

Course-Section: ECAC 329 1
 Title Cost Accounting
 Instructor: Hardy, Timothy W
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 438
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	1	11	8	4	3.33	1435/1509	3.33	3.99	4.31	4.32	3.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	6	6	7	6	3.33	1419/1509	3.33	3.94	4.26	4.25	3.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	3	6	7	7	3.37	1195/1287	3.37	3.97	4.30	4.33	3.37
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	1	7	8	8	3.73	1202/1459	3.73	4.19	4.22	4.26	3.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	2	0	6	7	8	3.83	994/1406	3.83	4.12	4.09	4.12	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	6	4	8	4	5	2.93	1339/1384	2.93	3.71	4.11	4.15	2.93
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	5	3	17	4.30	717/1489	4.30	4.31	4.17	4.14	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	16	11	4.41	1166/1506	4.41	4.53	4.67	4.67	4.41
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	2	3	9	4	3	3.14	1370/1463	3.14	3.77	4.09	4.08	3.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	4	7	3	12	3.78	1308/1438	3.78	4.38	4.46	4.43	3.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	4	8	13	4.27	1289/1421	4.27	4.57	4.73	4.73	4.27
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	8	6	0	11	3.46	1289/1411	3.46	4.20	4.31	4.29	3.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	5	6	5	4	6	3.00	1348/1405	3.00	3.94	4.32	4.32	3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	3	2	6	7	5	3.39	1034/1236	3.39	3.41	4.00	4.07	3.39
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	3	0	1	1	2.67	****/1260	****	3.25	4.14	4.22	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	0	3	2	0	1	2.83	****/1255	****	4.06	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	1	1	2	1	1	3.00	****/1258	****	4.06	4.38	4.42	****
4. Were special techniques successful	21	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 873	****	****	4.03	4.08	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.17	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.52	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.11	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	3.94	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.40	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****

Course-Section: ECAC 329 1
 Title Cost Accounting
 Instructor: Hardy, Timothy W
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 438
 MAR 22, 2010
 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	21	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	27	Non-major	27
84-150	6	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	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECAC 330 3
 Title Taxation
 Instructor: Stmartin,Jeanne
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 439
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	19	4.78	267/1509	4.50	3.99	4.31	4.32	4.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	18	4.74	278/1509	4.33	3.94	4.26	4.25	4.74
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	20	4.78	229/1287	4.32	3.97	4.30	4.33	4.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	3	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	173/1459	4.33	4.19	4.22	4.26	4.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	2	6	13	4.36	478/1406	4.27	4.12	4.09	4.12	4.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	174/1384	4.28	3.71	4.11	4.15	4.72
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	145/1489	4.59	4.31	4.17	4.14	4.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	9	12	4.57	1014/1506	4.71	4.53	4.67	4.67	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	118/1463	4.28	3.77	4.09	4.08	4.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	319/1438	4.60	4.38	4.46	4.43	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	322/1421	4.65	4.57	4.73	4.73	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	279/1411	4.53	4.20	4.31	4.29	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	251/1405	4.52	3.94	4.32	4.32	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	11	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/1236	3.00	3.41	4.00	4.07	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1260	3.50	3.25	4.14	4.22	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1255	3.63	4.06	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1258	3.63	4.06	4.38	4.42	****
4. Were special techniques successful	19	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 873	****	****	4.03	4.08	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required for Majors 17	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 9			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 23	Non-major 23
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 1			

Course-Section: ECAC 330 4
 Title Taxation
 Instructor: Cole, Richard M.
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 440
 MAR 22, 2010
 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	2	7	5	4.21	921/1509	4.50	3.99	4.31	4.32	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	8	3	3.93	1148/1509	4.33	3.94	4.26	4.25	3.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	8	3	3.86	1047/1287	4.32	3.97	4.30	4.33	3.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	1111/1459	4.33	4.19	4.22	4.26	3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	683/1406	4.27	4.12	4.09	4.12	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	3	5	3	3.83	993/1384	4.28	3.71	4.11	4.15	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	652/1489	4.59	4.31	4.17	4.14	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	682/1506	4.71	4.53	4.67	4.67	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	4	7	1	3.75	1101/1463	4.28	3.77	4.09	4.08	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	981/1438	4.60	4.38	4.46	4.43	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	1246/1421	4.65	4.57	4.73	4.73	4.36
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	8	5	4.29	858/1411	4.53	4.20	4.31	4.29	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	926/1405	4.52	3.94	4.32	4.32	4.21
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	1	2	4	0	2	3.00	1131/1236	3.00	3.41	4.00	4.07	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	2	1	4	1	3.50	1045/1260	3.50	3.25	4.14	4.22	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	1097/1255	3.63	4.06	4.33	4.37	3.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	1118/1258	3.63	4.06	4.38	4.42	3.63
4. Were special techniques successful	6	6	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 873	****	****	4.03	4.08	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.17	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

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

Course-Section: ECAC 420 1
 Title Info Sys For Auditors
 Instructor: Mulchandani,Kab
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 441
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	4	1	3.63	1359/1509	3.63	3.99	4.31	4.39	3.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	2	3	3.75	1259/1509	3.75	3.94	4.26	4.26	3.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1036/1287	3.88	3.97	4.30	4.38	3.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	647/1459	4.38	4.19	4.22	4.32	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	720/1406	4.13	4.12	4.09	4.11	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	2	1	3.38	1247/1384	3.38	3.71	4.11	4.23	3.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	2	3	3.75	1197/1489	3.75	4.31	4.17	4.18	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	1236/1506	4.29	4.53	4.67	4.67	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	2	2	3	1	3.38	1303/1463	3.38	3.77	4.09	4.18	3.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	712/1438	4.57	4.38	4.46	4.50	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	950/1421	4.71	4.57	4.73	4.76	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	858/1411	4.29	4.20	4.31	4.35	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	0	2	3	3.71	1203/1405	3.71	3.94	4.32	4.34	3.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	809/1236	3.83	3.41	4.00	4.03	3.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	1162/1260	3.00	3.25	4.14	4.25	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	575/1255	4.50	4.06	4.33	4.46	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	620/1258	4.50	4.06	4.38	4.51	4.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors		7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	B	5							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General		0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	8
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	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		0				
				?	0							