	4.16	4.28	4.27	4.18	4.46	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	1	5	20	4.54	552/1342	4.23	4.28	4.32	4.19	4.54	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	16	0	0	3	0	9	4.50	511/1520	4.02	4.12	4.25	4.09	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	19	0	1	4	0	4	3.78	1088/1465	3.90	4.08	4.12	4.02	3.78	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	20	0	1	1	0	6	4.38	554/1434	3.89	4.05	4.14	3.94	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	3	7	17	4.39	699/1547	4.21	4.34	4.19	4.10	4.39	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	24	4	4.14	1398/1574	4.16	4.54	4.64	4.59	4.14	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	3	13	6	4.04	902/1554	4.04	4.04	4.10	4.01	4.04	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	23	4.82	370/1488	4.51	4.59	4.47	4.41	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	1	26	4.86	683/1493	4.71	4.72	4.73	4.65	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	4	22	4.71	393/1486	4.23	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	3	22	4.68	487/1489	4.32	4.35	4.32	4.22	4.68	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	1	0	4	3	15	4.35	455/1277	3.86	3.82	4.03	3.91	4.35	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	2	5	7	7	3.90	899/1279	3.80	3.94	4.17	3.96	3.90	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	9	4	7	3.76	1049/1270	4.00	4.00	4.35	4.09	3.76	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	2	1	3	5	10	3.95	960/1269	4.11	4.16	4.35	4.09	3.95	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	12	1	2	4	1	1	2.89	828/ 878	3.40	3.53	4.05	3.91	2.89	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.29	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	1	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	****/ 379	4.11	4.11	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	1	0	0	6	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	3.31	3.22	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	1	0	0	5	1	0	3.17	****/ 326	3.10	3.09	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	14	2	0	3.13	302/ 382	3.14	3.20	4.08	3.86	3.13	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	9	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 5	C 4	General 3	Under-grad 29 Non-major 29
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 11	
			? 0		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	6	1	11	18	8	3.48	1456/1576	4.08	4.24	4.30	4.11	3.48	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	3	12	16	9	3.58	1372/1576	4.16	4.28	4.27	4.18	3.58	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	5	5	14	15	3.66	1169/1342	4.23	4.28	4.32	4.19	3.66		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	22	4	1	5	4	8	3.50	1362/1520	4.02	4.12	4.25	4.09	3.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	24	6	3	3	1	5	2.78	1429/1465	3.90	4.08	4.12	4.02	2.78	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	26	3	2	3	4	4	3.25	1313/1434	3.89	4.05	4.14	3.94	3.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	4	4	8	10	14	3.65	1281/1547	4.21	4.34	4.19	4.10	3.65	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	1	32	9	4.14	1405/1574	4.16	4.54	4.64	4.59	4.14	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	1	4	15	13	3	3.36	1360/1554	4.04	4.04	4.10	4.01	3.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	2	1	10	17	10	3.80	1343/1488	4.51	4.59	4.47	4.41	3.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	2	2	4	11	21	4.18	1382/1493	4.71	4.72	4.73	4.65	4.18	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	3	3	8	12	12	3.71	1269/1486	4.23	4.33	4.32	4.26	3.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	1	3	1	5	12	17	4.03	1107/1489	4.32	4.35	4.32	4.22	4.03	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	10	2	4	5	9	9	3.66	948/1277	3.86	3.82	4.03	3.91	3.66	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	4	3	5	5	4	3.10	1174/1279	3.80	3.94	4.17	3.96	3.10	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	3	0	5	3	10	3.81	1033/1270	4.00	4.00	4.35	4.09	3.81	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	3	2	4	5	7	3.52	1110/1269	4.11	4.16	4.35	4.09	3.52	
4. Were special techniques successful	24	9	2	2	4	2	1	2.82	835/ 878	3.40	3.53	4.05	3.91	2.82	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	30	0	0	0	0	11	3	4.21	168/ 379	4.11	4.11	4.20	4.15	4.21	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	0	0	0	10	2	1	3.31	237/ 375	3.31	3.22	4.01	3.78	3.31	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	18	3	1	3.23	219/ 326	3.10	3.09	4.03	3.64	3.23	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	42	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	42	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	42	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	42	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	24	2	0	3.08	309/ 382	3.14	3.20	4.08	3.86	3.08	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	8	General	2	Under-grad	44	Non-major	44
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	1	Electives	1	#### - 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	1	3	12	30	4.54	582/1576	4.22	4.24	4.30	4.11	4.54	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	11	32	4.61	476/1576	4.29	4.28	4.27	4.18	4.61	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	9	35	4.72	345/1342	4.31	4.28	4.32	4.19	4.72	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	2	2	3	7	22	4.25	859/1520	4.24	4.12	4.25	4.09	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	10	11	21	3.98	891/1465	4.12	4.08	4.12	4.02	3.98	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	1	6	12	20	4.31	625/1434	4.14	4.05	4.14	3.94	4.31	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	2	10	34	4.70	303/1547	4.20	4.34	4.19	4.10	4.70	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	37	4.79	702/1574	4.56	4.54	4.64	4.59	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	7	17	17	4.24	722/1554	3.97	4.04	4.10	4.01	4.24	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	5	40	4.85	339/1488	4.55	4.59	4.47	4.41	4.85	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	6	41	4.87	632/1493	4.82	4.72	4.73	4.65	4.87	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	12	34	4.70	407/1486	4.38	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.70	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	8	38	4.79	336/1489	4.30	4.35	4.32	4.22	4.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	30	2	1	5	1	6	3.53	1006/1277	3.39	3.82	4.03	3.91	3.53	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	2	1	3	4	13	4.09	777/1279	3.67	3.94	4.17	3.96	4.09	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	2	1	5	3	12	3.96	967/1270	3.78	4.00	4.35	4.09	3.96	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	1	0	5	3	14	4.26	814/1269	3.93	4.16	4.35	4.09	4.26	
4. Were special techniques successful	24	17	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	****/ 878	3.44	3.53	4.05	3.91	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.29	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	38	1	0	0	0	8	0	4.00	****/ 379	4.17	4.11	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	37	1	0	0	9	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	3.14	3.22	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	36	2	0	0	9	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	3.00	3.09	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	31	1	0	0	13	2	0	3.13	299/ 382	3.18	3.20	4.08	3.86	3.13	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	22						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	6	C	5	General	3	Under-grad	47	Non-major	42
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0						

Course-Section: ECON 102 0501
 Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS
 Instructor: PAPADANTONAKIS,
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 521
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	5	14	4.41	787/1576	4.22	4.24	4.30	4.11	4.41	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	4	13	4.23	968/1576	4.29	4.28	4.27	4.18	4.23	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	14	4.55	541/1342	4.31	4.28	4.32	4.19	4.55	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	4	4	13	4.43	648/1520	4.24	4.12	4.25	4.09	4.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	4	15	4.50	366/1465	4.12	4.08	4.12	4.02	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	6	11	4.23	716/1434	4.14	4.05	4.14	3.94	4.23	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	7	5	8	3.86	1174/1547	4.20	4.34	4.19	4.10	3.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	18	4	4.18	1373/1574	4.56	4.54	4.64	4.59	4.18	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	2	5	5	7	3.89	1067/1554	3.97	4.04	4.10	4.01	3.89	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	3	4	13	4.23	1134/1488	4.55	4.59	4.47	4.41	4.23	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	0	20	4.77	868/1493	4.82	4.72	4.73	4.65	4.77	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	3	10	7	4.00	1101/1486	4.38	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	5	4	9	3.73	1266/1489	4.30	4.35	4.32	4.22	3.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	13	4	0	3	0	2	2.56	1234/1277	3.39	3.82	4.03	3.91	2.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	5	4	3	3.62	1018/1279	3.67	3.94	4.17	3.96	3.62	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	2	1	3	7	4.15	876/1270	3.78	4.00	4.35	4.09	4.15	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	2	2	8	4.23	830/1269	3.93	4.16	4.35	4.09	4.23	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	10	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 878	3.44	3.53	4.05	3.91	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	1	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	77/ 379	4.17	4.11	4.20	4.15	4.50	
Seminar															
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.43	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	1	0	0	4	1	0	3.20	****/ 375	3.14	3.22	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	1	0	0	7	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.00	3.09	4.03	3.64	3.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	1	0	0	6	1	0	3.14	297/ 382	3.18	3.20	4.08	3.86	3.14	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ECON 102 0601
 Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS
 Instructor: TAKACS, WENDY E
 Enrollment: 81
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 522
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	5	0	9	5	11	3.57	1424/1576	4.22	4.24	4.30	4.11	3.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	11	7	10	3.83	1275/1576	4.29	4.28	4.27	4.18	3.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	5	4	8	12	3.83	1097/1342	4.31	4.28	4.32	4.19	3.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	13	0	0	4	5	8	4.24	880/1520	4.24	4.12	4.25	4.09	4.24	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	2	3	5	16	4.00	850/1465	4.12	4.08	4.12	4.02	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	19	0	3	4	0	4	3.45	1233/1434	4.14	4.05	4.14	3.94	3.45	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	4	6	18	4.33	755/1547	4.20	4.34	4.19	4.10	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	3	25	4.77	739/1574	4.56	4.54	4.64	4.59	4.77	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	0	1	6	8	4	3.79	1145/1554	3.97	4.04	4.10	4.01	3.79	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	4	3	20	4.41	982/1488	4.55	4.59	4.47	4.41	4.41	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	1	5	22	4.66	1065/1493	4.82	4.72	4.73	4.65	4.66	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	2	5	6	15	4.10	1069/1486	4.38	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.10	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	1	3	10	11	3.79	1239/1489	4.30	4.35	4.32	4.22	3.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	11	1	3	3	2	7	3.69	933/1277	3.39	3.82	4.03	3.91	3.69	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	2	3	1	0	2	2.63	1238/1279	3.67	3.94	4.17	3.96	2.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	3	1	0	4	2	3.10	1200/1270	3.78	4.00	4.35	4.09	3.10	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	2	1	4	1	2	3.00	1210/1269	3.93	4.16	4.35	4.09	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	21	8	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 878	3.44	3.53	4.05	3.91	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	28	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	29	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	30	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 379	4.17	4.11	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	30	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.43	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	1	0	4	0	0	2.60	****/ 375	3.14	3.22	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	30	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	30	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	29	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	30	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	****/ 326	3.00	3.09	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	1	0	1	5	1	0	3.00	****/ 382	3.18	3.20	4.08	3.86	****	

