

Course-Section: ECAC 329 0101
 Title COST ACCOUNTING
 Instructor: DAVIS, MARY B
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 510
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	233/1674	4.66	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.81	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	270/1674	4.68	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	262/1423	4.70	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	292/1609	4.45	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.69	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	2	1	3	2	5	3.54	1205/1585	3.95	4.04	3.96	3.95	3.54	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	6	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	283/1535	4.42	4.08	4.08	4.15	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	169/1651	4.81	4.20	4.18	4.16	4.81	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	123/1656	4.66	4.06	4.07	4.07	4.87	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	266/1586	4.87	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.66	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	409/1582	4.67	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.69	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	467/1575	4.73	4.32	4.27	4.25	4.69	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	8	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	585/1380	3.86	3.94	3.94	4.01	4.14	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	572/1520	3.94	4.14	4.01	4.09	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	289/1515	4.58	4.37	4.24	4.32	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	642/1511	4.31	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	95/ 994	4.73	3.97	3.94	3.96	4.80	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 4	General	2
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	13
			? 0		

Course-Section: ECAC 329 0201
 Title COST ACCOUNTING
 Instructor: DAVIS, MARY B
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 511
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	0	4	9	4.50	607/1674	4.66	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	460/1674	4.68	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	404/1423	4.70	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	1	5	7	4.21	905/1609	4.45	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.21	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	462/1585	3.95	4.04	3.96	3.95	4.36	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	1	4	7	4.23	691/1535	4.42	4.08	4.08	4.15	4.23	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	175/1651	4.81	4.20	4.18	4.16	4.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	437/1656	4.66	4.06	4.07	4.07	4.46	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	301/1586	4.87	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.66	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	467/1582	4.67	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	343/1575	4.73	4.32	4.27	4.25	4.77	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	0	2	1	2	2	3.57	1009/1380	3.86	3.94	3.94	4.01	3.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	2	2	3	3.56	1149/1520	3.94	4.14	4.01	4.09	3.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	827/1515	4.58	4.37	4.24	4.32	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	1011/1511	4.31	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.11	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	148/ 994	4.73	3.97	3.94	3.96	4.67	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.49	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.33	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.18	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	4.29	****	

Course-Section: ECAC 329 0201
 Title COST ACCOUNTING
 Instructor: DAVIS, MARY B
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 511
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	15	Non-major	2
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECAC 330 0101
 Title TAXATION
 Instructor: ST MARTIN, JEAN
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 512
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.23	4.27	4.26	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	207/1674	4.82	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.82	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	160/1423	4.86	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	173/1609	4.80	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	238/1585	4.64	4.04	3.96	3.95	4.64	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	161/1535	4.76	4.08	4.08	4.15	4.76	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	139/1651	4.86	4.20	4.18	4.16	4.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	10	11	4.52	1189/1673	4.52	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.52	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	239/1656	4.69	4.06	4.07	4.07	4.69	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	371/1586	4.82	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	567/1585	4.91	4.72	4.69	4.66	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	236/1582	4.82	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	268/1575	4.82	4.32	4.27	4.25	4.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	14	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	399/1380	4.38	3.94	3.94	4.01	4.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	274/1520	4.70	4.14	4.01	4.09	4.70	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	325/1515	4.80	4.37	4.24	4.32	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	642/1511	4.50	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	6	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 994	****	3.97	3.94	3.96	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.26	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.24	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 10	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 22
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	17
			? 1		