

Course Section: ECAC 317 0101
 Title ACCOUNTING INFOR SYSTE
 Instructor: EISENMAN, S
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 468
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	1	3	3	3.67	1409/1669	3.67	4.37	4.23	4.28	3.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	1	5	4.00	1094/1666	4.00	4.45	4.19	4.20	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	1	5	4.00	969/1421	4.00	4.47	4.24	4.25	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	1179/1617	3.89	4.33	4.15	4.22	3.89	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	687/1555	4.13	4.29	4.00	4.03	4.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	3	1	2	3.43	1294/1543	3.43	4.13	4.06	4.14	3.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	896/1647	4.22	4.52	4.12	4.14	4.22	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	6	1	3.89	1596/1668	3.89	4.70	4.67	4.68	3.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	1	1	4	1	3.38	1412/1605	3.38	4.16	4.07	4.09	3.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	1281/1514	3.88	4.61	4.39	4.46	3.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	1193/1551	4.50	4.84	4.66	4.70	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	1180/1503	3.88	4.48	4.24	4.28	3.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	1	4	3.75	1243/1506	3.75	4.34	4.26	4.30	3.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	3	0	4	3.75	791/1311	3.75	4.06	3.85	3.97	3.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1490	5.00	4.40	4.05	4.11	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	393/1502	4.75	4.62	4.26	4.28	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.58	4.29	4.35	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1006	****	4.16	4.00	4.10	****	

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 4		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	9
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Major 9
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	4
			? 0		

Course Section: ECAC 329 0101
 Title COST ACCOUNTING
 Instructor: DAVIS, MARY B
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 469
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	1	5	18	4.46	647/1669	4.49	4.37	4.23	4.28	4.46	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	21	4.69	319/1666	4.64	4.45	4.19	4.20	4.69	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	20	4.69	356/1421	4.43	4.47	4.24	4.25	4.69	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	1	1	4	13	4.35	695/1617	4.43	4.33	4.15	4.22	4.35	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	3	3	6	6	3.68	1118/1555	4.09	4.29	4.00	4.03	3.68	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	1	5	1	11	4.22	690/1543	4.39	4.13	4.06	4.14	4.22	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	22	4.85	145/1647	4.84	4.52	4.12	4.14	4.85	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1668	4.97	4.70	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	3	3	15	4.45	436/1605	4.43	4.16	4.07	4.09	4.45	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	22	4.81	360/1514	4.80	4.61	4.39	4.46	4.81	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/1551	4.95	4.84	4.66	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	4	18	4.54	528/1503	4.43	4.48	4.24	4.28	4.54	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	5	19	4.54	613/1506	4.42	4.34	4.26	4.30	4.54	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	16	2	0	1	1	6	3.90	699/1311	4.16	4.06	3.85	3.97	3.90	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	****/1490	4.88	4.40	4.05	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	****/1502	4.75	4.62	4.26	4.28	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	****/1489	4.38	4.58	4.29	4.35	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	20	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/1006	4.88	4.16	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.13	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	2	Under-grad	26	Non-major	26
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	9	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	21				
				?	1						

Course Section: ECAC 329 0201
 Title: COST ACCOUNTING
 Instructor: DAVIS, MARY B
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 470
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	567/1669	4.49	4.37	4.23	4.28	4.53	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	472/1666	4.64	4.45	4.19	4.20	4.58	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	7	9	4.16	894/1421	4.43	4.47	4.24	4.25	4.16	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	1	1	2	10	4.50	496/1617	4.43	4.33	4.15	4.22	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	340/1555	4.09	4.29	4.00	4.03	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	344/1543	4.39	4.13	4.06	4.14	4.56	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	145/1647	4.84	4.52	4.12	4.14	4.84	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	428/1668	4.97	4.70	4.67	4.68	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	499/1605	4.43	4.16	4.07	4.09	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	1	17	4.79	392/1514	4.80	4.61	4.39	4.46	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	539/1551	4.95	4.84	4.66	4.70	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	6	10	4.32	823/1503	4.43	4.48	4.24	4.28	4.32	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	3	3	10	4.29	876/1506	4.42	4.34	4.26	4.30	4.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	11	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	319/1311	4.16	4.06	3.85	3.97	4.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	162/1490	4.88	4.40	4.05	4.11	4.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	393/1502	4.75	4.62	4.26	4.28	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	827/1489	4.38	4.58	4.29	4.35	4.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	105/1006	4.88	4.16	4.00	4.10	4.88	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	2	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	18	Non-major	19
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						

Course Section: ECAC 330 0101
 Title TAXATION
 Instructor: ST MARTIN, JEAN
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 471
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	25	4.79	219/1669	4.79	4.37	4.23	4.28	4.79	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	21	4.66	372/1666	4.66	4.45	4.19	4.20	4.66	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	23	4.69	368/1421	4.69	4.47	4.24	4.25	4.69	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	3	3	19	4.54	465/1617	4.54	4.33	4.15	4.22	4.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	5	5	15	4.31	516/1555	4.31	4.29	4.00	4.03	4.31	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	2	4	17	4.54	353/1543	4.54	4.13	4.06	4.14	4.54	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	5	21	4.59	389/1647	4.59	4.52	4.12	4.14	4.59	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	24	4	4.10	1477/1668	4.10	4.70	4.67	4.68	4.10	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	1	9	13	4.38	538/1605	4.38	4.16	4.07	4.09	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	7	19	4.67	584/1514	4.67	4.61	4.39	4.46	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	1	25	4.89	567/1551	4.89	4.84	4.66	4.70	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	7	18	4.59	473/1503	4.59	4.48	4.24	4.28	4.59	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	5	21	4.70	421/1506	4.70	4.34	4.26	4.30	4.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	18	1	1	0	3	4	3.89	712/1311	3.89	4.06	3.85	3.97	3.89	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	3	1	7	4.17	764/1490	4.17	4.40	4.05	4.11	4.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	741/1502	4.42	4.62	4.26	4.28	4.42	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	865/1489	4.33	4.58	4.29	4.35	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	4	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	235/1006	4.50	4.16	4.00	4.10	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	28	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.17	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.13	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	4.47	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	4.15	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	28	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	28	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	27	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****	

Course Section: ECAC 330 0101
 Title TAXATION
 Instructor: ST MARTIN, JEAN
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 471
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	4	Under-grad	29	Non-major	29
84-150	16	3.00-3.49	15	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	0						