Course-Section: ECON 102 0601
 Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS
 Instructor: TAKACS, WENDY E
 Enrollment: 81
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 522
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1	B	11						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	8	General	2	Under-grad	31	Non-major	27
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 102 0801
 Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS
 Instructor: GOLDFARB, MARSH
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 523
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	8	17	4.56	568/1576	4.22	4.24	4.30	4.11	4.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	19	4.63	448/1576	4.29	4.28	4.27	4.18	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	21	4.74	310/1342	4.31	4.28	4.32	4.19	4.74	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	1	0	2	4	8	4.20	921/1520	4.24	4.12	4.25	4.09	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	0	1	11	11	4.29	606/1465	4.12	4.08	4.12	4.02	4.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	18	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	594/1434	4.14	4.05	4.14	3.94	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	8	3	13	3.96	1082/1547	4.20	4.34	4.19	4.10	3.96	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	4	14	7	4.12	1411/1574	4.56	4.54	4.64	4.59	4.12	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	1	3	8	8	4.15	816/1554	3.97	4.04	4.10	4.01	4.15	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	0	7	18	4.58	786/1488	4.55	4.59	4.47	4.41	4.58	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	24	4.92	445/1493	4.82	4.72	4.73	4.65	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	7	17	4.58	596/1486	4.38	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.58	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	6	20	4.77	364/1489	4.30	4.35	4.32	4.22	4.77	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	12	1	2	2	2	6	3.77	882/1277	3.39	3.82	4.03	3.91	3.77	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	641/1279	3.67	3.94	4.17	3.96	4.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	1019/1270	3.78	4.00	4.35	4.09	3.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	928/1269	3.93	4.16	4.35	4.09	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	20	2	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/ 878	3.44	3.53	4.05	3.91	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	0	10	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.17	4.11	4.20	4.15	4.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	6	1	0	3.14	270/ 375	3.14	3.22	4.01	3.78	3.14	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	8	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.00	3.09	4.03	3.64	3.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	1	0	0	9	1	0	3.10	308/ 382	3.18	3.20	4.08	3.86	3.10	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	4	General	2	Under-grad	27	Non-major	27
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	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	12				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	4	12	10	4.04	1130/1576	4.22	4.24	4.30	4.11	4.04	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	9	13	4.14	1040/1576	4.29	4.28	4.27	4.18	4.14	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	5	9	9	3.71	1150/1342	4.31	4.28	4.32	4.19	3.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	7	2	0	1	8	9	4.10	994/1520	4.24	4.12	4.25	4.09	4.10	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	3	3	8	11	3.85	1028/1465	4.12	4.08	4.12	4.02	3.85	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	18	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	524/1434	4.14	4.05	4.14	3.94	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	5	6	14	4.15	939/1547	4.20	4.34	4.19	4.10	4.15	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	375/1574	4.56	4.54	4.64	4.59	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	2	1	2	16	4	3.76	1159/1554	3.97	4.04	4.10	4.01	3.76	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	1	2	23	4.70	610/1488	4.55	4.59	4.47	4.41	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	24	4.89	607/1493	4.82	4.72	4.73	4.65	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	0	0	4	19	4.52	654/1486	4.38	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.52	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	2	3	18	4.40	813/1489	4.30	4.35	4.32	4.22	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	13	2	2	2	1	5	3.42	1061/1277	3.39	3.82	4.03	3.91	3.42	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	1	3	3	7	3.75	962/1279	3.67	3.94	4.17	3.96	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	2	5	3	6	3.81	1030/1270	3.78	4.00	4.35	4.09	3.81	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	5	4	8	4.18	864/1269	3.93	4.16	4.35	4.09	4.18	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	7	1	2	2	0	4	3.44	728/ 878	3.44	3.53	4.05	3.91	3.44	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	1	0	0	0	8	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.17	4.11	4.20	4.15	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.43	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	1	0	4	0	0	2.60	****/ 375	3.14	3.22	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	4	2	0	3.33	****/ 326	3.00	3.09	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	8	2	1	3.36	243/ 382	3.18	3.20	4.08	3.86	3.36	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	9						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	2	C	9	General	5	Under-grad	28	Non-major	28
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				

Course-Section: ECON 121 0201
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I
 Instructor: MCBRIDE, CHUCK
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 525
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	2	12	5	3.90	1241/1576	4.28	4.24	4.30	4.11	3.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	3	6	9	3.95	1187/1576	4.34	4.28	4.27	4.18	3.95	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	7	11	4.29	812/1342	4.46	4.28	4.32	4.19	4.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	7	2	1	2	5	4	3.57	1339/1520	4.14	4.12	4.25	4.09	3.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	6	11	4.24	668/1465	4.50	4.08	4.12	4.02	4.24	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	12	1	1	4	0	3	3.33	1289/1434	3.94	4.05	4.14	3.94	3.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	6	4	10	4.10	978/1547	4.41	4.34	4.19	4.10	4.10	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	18	3	4.14	1398/1574	4.64	4.54	4.64	4.59	4.14	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	4	5	6	4.13	838/1554	4.11	4.04	4.10	4.01	4.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	4	5	8	4.11	1197/1488	4.57	4.59	4.47	4.41	4.11	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	0	1	5	12	4.42	1270/1493	4.75	4.72	4.73	4.65	4.42	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	2	3	7	6	3.79	1241/1486	4.33	4.33	4.32	4.26	3.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	2	1	8	6	3.74	1262/1489	4.33	4.35	4.32	4.22	3.74	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	8	3	1	3	1	3	3.00	1149/1277	3.40	3.82	4.03	3.91	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	1	4	1	2	3.22	1150/1279	3.75	3.94	4.17	3.96	3.22	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	1	1	2	4	3.78	1045/1270	3.90	4.00	4.35	4.09	3.78	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	1	1	1	4	3.75	1036/1269	4.19	4.16	4.35	4.09	3.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	6	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 878	4.25	3.53	4.05	3.91	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 379	4.02	4.11	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	1	0	3	0	0	2.50	****/ 375	3.10	3.22	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	1	1	0	5	0	0	2.67	325/ 326	2.99	3.09	4.03	3.64	2.67	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	1	1	0	7	1	0	2.89	377/ 382	2.99	3.20	4.08	3.86	2.89	

Course-Section: ECON 121 0201
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I
 Instructor: MCBRIDE, CHUCK
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 525
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	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	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 121 0301
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I
 Instructor: MCBRIDE, CHUCK
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 526
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	3	5	9	8	3.88	1257/1576	4.28	4.24	4.30	4.11	3.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	11	7	3.92	1217/1576	4.34	4.28	4.27	4.18	3.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	9	13	4.40	709/1342	4.46	4.28	4.32	4.19	4.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	1	1	4	6	5	3.76	1251/1520	4.14	4.12	4.25	4.09	3.76	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	4	6	14	4.42	498/1465	4.50	4.08	4.12	4.02	4.42	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	15	1	1	2	3	2	3.44	1239/1434	3.94	4.05	4.14	3.94	3.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	5	6	14	4.36	727/1547	4.41	4.34	4.19	4.10	4.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	16	9	4.36	1236/1574	4.64	4.54	4.64	4.59	4.36	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	1	2	4	7	3	3.53	1295/1554	4.11	4.04	4.10	4.01	3.53	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	4	5	13	4.41	995/1488	4.57	4.59	4.47	4.41	4.41	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	557/1493	4.75	4.72	4.73	4.65	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	2	4	11	5	3.86	1211/1486	4.33	4.33	4.32	4.26	3.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	6	6	8	4.00	1118/1489	4.33	4.35	4.32	4.22	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	11	2	2	3	1	2	2.90	1194/1277	3.40	3.82	4.03	3.91	2.90	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	3	3	4	2	3.23	1148/1279	3.75	3.94	4.17	3.96	3.23	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	4	2	7	4.23	836/1270	3.90	4.00	4.35	4.09	4.23	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	3	7	3	4.00	928/1269	4.19	4.16	4.35	4.09	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	8	2	0	0	1	1	2.75	****/ 878	4.25	3.53	4.05	3.91	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.29	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	****/ 379	4.02	4.11	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	8	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.10	3.22	4.01	3.78	3.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	1	0	0	6	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	2.99	3.09	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	12	1	0	3.08	309/ 382	2.99	3.20	4.08	3.86	3.08	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ECON 121 0401
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I
 Instructor: COLE, RICHARD
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 527
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	17	4.58	527/1576	4.28	4.24	4.30	4.11	4.58	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	15	4.46	683/1576	4.34	4.28	4.27	4.18	4.46	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	9	12	4.33	770/1342	4.46	4.28	4.32	4.19	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	2	8	7	4.29	815/1520	4.14	4.12	4.25	4.09	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	2	5	14	4.57	322/1465	4.50	4.08	4.12	4.02	4.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	0	2	6	6	4.07	852/1434	3.94	4.05	4.14	3.94	4.07	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	0	2	20	4.67	339/1547	4.41	4.34	4.19	4.10	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	235/1574	4.64	4.54	4.64	4.59	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	4	9	3	3.94	1019/1554	4.11	4.04	4.10	4.01	3.94	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	6	16	4.73	568/1488	4.57	4.59	4.47	4.41	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	1029/1493	4.75	4.72	4.73	4.65	4.68	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	7	14	4.59	572/1486	4.33	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.59	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	0	6	14	4.45	754/1489	4.33	4.35	4.32	4.22	4.45	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	12	1	1	1	2	5	3.90	802/1277	3.40	3.82	4.03	3.91	3.90	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	2	2	0	6	4.00	802/1279	3.75	3.94	4.17	3.96	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	928/1270	3.90	4.00	4.35	4.09	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	644/1269	4.19	4.16	4.35	4.09	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	5	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	****/ 878	4.25	3.53	4.05	3.91	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	****/ 379	4.02	4.11	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	5	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	3.10	3.22	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	9	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	2.99	3.09	4.03	3.64	3.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	7	0	0	3.00	313/ 382	2.99	3.20	4.08	3.86	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	6	C	4	General	2	Under-grad	24	Non-major	24
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
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				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 121 0501
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I
 Instructor: COLE, RICHARD
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 528
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	3	11	7	4.05	1124/1576	4.28	4.24	4.30	4.11	4.05	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	13	4.45	683/1576	4.34	4.28	4.27	4.18	4.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	14	4.50	583/1342	4.46	4.28	4.32	4.19	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	2	2	3	5	3.92	1153/1520	4.14	4.12	4.25	4.09	3.92	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	7	12	4.48	410/1465	4.50	4.08	4.12	4.02	4.48	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	2	1	2	3	3	3.36	1278/1434	3.94	4.05	4.14	3.94	3.36	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	5	5	11	4.14	947/1547	4.41	4.34	4.19	4.10	4.14	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	14	4.64	957/1574	4.64	4.54	4.64	4.59	4.64	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	649/1554	4.11	4.04	4.10	4.01	4.31	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	385/1488	4.57	4.59	4.47	4.41	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	810/1493	4.75	4.72	4.73	4.65	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	5	15	4.59	572/1486	4.33	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.59	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	4	15	4.50	696/1489	4.33	4.35	4.32	4.22	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	11	1	0	4	0	3	3.50	1020/1277	3.40	3.82	4.03	3.91	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	3	4	1	3.75	962/1279	3.75	3.94	4.17	3.96	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	0	3	2	2	3.50	1135/1270	3.90	4.00	4.35	4.09	3.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	644/1269	4.19	4.16	4.35	4.09	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	4	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 878	4.25	3.53	4.05	3.91	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	2	0	0	0	14	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.02	4.11	4.20	4.15	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.52	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	1	0	0	18	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.10	3.22	4.01	3.78	3.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	1	0	0	18	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	2.99	3.09	4.03	3.64	3.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	1	0	0	10	0	0	3.00	313/ 382	2.99	3.20	4.08	3.86	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	8	General	4	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	7	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	15
?	1		

Course-Section: ECON 121 0601
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I
 Instructor: DAVIS, ALEXIS C
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 529
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	8	14	4.44	727/1576	4.28	4.24	4.30	4.11	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	15	4.52	581/1576	4.34	4.28	4.27	4.18	4.52	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	7	13	4.32	779/1342	4.46	4.28	4.32	4.19	4.32	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	3	3	11	4.47	562/1520	4.14	4.12	4.25	4.09	4.47	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	22	4.84	153/1465	4.50	4.08	4.12	4.02	4.84	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	1	1	1	14	4.65	287/1434	3.94	4.05	4.14	3.94	4.65	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	7	15	4.48	559/1547	4.41	4.34	4.19	4.10	4.48	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	18	4.75	758/1574	4.64	4.54	4.64	4.59	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	3	12	3	4.00	924/1554	4.11	4.04	4.10	4.01	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	9	13	4.46	932/1488	4.57	4.59	4.47	4.41	4.46	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4	19	4.75	908/1493	4.75	4.72	4.73	4.65	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	6	16	4.58	584/1486	4.33	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.58	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	4	16	4.50	696/1489	4.33	4.35	4.32	4.22	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	2	2	4	3	4	3.33	1086/1277	3.40	3.82	4.03	3.91	3.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	2	1	5	10	4.28	649/1279	3.75	3.94	4.17	3.96	4.28	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	636/1270	3.90	4.00	4.35	4.09	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	5	2	11	4.33	773/1269	4.19	4.16	4.35	4.09	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	6	0	2	1	1	8	4.25	367/ 878	4.25	3.53	4.05	3.91	4.25	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	2	0	0	0	13	1	4.07	214/ 379	4.02	4.11	4.20	4.15	4.07	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.52	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	13	1	2	3.31	235/ 375	3.10	3.22	4.01	3.78	3.31	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	13	0	2	3.27	211/ 326	2.99	3.09	4.03	3.64	3.27	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	2	0	0	11	0	0	3.00	313/ 382	2.99	3.20	4.08	3.86	3.00	

Course-Section: ECON 121 0601
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I
 Instructor: DAVIS, ALEXIS C
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 529
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	6	C	5	General	5	Under-grad	25	Non-major	25
84-150	2	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	13				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	243/1576	4.28	4.24	4.30	4.11	4.81	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	324/1576	4.34	4.28	4.27	4.18	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	179/1342	4.46	4.28	4.32	4.19	4.90	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	173/1520	4.14	4.12	4.25	4.09	4.85	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	5	12	4.45	454/1465	4.50	4.08	4.12	4.02	4.45	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	167/1434	3.94	4.05	4.14	3.94	4.79	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	280/1547	4.41	4.34	4.19	4.10	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1574	4.64	4.54	4.64	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	208/1554	4.11	4.04	4.10	4.01	4.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	248/1488	4.57	4.59	4.47	4.41	4.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	557/1493	4.75	4.72	4.73	4.65	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	7	13	4.57	596/1486	4.33	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	309/1489	4.33	4.35	4.32	4.22	4.81	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	1	2	2	3	6	3.79	869/1277	3.40	3.82	4.03	3.91	3.79	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	5	2	5	4.00	802/1279	3.75	3.94	4.17	3.96	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	6	3	2	3.42	1153/1270	3.90	4.00	4.35	4.09	3.42	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	5	1	6	4.08	911/1269	4.19	4.16	4.35	4.09	4.08	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	9	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 878	4.25	3.53	4.05	3.91	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	0	6	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.02	4.11	4.20	4.15	4.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 375	3.10	3.22	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	6	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	2.99	3.09	4.03	3.64	3.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	2.99	3.20	4.08	3.86	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	21	Non-major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	5	12	4.35	840/1576	4.22	4.24	4.30	4.11	4.35	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	6	11	4.30	891/1576	4.25	4.28	4.27	4.18	4.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	7	11	4.35	753/1342	4.16	4.28	4.32	4.19	4.35	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	1	1	1	3	3	3.67	1300/1520	3.81	4.12	4.25	4.09	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	5	4	9	4.05	824/1465	4.21	4.08	4.12	4.02	4.05	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1021/1434	3.91	4.05	4.14	3.94	3.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	4	13	4.40	690/1547	4.47	4.34	4.19	4.10	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	14	5	4.10	1424/1574	4.35	4.54	4.64	4.59	4.10	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	1	5	7	3	3.59	1274/1554	3.94	4.04	4.10	4.01	3.59	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	3	5	10	4.26	1103/1488	4.46	4.59	4.47	4.41	4.26	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	947/1493	4.64	4.72	4.73	4.65	4.74	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	6	4	7	3.84	1218/1486	4.21	4.33	4.32	4.26	3.84	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	3	5	8	3.89	1196/1489	4.21	4.35	4.32	4.22	3.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	11	4	0	1	1	2	2.63	1226/1277	3.75	3.82	4.03	3.91	2.63	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	758/1279	3.91	3.94	4.17	3.96	4.13	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	827/1270	4.09	4.00	4.35	4.09	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	894/1269	4.38	4.16	4.35	4.09	4.13	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	7	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 878	3.94	3.53	4.05	3.91	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	****/ 379	4.00	4.11	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	7	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.22	3.22	4.01	3.78	3.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	5	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.00	3.09	4.03	3.64	3.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	6	0	0	3.00	313/ 382	3.21	3.20	4.08	3.86	3.00	

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	1	Major	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	16
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	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	3	10	14	8	3.77	1337/1576	4.22	4.24	4.30	4.11	3.77	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	13	12	10	3.91	1227/1576	4.25	4.28	4.27	4.18	3.91	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	8	11	15	4.14	912/1342	4.16	4.28	4.32	4.19	4.14	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	1	8	10	9	3.86	1192/1520	3.81	4.12	4.25	4.09	3.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	3	7	7	15	4.06	818/1465	4.21	4.08	4.12	4.02	4.06	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	3	7	8	9	3.85	1033/1434	3.91	4.05	4.14	3.94	3.85	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	6	12	17	4.31	774/1547	4.47	4.34	4.19	4.10	4.31	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	9	11	15	4.17	1379/1574	4.35	4.54	4.64	4.59	4.17	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	0	0	2	7	11	1	3.52	1295/1554	3.94	4.04	4.10	4.01	3.52	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	6	12	15	4.27	1095/1488	4.46	4.59	4.47	4.41	4.27	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	4	7	22	4.55	1176/1493	4.64	4.72	4.73	4.65	4.55	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	9	10	13	4.06	1081/1486	4.21	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.06	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	6	8	16	4.09	1070/1489	4.21	4.35	4.32	4.22	4.09	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	3	3	4	8	10	3.68	938/1277	3.75	3.82	4.03	3.91	3.68	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	3	3	4	3.82	934/1279	3.91	3.94	4.17	3.96	3.82	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	860/1270	4.09	4.00	4.35	4.09	4.18	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	25	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	793/1269	4.38	4.16	4.35	4.09	4.30	
4. Were special techniques successful	25	0	0	1	3	2	4	3.90	557/ 878	3.94	3.53	4.05	3.91	3.90	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	33	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	33	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	33	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	26	1	0	0	0	7	1	4.13	****/ 379	4.00	4.11	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	7	0	2	3.44	217/ 375	3.22	3.22	4.01	3.78	3.44	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	29	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	****/ 326	3.00	3.09	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	1	0	0	8	2	2	3.50	219/ 382	3.21	3.20	4.08	3.86	3.50	

Course-Section: ECON 122 0201
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING II
 Instructor: MEDICUS, SUZANN
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 532
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	6	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	35	Non-major	32
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	6	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	23				
				?	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	2	0	0	2	3	5	9	4.11	1089/1576	4.22	4.24	4.30	4.11	4.11	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	0	3	4	11	4.26	929/1576	4.25	4.28	4.27	4.18	4.26	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	1	3	3	11	4.16	905/1342	4.16	4.28	4.32	4.19	4.16	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	6	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	665/1520	3.81	4.12	4.25	4.09	4.42	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	0	7	10	4.26	637/1465	4.21	4.08	4.12	4.02	4.26	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	4	1	1	1	4	8	4.13	806/1434	3.91	4.05	4.14	3.94	4.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	3	1	14	4.61	399/1547	4.47	4.34	4.19	4.10	4.61	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	1	1	2	10	4	3.83	1532/1574	4.35	4.54	4.64	4.59	3.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	2	0	2	3	3	3	3.64	1247/1554	3.94	4.04	4.10	4.01	3.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	1	2	1	11	4.25	1111/1488	4.46	4.59	4.47	4.41	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	2	1	1	12	4.44	1263/1493	4.64	4.72	4.73	4.65	4.44	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	2	0	2	2	10	4.13	1054/1486	4.21	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	2	0	3	9	3.94	1169/1489	4.21	4.35	4.32	4.22	3.94	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	1	1	0	0	5	8	4.36	446/1277	3.75	3.82	4.03	3.91	4.36	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	2	0	1	1	3	3.43	1097/1279	3.91	3.94	4.17	3.96	3.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	928/1270	4.09	4.00	4.35	4.09	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	1005/1269	4.38	4.16	4.35	4.09	3.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	1	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	415/ 878	3.94	3.53	4.05	3.91	4.17	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 379	4.00	4.11	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 375	3.22	3.22	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 326	3.00	3.09	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	5	1	0	3.17	291/ 382	3.21	3.20	4.08	3.86	3.17	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 7	Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 1	General 0
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D 0	Under-grad 21
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Non-major 19
				P 0	Electives 0
				I 0	Other 15
				? 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ECON 122 0401
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING II
 Instructor: HARDY, TIMOTHY
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 534
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	471/1576	4.22	4.24	4.30	4.11	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	939/1576	4.25	4.28	4.27	4.18	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	972/1342	4.16	4.28	4.32	4.19	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	1	1	3	3.25	1438/1520	3.81	4.12	4.25	4.09	3.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	483/1465	4.21	4.08	4.12	4.02	4.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	878/1434	3.91	4.05	4.14	3.94	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	280/1547	4.47	4.34	4.19	4.10	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	527/1574	4.35	4.54	4.64	4.59	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	160/1554	3.94	4.04	4.10	4.01	4.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	505/1488	4.46	4.59	4.47	4.41	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	1150/1493	4.64	4.72	4.73	4.65	4.57	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	596/1486	4.21	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	614/1489	4.21	4.35	4.32	4.22	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	692/1277	3.75	3.82	4.03	3.91	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	802/1279	3.91	3.94	4.17	3.96	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	928/1270	4.09	4.00	4.35	4.09	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	353/1269	4.38	4.16	4.35	4.09	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	631/ 878	3.94	3.53	4.05	3.91	3.75	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.00	4.11	4.20	4.15	4.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	3.00	3.09	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	313/ 382	3.21	3.20	4.08	3.86	3.00	

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	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 122 0501
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING II
 Instructor: HARDY, TIMOTHY
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 535
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	6	4.23	976/1576	4.22	4.24	4.30	4.11	4.23	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	568/1576	4.25	4.28	4.27	4.18	4.54	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	899/1342	4.16	4.28	4.32	4.19	4.17	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	8	1	3.83	1212/1520	3.81	4.12	4.25	4.09	3.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	668/1465	4.21	4.08	4.12	4.02	4.23	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	2	5	2	3.70	1123/1434	3.91	4.05	4.14	3.94	3.70	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	1	9	4.31	784/1547	4.47	4.34	4.19	4.10	4.31	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	739/1574	4.35	4.54	4.64	4.59	4.77	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	805/1554	3.94	4.04	4.10	4.01	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	484/1488	4.46	4.59	4.47	4.41	4.77	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	445/1493	4.64	4.72	4.73	4.65	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	735/1486	4.21	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.46	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	660/1489	4.21	4.35	4.32	4.22	4.54	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	2	1	4	6	4.08	664/1277	3.75	3.82	4.03	3.91	4.08	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	712/1279	3.91	3.94	4.17	3.96	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	928/1270	4.09	4.00	4.35	4.09	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	386/1269	4.38	4.16	4.35	4.09	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 878	3.94	3.53	4.05	3.91	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 379	4.00	4.11	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	3.22	3.22	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.00	3.09	4.03	3.64	3.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	4	0	1	3.40	235/ 382	3.21	3.20	4.08	3.86	3.40	

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	2	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 5	General	0
84-150	3	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	12
			? 1		

Course-Section: ECON 301 0101
 Title INTERMED ACCOUNTING I
 Instructor: ST MARTIN, JEAN
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 536
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	500/1576	4.70	4.24	4.30	4.30	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	0	13	4.73	301/1576	4.77	4.28	4.27	4.28	4.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	480/1342	4.68	4.28	4.32	4.30	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	476/1520	4.66	4.12	4.25	4.25	4.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	0	5	7	4.14	758/1465	4.47	4.08	4.12	4.09	4.14	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	574/1434	4.55	4.05	4.14	4.15	4.36	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	1	12	4.67	339/1547	4.83	4.34	4.19	4.21	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.54	4.64	4.61	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	237/1554	4.82	4.04	4.10	4.09	4.70	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	484/1488	4.86	4.59	4.47	4.47	4.77	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	888/1493	4.86	4.72	4.73	4.70	4.77	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	231/1486	4.86	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.85	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	0	11	4.69	461/1489	4.79	4.35	4.32	4.34	4.69	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	1	1	0	1	6	4.11	645/1277	4.26	3.82	4.03	4.11	4.11	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	732/1279	4.01	3.94	4.17	4.20	4.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	716/1270	4.30	4.00	4.35	4.42	4.43	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	928/1269	4.00	4.16	4.35	4.41	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	4	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 878	****	3.53	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	6	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.06	4.11	4.20	4.17	4.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	8	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.14	3.22	4.01	4.12	3.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	4	1	0	3.20	223/ 326	3.20	3.09	4.03	4.23	3.20	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	5	1	0	3.17	291/ 382	3.17	3.20	4.08	4.24	3.17	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 301 0201
 Title INTERMED ACCOUNTING I
 Instructor: ST MARTIN, JEAN
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 537
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	243/1576	4.70	4.24	4.30	4.30	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	222/1576	4.77	4.28	4.27	4.28	4.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	1	18	4.75	298/1342	4.68	4.28	4.32	4.30	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	218/1520	4.66	4.12	4.25	4.25	4.79	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	175/1465	4.47	4.08	4.12	4.09	4.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	209/1434	4.55	4.05	4.14	4.15	4.74	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1547	4.83	4.34	4.19	4.21	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.54	4.64	4.61	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	81/1554	4.82	4.04	4.10	4.09	4.93	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	149/1488	4.86	4.59	4.47	4.47	4.95	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	334/1493	4.86	4.72	4.73	4.70	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	191/1486	4.86	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	205/1489	4.79	4.35	4.32	4.34	4.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	12	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	404/1277	4.26	3.82	4.03	4.11	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	918/1279	4.01	3.94	4.17	4.20	3.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	871/1270	4.30	4.00	4.35	4.42	4.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	928/1269	4.00	4.16	4.35	4.41	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	3	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 878	****	3.53	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.32	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	1	0	0	0	7	1	4.13	200/ 379	4.06	4.11	4.20	4.17	4.13	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.53	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	6	0	1	3.29	240/ 375	3.14	3.22	4.01	4.12	3.29	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	3.92	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.63	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	1	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	****/ 326	3.20	3.09	4.03	4.23	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.83	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.89	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	1	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	****/ 382	3.17	3.20	4.08	4.24	****	

Course-Section: ECON 301 0201
 Title INTERMED ACCOUNTING I
 Instructor: ST MARTIN, JEAN
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 537
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	20	Non-major	19
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	0						

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	4	14	4.68	387/1576	4.68	4.24	4.30	4.30	4.68	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	11	4.42	728/1576	4.42	4.28	4.27	4.28	4.42	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	510/1342	4.58	4.28	4.32	4.30	4.58	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	8	7	4.11	994/1520	4.11	4.12	4.25	4.25	4.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	2	7	6	4.13	778/1465	4.13	4.08	4.12	4.09	4.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	2	5	2	6	3.63	1162/1434	3.63	4.05	4.14	4.15	3.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	434/1547	4.59	4.34	4.19	4.21	4.59	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	281/1574	4.95	4.54	4.64	4.61	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	3	8	5	4.00	924/1554	4.00	4.04	4.10	4.09	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	463/1488	4.78	4.59	4.47	4.47	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	607/1493	4.89	4.72	4.73	4.70	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	3	12	4.53	654/1486	4.53	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.53	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	5	11	4.39	834/1489	4.39	4.35	4.32	4.34	4.39	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	692/1277	4.00	3.82	4.03	4.11	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	1	1	4	3	3.70	986/1279	3.70	3.94	4.17	4.20	3.70	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	0	2	3	3	3.78	1045/1270	3.78	4.00	4.35	4.42	3.78	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	728/1269	4.40	4.16	4.35	4.41	4.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	6	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 878	****	3.53	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	175/ 379	4.20	4.11	4.20	4.17	4.20	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	3.22	4.01	4.12	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	3.09	4.03	4.23	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.83	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	8	2	0	3.20	281/ 382	3.20	3.20	4.08	4.24	3.20	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General	2	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	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	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	3	1	3	6	13	3.96	1185/1576	3.99	4.24	4.30	4.30	3.96	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	8	6	10	3.92	1217/1576	3.93	4.28	4.27	4.28	3.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	4	5	13	4.08	944/1342	4.08	4.28	4.32	4.30	4.08	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	2	6	6	6	3.67	1300/1520	3.78	4.12	4.25	4.25	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	7	2	7	4	4	2.83	1423/1465	3.40	4.08	4.12	4.09	2.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	1	7	3	9	3.86	1033/1434	3.42	4.05	4.14	4.15	3.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	4	7	12	4.04	1020/1547	3.95	4.34	4.19	4.21	4.04	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	4	21	4.69	866/1574	4.64	4.54	4.64	4.61	4.69	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	2	0	4	8	6	3.80	1132/1554	3.51	4.04	4.10	4.09	3.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	7	17	4.64	694/1488	4.56	4.59	4.47	4.47	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	6	18	4.68	1041/1493	4.77	4.72	4.73	4.70	4.68	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	3	7	13	4.20	1003/1486	4.09	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	2	7	13	4.16	1020/1489	4.21	4.35	4.32	4.34	4.16	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	1	1	3	3	9	4.06	672/1277	3.79	3.82	4.03	4.11	4.06	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	2	3	8	4.21	697/1279	3.87	3.94	4.17	4.20	4.21	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	876/1270	3.72	4.00	4.35	4.42	4.15	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	0	2	2	8	4.23	830/1269	3.81	4.16	4.35	4.41	4.23	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	3	2	0	2	1	5	3.70	660/ 878	3.01	3.53	4.05	4.09	3.70	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	****/ 379	4.00	4.11	4.20	4.17	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.53	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 375	3.27	3.22	4.01	4.12	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	8	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.10	3.09	4.03	4.23	3.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	7	1	1	3.33	250/ 382	3.14	3.20	4.08	4.24	3.33	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	3	C	8	General	2	Under-grad	26	Non-major	26
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	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	6	3	3.92	1231/1576	3.99	4.24	4.30	4.30	3.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	3	3	3.75	1311/1576	3.93	4.28	4.27	4.28	3.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	5	0	5	3.73	1146/1342	4.08	4.28	4.32	4.30	3.73	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	1	3	1	2	3.25	1438/1520	3.78	4.12	4.25	4.25	3.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	4	3	3.50	1242/1465	3.40	4.08	4.12	4.09	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	1432/1434	3.42	4.05	4.14	4.15	2.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	5	2	4	3.75	1239/1547	3.95	4.34	4.19	4.21	3.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	645/1574	4.64	4.54	4.64	4.61	4.82	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	2	0	3	6	0	3.18	1410/1554	3.51	4.04	4.10	4.09	3.18	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	822/1488	4.56	4.59	4.47	4.47	4.55	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	557/1493	4.77	4.72	4.73	4.70	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	0	6	3	3.91	1197/1486	4.09	4.33	4.32	4.32	3.91	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	1005/1489	4.21	4.35	4.32	4.34	4.18	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	692/1277	3.79	3.82	4.03	4.11	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	0	0	1	3	3.50	1064/1279	3.87	3.94	4.17	4.20	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	1	2	1	1	3.00	1208/1270	3.72	4.00	4.35	4.42	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	1	0	2	2	3.50	1116/1269	3.81	4.16	4.35	4.41	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	858/ 878	3.01	3.53	4.05	4.09	2.33	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.32	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	1	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.00	4.11	4.20	4.17	4.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	1	0	0	4	1	0	3.20	254/ 375	3.27	3.22	4.01	4.12	3.20	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	3.92	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	1	0	0	8	1	0	3.11	244/ 326	3.10	3.09	4.03	4.23	3.11	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.83	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.89	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	0	0	1	7	0	0	2.88	377/ 382	3.14	3.20	4.08	4.24	2.88	

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	3	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 4	General	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		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	10

Course-Section: ECON 311 0301
 Title INTERM MICROECON ANALY
 Instructor: LORD, WILLIAM
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 541
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	4	9	4.11	1089/1576	3.99	4.24	4.30	4.30	4.11	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	9	6	4.11	1076/1576	3.93	4.28	4.27	4.28	4.11	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	5	12	4.42	683/1342	4.08	4.28	4.32	4.30	4.42	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	12	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	648/1520	3.78	4.12	4.25	4.25	4.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	0	2	9	3	3.87	1020/1465	3.40	4.08	4.12	4.09	3.87	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	14	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	524/1434	3.42	4.05	4.14	4.15	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	1	5	10	4.05	1006/1547	3.95	4.34	4.19	4.21	4.05	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	11	8	4.42	1177/1574	4.64	4.54	4.64	4.61	4.42	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	2	5	7	2	3.56	1281/1554	3.51	4.04	4.10	4.09	3.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	3	12	4.50	870/1488	4.56	4.59	4.47	4.47	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	966/1493	4.77	4.72	4.73	4.70	4.72	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	2	5	9	4.17	1025/1486	4.09	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	5	10	4.28	941/1489	4.21	4.35	4.32	4.34	4.28	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	4	1	1	6	4	3.31	1092/1277	3.79	3.82	4.03	4.11	3.31	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	3	2	4	3.90	899/1279	3.87	3.94	4.17	4.20	3.90	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	4	2	4	4.00	928/1270	3.72	4.00	4.35	4.42	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	5	0	4	3.70	1055/1269	3.81	4.16	4.35	4.41	3.70	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	4	2	0	1	0	2	3.00	799/ 878	3.01	3.53	4.05	4.09	3.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	8	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.00	4.11	4.20	4.17	4.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	5	0	1	3.33	232/ 375	3.27	3.22	4.01	4.12	3.33	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	4	1	0	3.20	223/ 326	3.10	3.09	4.03	4.23	3.20	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.83	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.89	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	1	0	0	4	1	0	3.20	281/ 382	3.14	3.20	4.08	4.24	3.20	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	9
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	5
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	1
			Required for Majors	0	Graduate
			General	0	Under-grad
			Electives	0	20
			Other	16	Non-major
					17
				#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	

Course-Section: ECON 312 0101
 Title INTERM MACROECON ANALY
 Instructor: CINYABUGUMA, MA
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 542
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	1	5	3	8	3.89	1257/1576	4.38	4.24	4.30	4.30	3.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	8	9	4.21	978/1576	4.46	4.28	4.27	4.28	4.21	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	6	10	4.21	865/1342	4.51	4.28	4.32	4.30	4.21	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	2	5	4	5	3.59	1336/1520	4.21	4.12	4.25	4.25	3.59	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	5	6	4	3.56	1225/1465	4.20	4.08	4.12	4.09	3.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	4	6	5	3.67	1142/1434	4.43	4.05	4.14	4.15	3.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	2	4	9	3.89	1152/1547	4.34	4.34	4.19	4.21	3.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	702/1574	4.91	4.54	4.64	4.61	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	924/1554	4.31	4.04	4.10	4.09	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	0	2	4	8	4.20	1155/1488	4.64	4.59	4.47	4.47	4.20	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	0	2	2	11	4.38	1301/1493	4.73	4.72	4.73	4.70	4.38	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	0	3	4	7	4.07	1081/1486	4.55	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.07	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	3	3	8	4.13	1042/1489	4.52	4.35	4.32	4.34	4.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	4	1	2	0	2	5	3.80	856/1277	3.60	3.82	4.03	4.11	3.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	2	1	3	4	3.64	1011/1279	4.29	3.94	4.17	4.20	3.64	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	1	3	2	4	3.64	1103/1270	4.25	4.00	4.35	4.42	3.64	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	2	1	1	1	6	3.73	1047/1269	4.41	4.16	4.35	4.41	3.73	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	5	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	742/ 878	3.40	3.53	4.05	4.09	3.40	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.24	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.48	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.16	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/ 379	4.25	4.11	4.20	4.17	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.53	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	7	0	1	3.25	245/ 375	3.22	3.22	4.01	4.12	3.25	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	3.92	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	6	1	1	3.38	196/ 326	3.38	3.09	4.03	4.23	3.38	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.83	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.89	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	****/ 382	3.10	3.20	4.08	4.24	****	

Course-Section: ECON 312 0101
 Title INTERM MACROECON ANALY
 Instructor: CINYABUGUMA, MA
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 542
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	4	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	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	11				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	3	11	4.53	595/1576	4.38	4.24	4.30	4.30	4.53	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	668/1576	4.46	4.28	4.27	4.28	4.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	633/1342	4.51	4.28	4.32	4.30	4.47	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	476/1520	4.21	4.12	4.25	4.25	4.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	366/1465	4.20	4.08	4.12	4.09	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	398/1434	4.43	4.05	4.14	4.15	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	690/1547	4.34	4.34	4.19	4.21	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	328/1574	4.91	4.54	4.64	4.61	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	395/1554	4.31	4.04	4.10	4.09	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1488	4.64	4.59	4.47	4.47	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	849/1493	4.73	4.72	4.73	4.70	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	298/1486	4.55	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	336/1489	4.52	4.35	4.32	4.34	4.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	8	2	0	0	2	1	3.00	1149/1277	3.60	3.82	4.03	4.11	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	554/1279	4.29	3.94	4.17	4.20	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	559/1270	4.25	4.00	4.35	4.42	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1269	4.41	4.16	4.35	4.41	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 878	3.40	3.53	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	186/ 379	4.25	4.11	4.20	4.17	4.17	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	6	1	0	3.14	270/ 375	3.22	3.22	4.01	4.12	3.14	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 326	3.38	3.09	4.03	4.23	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	5	0	0	3.00	313/ 382	3.10	3.20	4.08	4.24	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 9	Graduate	0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	2
84-150	3	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	11
			? 0		

Course-Section: ECON 312 0301
 Title INTERM MACROECON ANALY
 Instructor: CINYABUGUMA, MA
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 544
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	757/1576	4.38	4.24	4.30	4.30	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	608/1576	4.46	4.28	4.27	4.28	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	263/1342	4.51	4.28	4.32	4.30	4.79	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	880/1520	4.21	4.12	4.25	4.25	4.23	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	616/1465	4.20	4.08	4.12	4.09	4.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	151/1434	4.43	4.05	4.14	4.15	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	2	3	8	4.21	882/1547	4.34	4.34	4.19	4.21	4.21	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	375/1574	4.91	4.54	4.64	4.61	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	532/1554	4.31	4.04	4.10	4.09	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	920/1488	4.64	4.59	4.47	4.47	4.46	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	445/1493	4.73	4.72	4.73	4.70	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	545/1486	4.55	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.62	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	1	10	4.54	660/1489	4.52	4.35	4.32	4.34	4.54	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	8	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	692/1277	3.60	3.82	4.03	4.11	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	204/1279	4.29	3.94	4.17	4.20	4.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	636/1270	4.25	4.00	4.35	4.42	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	644/1269	4.41	4.16	4.35	4.41	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 878	3.40	3.53	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 379	4.25	4.11	4.20	4.17	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	4	1	1	3.50	209/ 375	3.22	3.22	4.01	4.12	3.50	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 326	3.38	3.09	4.03	4.23	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	4	1	0	3.20	281/ 382	3.10	3.20	4.08	4.24	3.20	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	15	Non-major	13
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	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	7				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ECON 312 0401
 Title INTERM MACROECON ANALY
 Instructor: ROSE, MORGAN
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 545
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	0	10	4.67	415/1576	4.38	4.24	4.30	4.30	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	392/1576	4.46	4.28	4.27	4.28	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	500/1342	4.51	4.28	4.32	4.30	4.58	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	511/1520	4.21	4.12	4.25	4.25	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	439/1465	4.20	4.08	4.12	4.09	4.45	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	193/1434	4.43	4.05	4.14	4.15	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	167/1547	4.34	4.34	4.19	4.21	4.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1574	4.91	4.54	4.64	4.61	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	8	4	4.33	623/1554	4.31	4.04	4.10	4.09	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	248/1488	4.64	4.59	4.47	4.47	4.91	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	784/1493	4.73	4.72	4.73	4.70	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	379/1486	4.55	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	539/1489	4.52	4.35	4.32	4.34	4.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1277	3.60	3.82	4.03	4.11	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	128/ 379	4.25	4.11	4.20	4.17	4.33	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.22	3.22	4.01	4.12	3.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	3.38	3.09	4.03	4.23	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	3.10	3.20	4.08	4.24	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ECON 320 0101
 Title QUANT MTHDS:MANAGEMENT
 Instructor: PALMATEER, JASO
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 546
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	7	14	4.36	829/1576	4.36	4.24	4.30	4.30	4.36	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	15	4.52	581/1576	4.52	4.28	4.27	4.28	4.52	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	4	14	4.24	850/1342	4.24	4.28	4.32	4.30	4.24	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	1	3	5	13	4.22	902/1520	4.22	4.12	4.25	4.25	4.22	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	1	1	5	4	6	3.76	1095/1465	3.76	4.08	4.12	4.09	3.76	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	0	3	8	7	4.05	857/1434	4.05	4.05	4.14	4.15	4.05	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	6	16	4.48	559/1547	4.48	4.34	4.19	4.21	4.48	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	9	15	4.63	972/1574	4.63	4.54	4.64	4.61	4.63	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	16	3	4.00	924/1554	4.00	4.04	4.10	4.09	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	2	19	4.67	666/1488	4.67	4.59	4.47	4.47	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	6	15	4.50	1210/1493	4.50	4.72	4.73	4.70	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	4	17	4.54	631/1486	4.54	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.54	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	5	14	4.33	888/1489	4.33	4.35	4.32	4.34	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	0	1	4	4	8	4.12	645/1277	4.12	3.82	4.03	4.11	4.12	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	2	0	2	0	3	3.29	1141/1279	3.29	3.94	4.17	4.20	3.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	928/1270	4.00	4.00	4.35	4.42	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	1	4	0	3	3.63	1079/1269	3.63	4.16	4.35	4.41	3.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	4	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 878	****	3.53	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	0	8	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.00	4.11	4.20	4.17	4.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	5	1	0	3.17	****/ 375	****	3.22	4.01	4.12	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	16	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.00	3.09	4.03	4.23	3.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	7	0	0	3.00	313/ 382	3.00	3.20	4.08	4.24	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	B 13			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 25	Non-major 21
84-150	16	3.00-3.49	6	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 21		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ECON 374 0101
 Title FUND FINANCIAL MGMT
 Instructor: LAMDIN, DOUGLAS
 Enrollment: 72
 Questionnaires: 45

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 547
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	0	4	10	29	4.50	637/1576	4.50	4.24	4.30	4.30	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	4	8	31	4.55	555/1576	4.55	4.28	4.27	4.28	4.55	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	9	31	4.57	521/1342	4.57	4.28	4.32	4.30	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	3	8	30	4.66	348/1520	4.66	4.12	4.25	4.25	4.66	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	1	8	9	18	4.22	678/1465	4.22	4.08	4.12	4.09	4.22	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	8	1	0	6	10	18	4.26	682/1434	4.26	4.05	4.14	4.15	4.26	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	5	5	34	4.66	351/1547	4.66	4.34	4.19	4.21	4.66	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	20	23	4.53	1056/1574	4.53	4.54	4.64	4.61	4.53	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	1	0	1	2	15	13	4.29	672/1554	4.29	4.04	4.10	4.09	4.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	1	6	35	4.72	568/1488	4.72	4.59	4.47	4.47	4.72	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	3	39	4.88	607/1493	4.88	4.72	4.73	4.70	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	7	33	4.70	422/1486	4.70	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.70	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	1	1	7	32	4.71	448/1489	4.71	4.35	4.32	4.34	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	6	0	0	5	5	24	4.56	283/1277	4.56	3.82	4.03	4.11	4.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	432/1279	4.53	3.94	4.17	4.20	4.53	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	28	0	1	0	3	5	8	4.12	897/1270	4.12	4.00	4.35	4.42	4.12	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	28	0	1	0	4	3	9	4.12	900/1269	4.12	4.16	4.35	4.41	4.12	
4. Were special techniques successful	28	5	0	1	3	2	6	4.08	449/ 878	4.08	3.53	4.05	4.09	4.08	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	40	0	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	****/ 379	****	4.11	4.20	4.17	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	39	0	0	0	4	2	0	3.33	****/ 375	****	3.22	4.01	4.12	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	36	0	0	0	9	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	3.09	4.03	4.23	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	37	0	0	0	7	1	0	3.13	****/ 382	****	3.20	4.08	4.24	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 18	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 15			
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	4	C 3	General 0	Under-grad 45	Non-major 43
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	12	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 37		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ECON 385 0101
 Title ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
 Instructor: GINDLING, THOMA
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 548
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	6	19	4.54	595/1576	4.54	4.24	4.30	4.30	4.54	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	18	4.54	568/1576	4.54	4.28	4.27	4.28	4.54	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	19	4.61	480/1342	4.61	4.28	4.32	4.30	4.61	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	7	5	13	4.24	880/1520	4.24	4.12	4.25	4.25	4.24	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	5	4	17	4.25	647/1465	4.25	4.08	4.12	4.09	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	0	9	16	4.41	524/1434	4.41	4.05	4.14	4.15	4.41	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	5	19	4.59	422/1547	4.59	4.34	4.19	4.21	4.59	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	25	4.93	375/1574	4.93	4.54	4.64	4.61	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	4	12	7	4.13	838/1554	4.13	4.04	4.10	4.09	4.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.59	4.47	4.47	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	2	22	4.84	708/1493	4.84	4.72	4.73	4.70	4.84	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	4	20	4.76	325/1486	4.76	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.76	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	1	21	4.79	322/1489	4.79	4.35	4.32	4.34	4.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	16	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	829/1277	3.86	3.82	4.03	4.11	3.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	649/1279	4.27	3.94	4.17	4.20	4.27	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	559/1270	4.60	4.00	4.35	4.42	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	644/1269	4.50	4.16	4.35	4.41	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	18	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 878	****	3.53	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	0	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	****/ 379	****	4.11	4.20	4.17	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	5	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	3.22	4.01	4.12	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 326	****	3.09	4.03	4.23	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	6	2	0	3.25	269/ 382	3.25	3.20	4.08	4.24	3.25	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	7	C	3	General	6	Under-grad	28	Non-major	16
84-150	10	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	17				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 405 0101
 Title BENEFIT-COST EVALUATIO
 Instructor: FARROW, ROBERT
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 549
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	7	7	6	3.81	1325/1576	3.81	4.24	4.30	4.46	3.81	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	7	5	7	3.81	1292/1576	3.81	4.28	4.27	4.35	3.81	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	7	9	4.14	912/1342	4.14	4.28	4.32	4.46	4.14	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	6	8	4.00	1041/1520	4.00	4.12	4.25	4.38	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	6	4	5	5	3.33	1317/1465	3.33	4.08	4.12	4.22	3.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	0	6	5	5	3.61	1167/1434	3.61	4.05	4.14	4.30	3.61	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	3	5	7	3	3.19	1424/1547	3.19	4.34	4.19	4.24	3.19	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	567/1574	4.86	4.54	4.64	4.69	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	8	5	2	3.50	1303/1554	3.50	4.04	4.10	4.24	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	2	5	11	4.37	1025/1488	4.37	4.59	4.47	4.55	4.37	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	1210/1493	4.50	4.72	4.73	4.80	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	7	4	7	3.89	1200/1486	3.89	4.33	4.32	4.41	3.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	5	6	8	4.16	1027/1489	4.16	4.35	4.32	4.38	4.16	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	1	1	5	5	3	3.53	1006/1277	3.53	3.82	4.03	4.04	3.53	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	2	2	3	1	3.38	1115/1279	3.38	3.94	4.17	4.31	3.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	756/1270	4.38	4.00	4.35	4.53	4.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	747/1269	4.38	4.16	4.35	4.55	4.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	2	3	2	0	1	0	1.83	874/ 878	1.83	3.53	4.05	4.33	1.83	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	7	1	4.13	200/ 379	4.13	4.11	4.20	4.19	4.13	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	9	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.00	3.22	4.01	3.90	3.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	9	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.00	3.09	4.03	3.97	3.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	10	0	0	3.00	313/ 382	3.00	3.20	4.08	3.88	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	3	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	4	Under-grad	18	Non-major	14
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	637/1576	4.50	4.24	4.30	4.46	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	279/1576	4.75	4.28	4.27	4.35	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	455/1342	4.63	4.28	4.32	4.46	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	1	0	5	7	4.14	961/1520	4.14	4.12	4.25	4.38	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	328/1465	4.56	4.08	4.12	4.22	4.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	524/1434	4.40	4.05	4.14	4.30	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	527/1547	4.50	4.34	4.19	4.24	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	9	5	4.27	1317/1574	4.27	4.54	4.64	4.69	4.27	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	742/1554	4.22	4.04	4.10	4.24	4.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	309/1488	4.87	4.59	4.47	4.55	4.87	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	390/1493	4.93	4.72	4.73	4.80	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	271/1486	4.80	4.33	4.32	4.41	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	309/1489	4.80	4.35	4.32	4.38	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	533/1277	4.25	3.82	4.03	4.04	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1279	****	3.94	4.17	4.31	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1270	****	4.00	4.35	4.53	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1269	****	4.16	4.35	4.55	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 878	****	3.53	4.05	4.33	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 379	****	4.11	4.20	4.19	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 375	****	3.22	4.01	3.90	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	3.09	4.03	3.97	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	6	1	0	3.14	297/ 382	3.14	3.20	4.08	3.88	3.14	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	16	Non-major	15
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	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	10				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ECON 410 0101
 Title TOPICS IN FIN ECON
 Instructor: CARPENTER, ROBE
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 551
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	18	4.68	401/1576	4.68	4.24	4.30	4.46	4.68	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	7	16	4.52	581/1576	4.52	4.28	4.27	4.35	4.52	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	20	4.68	393/1342	4.68	4.28	4.32	4.46	4.68	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	15	1	0	1	0	8	4.40	683/1520	4.40	4.12	4.25	4.38	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	5	4	11	4.19	708/1465	4.19	4.08	4.12	4.22	4.19	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	18	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	878/1434	4.00	4.05	4.14	4.30	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	4	18	4.67	339/1547	4.67	4.34	4.19	4.24	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	3	16	6	4.12	1411/1574	4.12	4.54	4.64	4.69	4.12	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	289/1554	4.63	4.04	4.10	4.24	4.63	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	21	4.84	339/1488	4.84	4.59	4.47	4.55	4.84	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	445/1493	4.92	4.72	4.73	4.80	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	4	19	4.68	453/1486	4.68	4.33	4.32	4.41	4.68	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	21	4.84	263/1489	4.84	4.35	4.32	4.38	4.84	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	1	6	16	4.50	309/1277	4.50	3.82	4.03	4.04	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	335/1279	4.67	3.94	4.17	4.31	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	574/1270	4.58	4.00	4.35	4.53	4.58	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	444/1269	4.75	4.16	4.35	4.55	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	8	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 878	****	3.53	4.05	4.33	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.45	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	1	0	0	0	7	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.00	4.11	4.20	4.19	4.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	1	0	0	6	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	3.22	4.01	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.70	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.30	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	1	0	0	6	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	3.09	4.03	3.97	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	1	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	****/ 382	****	3.20	4.08	3.88	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	11
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	1
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	5	D	0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	0
			Required for Majors	1	Graduate
			General	3	Under-grad
			Electives	1	Non-major
			Other	18	

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ECON 414 0101
 Title ECON OF ANTITRUST & RE
 Instructor: CARROLL, KATHLE
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 552
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	3	0	7	4.18	1027/1576	4.18	4.24	4.30	4.46	4.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	811/1576	4.36	4.28	4.27	4.35	4.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	3	3	3	3.80	1110/1342	3.80	4.28	4.32	4.46	3.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	3	2	1	4	3.60	1330/1520	3.60	4.12	4.25	4.38	3.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	1	1	5	3.70	1138/1465	3.70	4.08	4.12	4.22	3.70	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1021/1434	3.88	4.05	4.14	4.30	3.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	303/1547	4.70	4.34	4.19	4.24	4.70	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.54	4.64	4.69	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	860/1554	4.11	4.04	4.10	4.24	4.11	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	708/1488	4.64	4.59	4.47	4.55	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	1017/1493	4.70	4.72	4.73	4.80	4.70	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	1	6	4.20	1003/1486	4.20	4.33	4.32	4.41	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	813/1489	4.40	4.35	4.32	4.38	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	7	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1277	****	3.82	4.03	4.04	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	802/1279	4.00	3.94	4.17	4.31	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	412/1270	4.75	4.00	4.35	4.53	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	444/1269	4.75	4.16	4.35	4.55	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	164/ 878	4.67	3.53	4.05	4.33	4.67	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	4.11	4.20	4.19	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	3.22	4.01	3.90	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 326	****	3.09	4.03	3.97	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	313/ 382	3.00	3.20	4.08	3.88	3.00	

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	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	4	Under-grad	12	Non-major	8
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	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	5				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 421 0101
 Title INTRO TO ECONOMETRICS
 Instructor: YUAN, CHUNMING
 Enrollment: 43
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 553
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	14	4	3.54	1434/1576	3.54	4.24	4.30	4.46	3.54	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	6	9	8	3.68	1341/1576	3.68	4.28	4.27	4.35	3.68	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	6	2	8	11	3.79	1119/1342	3.79	4.28	4.32	4.46	3.79	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	1	2	3	9	5	3.75	1256/1520	3.75	4.12	4.25	4.38	3.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	2	3	2	8	6	3.62	1201/1465	3.62	4.08	4.12	4.22	3.62	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	3	0	4	7	3	3.41	1257/1434	3.41	4.05	4.14	4.30	3.41	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	7	4	15	4.11	971/1547	4.11	4.34	4.19	4.24	4.11	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	0	0	3	23	4.88	508/1574	4.88	4.54	4.64	4.69	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	4	1	6	13	0	3.17	1415/1554	3.17	4.04	4.10	4.24	3.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	1	5	4	14	4.04	1224/1488	4.04	4.59	4.47	4.55	4.04	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	2	7	16	4.42	1270/1493	4.42	4.72	4.73	4.80	4.42	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	4	1	7	8	6	3.42	1355/1486	3.42	4.33	4.32	4.41	3.42	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	4	2	1	8	11	3.77	1251/1489	3.77	4.35	4.32	4.38	3.77	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	16	3	2	5	1	0	2.36	1250/1277	2.36	3.82	4.03	4.04	2.36	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	4	0	2	2	3	3.00	1186/1279	3.00	3.94	4.17	4.31	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	3	2	4	2	0	2.45	1251/1270	2.45	4.00	4.35	4.53	2.45	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	5	2	1	2	1	2.27	1254/1269	2.27	4.16	4.35	4.55	2.27	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	9	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 878	****	3.53	4.05	4.33	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.28	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.45	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.70	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.56	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	2	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 379	****	4.11	4.20	4.19	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.77	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.64	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.52	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	1	0	0	4	1	2	3.71	201/ 375	3.71	3.22	4.01	3.90	3.71	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.70	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.30	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.60	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	1	0	0	5	1	0	3.17	****/ 326	****	3.09	4.03	3.97	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	1	0	0	7	2	0	3.22	276/ 382	3.22	3.20	4.08	3.88	3.22	

Course-Section: ECON 421 0101
 Title INTRO TO ECONOMETRICS
 Instructor: YUAN, CHUNMING
 Enrollment: 43
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 553
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	8	General	4	Under-grad	28	Non-major	22
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 444 0101
 Title HIST OF ECON THOUGHT I
 Instructor: BRADLEY, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 554
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	8	4.47	697/1576	4.47	4.24	4.30	4.46	4.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	668/1576	4.47	4.28	4.27	4.35	4.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	857/1342	4.22	4.28	4.32	4.46	4.22	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	429/1520	4.57	4.12	4.25	4.38	4.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	5	8	4.33	571/1465	4.33	4.08	4.12	4.22	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	209/1434	4.73	4.05	4.14	4.30	4.73	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	900/1547	4.20	4.34	4.19	4.24	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	702/1574	4.79	4.54	4.64	4.69	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	289/1554	4.64	4.04	4.10	4.24	4.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	736/1488	4.62	4.59	4.47	4.55	4.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	445/1493	4.92	4.72	4.73	4.80	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	642/1486	4.54	4.33	4.32	4.41	4.54	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	364/1489	4.77	4.35	4.32	4.38	4.77	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	7	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	159/1277	4.75	3.82	4.03	4.04	4.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	771/1279	4.10	3.94	4.17	4.31	4.10	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	3	1	5	4.00	928/1270	4.00	4.00	4.35	4.53	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	644/1269	4.50	4.16	4.35	4.55	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	400/ 878	4.20	3.53	4.05	4.33	4.20	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	3.22	4.01	3.90	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	3.09	4.03	3.97	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.20	4.08	3.88	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ECON 451 0101
 Title LABOR ECONOMICS
 Instructor: GOLDFARB, MARSH
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 555
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	485/1576	4.61	4.24	4.30	4.46	4.61	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	608/1576	4.50	4.28	4.27	4.35	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	531/1342	4.56	4.28	4.32	4.46	4.56	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	0	1	4	6	4.17	945/1520	4.17	4.12	4.25	4.38	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	353/1465	4.53	4.08	4.12	4.22	4.53	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	878/1434	4.00	4.05	4.14	4.30	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	4	11	4.33	755/1547	4.33	4.34	4.19	4.24	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	3	11	4	4.06	1441/1574	4.06	4.54	4.64	4.69	4.06	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	8	7	4.47	449/1554	4.47	4.04	4.10	4.24	4.47	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	505/1488	4.75	4.59	4.47	4.55	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	1029/1493	4.69	4.72	4.73	4.80	4.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	530/1486	4.63	4.33	4.32	4.41	4.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	625/1489	4.56	4.35	4.32	4.38	4.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	6	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	692/1277	4.00	3.82	4.03	4.04	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	802/1279	4.00	3.94	4.17	4.31	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1116/1270	3.60	4.00	4.35	4.53	3.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	852/1269	4.20	4.16	4.35	4.55	4.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	3	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 878	****	3.53	4.05	4.33	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	115/ 379	4.38	4.11	4.20	4.19	4.38	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	9	1	0	3.10	282/ 375	3.10	3.22	4.01	3.90	3.10	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	193/ 326	3.40	3.09	4.03	3.97	3.40	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	5	1	1	3.43	231/ 382	3.43	3.20	4.08	3.88	3.43	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	18	Non-major	8
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 453 0101
 Title HOUSEHOLD ECONOMICS
 Instructor: LORD, WILLIAM
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 556
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	2	7	7	7	3.60	1410/1576	3.60	4.24	4.30	4.46	3.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	5	8	9	3.92	1217/1576	3.92	4.28	4.27	4.35	3.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	4	5	5	11	3.92	1048/1342	3.92	4.28	4.32	4.46	3.92	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	14	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	998/1520	4.09	4.12	4.25	4.38	4.09	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	4	2	7	9	3.83	1051/1465	3.83	4.08	4.12	4.22	3.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	16	0	2	0	3	4	4.00	878/1434	4.00	4.05	4.14	4.30	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	2	19	4.56	457/1547	4.56	4.34	4.19	4.24	4.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	12	12	4.50	1079/1574	4.50	4.54	4.64	4.69	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	1	7	8	2	3.47	1317/1554	3.47	4.04	4.10	4.24	3.47	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	5	17	4.56	798/1488	4.56	4.59	4.47	4.55	4.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4	20	4.76	888/1493	4.76	4.72	4.73	4.80	4.76	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	5	5	13	4.16	1025/1486	4.16	4.33	4.32	4.41	4.16	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	4	8	10	3.96	1147/1489	3.96	4.35	4.32	4.38	3.96	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	1	0	4	3	9	4.12	645/1277	4.12	3.82	4.03	4.04	4.12	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	3	3	2	7	3.69	993/1279	3.69	3.94	4.17	4.31	3.69	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	2	6	7	4.19	860/1270	4.19	4.00	4.35	4.53	4.19	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	2	2	3	9	4.19	858/1269	4.19	4.16	4.35	4.55	4.19	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	10	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	****/ 878	****	3.53	4.05	4.33	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	193/ 379	4.14	4.11	4.20	4.19	4.14	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	7	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.00	3.22	4.01	3.90	3.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	4	2	0	3.33	****/ 326	****	3.09	4.03	3.97	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	4	1	1	3.50	****/ 382	****	3.20	4.08	3.88	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	6	General	4	Under-grad	26	Non-major	20
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	637/1576	4.50	4.24	4.30	4.46	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	476/1576	4.60	4.28	4.27	4.35	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	369/1342	4.70	4.28	4.32	4.46	4.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	4	5	8	4.11	985/1520	4.11	4.12	4.25	4.38	4.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	6	4	7	3.94	933/1465	3.94	4.08	4.12	4.22	3.94	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	6	3	7	3.60	1172/1434	3.60	4.05	4.14	4.30	3.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	2	16	4.65	351/1547	4.65	4.34	4.19	4.24	4.65	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	15	3	4.05	1441/1574	4.05	4.54	4.64	4.69	4.05	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	436/1554	4.47	4.04	4.10	4.24	4.47	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	610/1488	4.71	4.59	4.47	4.55	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	607/1493	4.88	4.72	4.73	4.80	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	654/1486	4.53	4.33	4.32	4.41	4.53	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	364/1489	4.76	4.35	4.32	4.38	4.76	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	13	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/1277	****	3.82	4.03	4.04	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/1279	****	3.94	4.17	4.31	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	****/1270	****	4.00	4.35	4.53	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	****/1269	****	4.16	4.35	4.55	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	2	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 878	****	3.53	4.05	4.33	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	9	1	4.10	208/ 379	4.10	4.11	4.20	4.19	4.10	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.77	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.64	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.52	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	10	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.00	3.22	4.01	3.90	3.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	6	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.00	3.09	4.03	3.97	3.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	7	3	0	3.30	257/ 382	3.30	3.20	4.08	3.88	3.30	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	2	Under-grad	20	Non-major	13
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	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	15				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 467 0101
 Title HEALTH ECONOMICS
 Instructor: MA, BING
 Enrollment: 65
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 558
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	5	20	4.47	697/1576	4.47	4.24	4.30	4.46	4.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	4	4	22	4.60	476/1576	4.60	4.28	4.27	4.35	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	2	26	4.71	357/1342	4.71	4.28	4.32	4.46	4.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	9	1	2	1	5	13	4.23	891/1520	4.23	4.12	4.25	4.38	4.23	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	1	6	9	11	4.00	850/1465	4.00	4.08	4.12	4.22	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	12	0	2	2	5	10	4.21	727/1434	4.21	4.05	4.14	4.30	4.21	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	3	6	21	4.60	411/1547	4.60	4.34	4.19	4.24	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	1	4	24	4.70	866/1574	4.70	4.54	4.64	4.69	4.70	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	2	0	0	1	13	5	4.21	752/1554	4.21	4.04	4.10	4.24	4.21	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	6	23	4.73	547/1488	4.73	4.59	4.47	4.55	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	3	5	22	4.63	1089/1493	4.63	4.72	4.73	4.80	4.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	5	23	4.76	339/1486	4.76	4.33	4.32	4.41	4.76	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	4	23	4.72	420/1489	4.72	4.35	4.32	4.38	4.72	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	15	2	2	1	3	4	3.42	1061/1277	3.42	3.82	4.03	4.04	3.42	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	488/1279	4.47	3.94	4.17	4.31	4.47	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	798/1270	4.31	4.00	4.35	4.53	4.31	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	728/1269	4.40	4.16	4.35	4.55	4.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	6	0	1	2	4	2	3.78	620/ 878	3.78	3.53	4.05	4.33	3.78	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	30	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.28	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.45	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.70	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	30	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.56	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	0	0	0	0	7	3	4.30	139/ 379	4.30	4.11	4.20	4.19	4.30	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.77	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.64	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.52	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	9	1	1	3.27	242/ 375	3.27	3.22	4.01	3.90	3.27	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.70	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.30	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.60	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	1	0	0	13	2	1	3.25	213/ 326	3.25	3.09	4.03	3.97	3.25	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	9	0	2	3.36	243/ 382	3.36	3.20	4.08	3.88	3.36	

Course-Section: ECON 467 0101
 Title HEALTH ECONOMICS
 Instructor: MA, BING
 Enrollment: 65
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 558
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	15	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	5	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	32	Non-major	25
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	20				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 471 0101
 Title MONEY & CAPITAL MARKET
 Instructor: CARPENTER, ROBE
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 559
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	3	6	6	3.88	1257/1576	3.88	4.24	4.30	4.46	3.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	7	6	4.00	1138/1576	4.00	4.28	4.27	4.35	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	3	10	4.18	892/1342	4.18	4.28	4.32	4.46	4.18	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1520	****	4.12	4.25	4.38	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	5	4	5	4.00	850/1465	4.00	4.08	4.12	4.22	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	15	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1434	****	4.05	4.14	4.30	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	2	3	9	4.00	1041/1547	4.00	4.34	4.19	4.24	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	14	2	4.06	1441/1574	4.06	4.54	4.64	4.69	4.06	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	2	1	6	2	3.73	1187/1554	3.73	4.04	4.10	4.24	3.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	2	12	4.56	798/1488	4.56	4.59	4.47	4.55	4.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	908/1493	4.75	4.72	4.73	4.80	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	951/1486	4.27	4.33	4.32	4.41	4.27	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	1	4	8	4.00	1118/1489	4.00	4.35	4.32	4.38	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	3	1	1	5	5	3.53	1006/1277	3.53	3.82	4.03	4.04	3.53	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	445/1279	4.50	3.94	4.17	4.31	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	784/1270	4.33	4.00	4.35	4.53	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	773/1269	4.33	4.16	4.35	4.55	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	4	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 878	****	3.53	4.05	4.33	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.28	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.45	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.70	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.56	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 379	****	4.11	4.20	4.19	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.77	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.64	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.52	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 375	****	3.22	4.01	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.70	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.30	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.60	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	5	0	1	3.33	200/ 326	3.33	3.09	4.03	3.97	3.33	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	1	0	0	4	1	2	3.71	199/ 382	3.71	3.20	4.08	3.88	3.71	

Course-Section: ECON 471 0101
 Title MONEY & CAPITAL MARKET
 Instructor: CARPENTER, ROBE
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 559
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	17	Non-major	16
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 475 0101
 Title FINANCIAL INVSTMT ANA
 Instructor: LAMDIN, DOUGLAS
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 560
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	1	8	10	4.35	840/1576	4.35	4.24	4.30	4.46	4.35	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	8	11	4.45	698/1576	4.45	4.28	4.27	4.35	4.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	531/1342	4.55	4.28	4.32	4.46	4.55	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	8	9	4.53	487/1520	4.53	4.12	4.25	4.38	4.53	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	328/1465	4.56	4.08	4.12	4.22	4.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	1	9	8	4.21	727/1434	4.21	4.05	4.14	4.30	4.21	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	186/1547	4.81	4.34	4.19	4.24	4.81	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	0	0	13	6	4.32	1279/1574	4.32	4.54	4.64	4.69	4.32	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	597/1554	4.36	4.04	4.10	4.24	4.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	278/1488	4.89	4.59	4.47	4.55	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	334/1493	4.94	4.72	4.73	4.80	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	468/1486	4.67	4.33	4.32	4.41	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	5	12	4.56	637/1489	4.56	4.35	4.32	4.38	4.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	1	0	1	5	8	4.27	524/1277	4.27	3.82	4.03	4.04	4.27	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	641/1279	4.29	3.94	4.17	4.31	4.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	716/1270	4.43	4.00	4.35	4.53	4.43	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	803/1269	4.29	4.16	4.35	4.55	4.29	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	5	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 878	****	3.53	4.05	4.33	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.45	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	1	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/ 379	****	4.11	4.20	4.19	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.77	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.64	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	1	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 375	****	3.22	4.01	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.70	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.30	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.60	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 326	****	3.09	4.03	3.97	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	1	0	0	3	3	0	3.50	219/ 382	3.50	3.20	4.08	3.88	3.50	

Course-Section: ECON 475 0101
 Title FINANCIAL INVSTMNT ANA
 Instructor: LAMDIN, DOUGLAS
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 560
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	2	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	7	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	14				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 476 0101
 Title PORTFOLIO MANAGEMENT
 Instructor: YUAN, CHUNMING
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 561
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	6	3	11	3.96	1194/1576	3.96	4.24	4.30	4.46	3.96	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	5	7	8	3.87	1259/1576	3.87	4.28	4.27	4.35	3.87	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	7	12	4.35	761/1342	4.35	4.28	4.32	4.46	4.35	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	3	8	10	4.23	891/1520	4.23	4.12	4.25	4.38	4.23	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	2	4	6	8	4.00	850/1465	4.00	4.08	4.12	4.22	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	2	8	8	4.33	594/1434	4.33	4.05	4.14	4.30	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	6	13	4.30	784/1547	4.30	4.34	4.19	4.24	4.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	235/1574	4.95	4.54	4.64	4.69	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	3	4	4	4	3.60	1267/1554	3.60	4.04	4.10	4.24	3.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	2	5	12	4.40	995/1488	4.40	4.59	4.47	4.55	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	0	1	18	4.80	810/1493	4.80	4.72	4.73	4.80	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	4	2	6	7	3.70	1273/1486	3.70	4.33	4.32	4.41	3.70	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	2	3	5	7	3.55	1305/1489	3.55	4.35	4.32	4.38	3.55	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	12	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	506/1277	4.29	3.82	4.03	4.04	4.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	1	2	1	4	3.67	1000/1279	3.67	3.94	4.17	4.31	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	2	2	1	4	3.78	1045/1270	3.78	4.00	4.35	4.53	3.78	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	928/1269	4.00	4.16	4.35	4.55	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	5	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 878	****	3.53	4.05	4.33	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.45	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.70	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.56	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	1	0	0	0	7	1	4.13	200/ 379	4.13	4.11	4.20	4.19	4.13	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.77	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.64	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	1	0	0	8	2	0	3.20	254/ 375	3.20	3.22	4.01	3.90	3.20	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.70	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.30	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.60	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	1	0	0	5	2	0	3.29	207/ 326	3.29	3.09	4.03	3.97	3.29	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	1	0	0	5	0	1	3.33	250/ 382	3.33	3.20	4.08	3.88	3.33	

Course-Section: ECON 476 0101
 Title PORTFOLIO MANAGEMENT
 Instructor: YUAN, CHUNMING
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 561
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	2	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	B	12						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	3	Under-grad	23	Non-major	21
84-150	14	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 478 0101
 Title REAL ESTATE ECON AND F
 Instructor: GETTER, DARYL
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 562
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	1	1	2	13	4.59	527/1576	4.59	4.24	4.30	4.46	4.59	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	2	3	11	4.41	743/1576	4.41	4.28	4.27	4.35	4.41	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	0	2	4	10	4.29	804/1342	4.29	4.28	4.32	4.46	4.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	1	2	2	2	9	4.00	1041/1520	4.00	4.12	4.25	4.38	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	8	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	788/1465	4.11	4.08	4.12	4.22	4.11	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	7	1	1	0	2	6	4.10	836/1434	4.10	4.05	4.14	4.30	4.10	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	575/1547	4.47	4.34	4.19	4.24	4.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	851/1574	4.71	4.54	4.64	4.69	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	395/1554	4.50	4.04	4.10	4.24	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	324/1488	4.86	4.59	4.47	4.55	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.72	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	298/1486	4.79	4.33	4.32	4.41	4.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	1	0	12	4.57	614/1489	4.57	4.35	4.32	4.38	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	4	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	404/1277	4.40	3.82	4.03	4.04	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	445/1279	4.50	3.94	4.17	4.31	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	871/1270	4.17	4.00	4.35	4.53	4.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	644/1269	4.50	4.16	4.35	4.55	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	2	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 878	****	3.53	4.05	4.33	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	8	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.00	4.11	4.20	4.19	4.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	7	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.00	3.22	4.01	3.90	3.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	3.09	4.03	3.97	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	6	0	2	3.50	219/ 382	3.50	3.20	4.08	3.88	3.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	4	Under-grad	19	Non-major	17
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 493 0501
 Title INDIV RESEARCH IN ECON
 Instructor: CARROLL, KATHLE
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 563
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.24	4.30	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.28	4.27	4.35	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.12	4.25	4.38	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.08	4.12	4.22	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.05	4.14	4.30	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.34	4.19	4.24	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.54	4.64	4.69	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.04	4.10	4.24	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ECON 600 0101
 Title POLICY CONSQ:ECON ANAL
 Instructor: BRENNAN, TIMOTH
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 564
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	2	1	6	3.75	1345/1576	3.75	4.24	4.30	4.43	3.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	851/1576	4.33	4.28	4.27	4.32	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	2	3.83	1097/1342	3.83	4.28	4.32	4.38	3.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	994/1520	4.10	4.12	4.25	4.36	4.10	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	3	4	3.83	1043/1465	3.83	4.08	4.12	4.25	3.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1021/1434	3.88	4.05	4.14	4.35	3.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	0	5	5	4.08	985/1547	4.08	4.34	4.19	4.24	4.08	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	606/1574	4.83	4.54	4.64	4.75	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	2	4	1	3.63	1253/1554	3.63	4.04	4.10	4.18	3.63	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	568/1488	4.73	4.59	4.47	4.52	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	557/1493	4.91	4.72	4.73	4.80	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	1101/1486	4.00	4.33	4.32	4.37	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	2	6	4.09	1070/1489	4.09	4.35	4.32	4.38	4.09	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	9	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	692/1277	4.00	3.82	4.03	4.08	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	2	3	4	3.64	1011/1279	3.64	3.94	4.17	4.34	3.64	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	763/1270	4.36	4.00	4.35	4.53	4.36	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	754/1269	4.36	4.16	4.35	4.55	4.36	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	8	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 878	****	3.53	4.05	4.11	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.00	4.11	4.20	4.37	4.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	209/ 375	3.50	3.22	4.01	4.10	3.50	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.00	3.09	4.03	4.10	3.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	208/ 382	3.60	3.20	4.08	4.13	3.60	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	8	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	4	Non-major	12
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ECON 602 0101
 Title MACROECONOMIC ANALYSIS
 Instructor: CINYABUGUMA, MA
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 565
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	187/1576	4.88	4.24	4.30	4.43	4.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	939/1576	4.25	4.28	4.27	4.32	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	735/1342	4.38	4.28	4.32	4.38	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	3	3	3.88	1185/1520	3.88	4.12	4.25	4.36	3.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	778/1465	4.13	4.08	4.12	4.25	4.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1063/1434	3.80	4.05	4.14	4.35	3.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	0	0	4	2	3.86	1182/1547	3.86	4.34	4.19	4.24	3.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	911/1574	4.67	4.54	4.64	4.75	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	772/1554	4.20	4.04	4.10	4.18	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	666/1488	4.67	4.59	4.47	4.52	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	1053/1493	4.67	4.72	4.73	4.80	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	678/1486	4.50	4.33	4.32	4.37	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	888/1489	4.33	4.35	4.32	4.38	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1149/1277	3.00	3.82	4.03	4.08	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1279	****	3.94	4.17	4.34	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1270	****	4.00	4.35	4.53	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1269	****	4.16	4.35	4.55	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 379	****	4.11	4.20	4.37	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.79	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.77	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.70	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.70	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	223/ 375	3.40	3.22	4.01	4.10	3.40	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.00	3.09	4.03	4.10	3.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	219/ 382	3.50	3.20	4.08	4.13	3.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ECON 612 0101
 Title ECONOMETRICS II
 Instructor: VIAUROUX, CHRIS
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 566
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	3	2	5	3.91	1241/1576	3.91	4.24	4.30	4.43	3.91	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	4	2	2	3.40	1438/1576	3.40	4.28	4.27	4.32	3.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	3	2	2	3.09	1287/1342	3.09	4.28	4.32	4.38	3.09	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	2	1	3	3	3.50	1362/1520	3.50	4.12	4.25	4.36	3.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	2	1	1	1	1	2.67	1439/1465	2.67	4.08	4.12	4.25	2.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	1	3	5	3.82	1057/1434	3.82	4.05	4.14	4.35	3.82	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	3	3	3	3.70	1259/1547	3.70	4.34	4.19	4.24	3.70	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	469/1574	4.91	4.54	4.64	4.75	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	4	2	0	3.00	1448/1554	3.00	4.04	4.10	4.18	3.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	1072/1488	4.30	4.59	4.47	4.52	4.30	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	810/1493	4.80	4.72	4.73	4.80	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	2	3	3	0	2.70	1458/1486	2.70	4.33	4.32	4.37	2.70	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	3	1	3	3.20	1392/1489	3.20	4.35	4.32	4.38	3.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1086/1277	3.33	3.82	4.03	4.08	3.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	603/1279	4.33	3.94	4.17	4.34	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	928/1270	4.00	4.00	4.35	4.53	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	535/1269	4.67	4.16	4.35	4.55	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 878	****	3.53	4.05	4.11	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 379	****	4.11	4.20	4.37	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	3.22	4.01	4.10	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.00	3.09	4.03	4.10	3.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.20	4.08	4.13	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ECON 652 0101
 Title ECONOMICS OF HEALTH
 Instructor: MA, BING
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 567
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1445/1576	3.50	4.24	4.30	4.43	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	608/1576	4.50	4.28	4.27	4.32	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	972/1342	4.00	4.28	4.32	4.38	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1041/1520	4.00	4.12	4.25	4.36	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1448/1465	2.50	4.08	4.12	4.25	2.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	398/1434	4.50	4.05	4.14	4.35	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1041/1547	4.00	4.34	4.19	4.24	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1079/1574	4.50	4.54	4.64	4.75	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1448/1554	3.00	4.04	4.10	4.18	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	870/1488	4.50	4.59	4.47	4.52	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1210/1493	4.50	4.72	4.73	4.80	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	678/1486	4.50	4.33	4.32	4.37	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	696/1489	4.50	4.35	4.32	4.38	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	5.00	3.82	4.03	4.08	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	802/1279	4.00	3.94	4.17	4.34	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1261/1270	2.00	4.00	4.35	4.53	2.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1259/1269	2.00	4.16	4.35	4.55	2.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	877/ 878	1.00	3.53	4.05	4.11	1.00

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ECON 701 1301
 Title INDIVIDUAL STUDY IN EC
 Instructor: MITCH, DAVID F
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 568
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.24	4.30	4.43	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.28	4.27	4.32	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.28	4.32	4.38	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.12	4.25	4.36	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.08	4.12	4.25	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.05	4.14	4.35	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.34	4.19	4.24	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.54	4.64	4.75	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.04	4.10	4.18	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.59	4.47	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.72	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.33	4.32	4.37	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.35	4.32	4.38	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	5.00	3.82	4.03	4.08	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1279	5.00	3.94	4.17	4.34	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.00	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.16	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	3.53	4.05	4.11	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ECON 801 1901
 Title INDIVIDUAL STUDY IN EC
 Instructor: YUAN, CHUNMING
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 569
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1148/1576	4.00	4.24	4.30	4.43	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1523/1576	3.00	4.28	4.27	4.32	3.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1294/1342	3.00	4.28	4.32	4.38	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1041/1520	4.00	4.12	4.25	4.36	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.08	4.12	4.25	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	878/1434	4.00	4.05	4.14	4.35	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.34	4.19	4.24	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1459/1574	4.00	4.54	4.64	4.75	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1448/1554	3.00	4.04	4.10	4.18	3.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1233/1488	4.00	4.59	4.47	4.52	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1490/1493	3.00	4.72	4.73	4.80	3.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1101/1486	4.00	4.33	4.32	4.37	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1118/1489	4.00	4.35	4.32	4.38	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	692/1277	4.00	3.82	4.03	4.08	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1279	5.00	3.94	4.17	4.34	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	928/1270	4.00	4.00	4.35	4.53	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.16	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	464/ 878	4.00	3.53	4.05	4.11	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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