

Course-Section: ECAC 300 0101  
 Title SPEC TOPICS ACCOUNTING  
 Instructor: ST MARTIN, JEAN  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 504  
 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	0	1	9	4.90	163/1576	4.90	4.65	4.30	4.30	4.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.77	4.27	4.28	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	179/1342	4.90	4.66	4.32	4.30	4.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	149/1520	4.89	4.69	4.25	4.25	4.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.70	4.12	4.09	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	122/1434	4.88	4.65	4.14	4.15	4.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.83	4.19	4.21	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	469/1574	4.90	4.75	4.64	4.61	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.55	4.10	4.09	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.95	4.47	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.99	4.73	4.70	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	221/1486	4.86	4.81	4.32	4.32	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.86	4.32	4.34	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	215/1277	4.67	4.39	4.03	4.11	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.39	4.17	4.20	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.84	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.77	4.35	4.41	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 878	****	4.67	4.05	4.09	****
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 379	****	4.07	4.20	4.17	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ECAC 321 0101  
 Title AUDIT THEORY & PRACTIC  
 Instructor: CROTEAU, MARCIA  
 Enrollment: 28  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 505  
 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	1	1	2	10	4.50	637/1576	4.50	4.65	4.30	4.30	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	324/1576	4.71	4.77	4.27	4.28	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	345/1342	4.71	4.66	4.32	4.30	4.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	683/1520	4.40	4.69	4.25	4.25	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	9	4.43	483/1465	4.43	4.70	4.12	4.09	4.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	2	2	5	4.00	878/1434	4.00	4.65	4.14	4.15	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	154/1547	4.86	4.83	4.19	4.21	4.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.75	4.64	4.61	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	463/1554	4.45	4.55	4.10	4.09	4.45	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.95	4.47	4.47	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.99	4.73	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	422/1486	4.69	4.81	4.32	4.32	4.69	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	0	12	4.77	364/1489	4.77	4.86	4.32	4.34	4.77	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	309/1277	4.50	4.39	4.03	4.11	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	3	0	6	4.00	802/1279	4.00	4.39	4.17	4.20	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	559/1270	4.60	4.84	4.35	4.42	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	511/1269	4.70	4.77	4.35	4.41	4.70	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	6	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	464/ 878	4.00	4.67	4.05	4.09	4.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	3.00	4.03	4.23	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.40	4.08	4.24	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	7	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	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECAC 330 0101  
 Title TAXATION  
 Instructor: ST MARTIN, JEAN  
 Enrollment: 38  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 506  
 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	0	4	19	4.83	227/1576	4.83	4.65	4.30	4.30	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	180/1576	4.86	4.77	4.27	4.28	4.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	90/1342	4.95	4.66	4.32	4.30	4.95	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	3	0	1	0	2	15	4.72	281/1520	4.72	4.69	4.25	4.25	4.72	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	8	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	366/1465	4.50	4.70	4.12	4.09	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	8	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	338/1434	4.58	4.65	4.14	4.15	4.58	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	123/1547	4.90	4.83	4.19	4.21	4.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.75	4.64	4.61	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	208/1554	4.74	4.55	4.10	4.09	4.74	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	248/1488	4.91	4.95	4.47	4.47	4.91	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	279/1493	4.95	4.99	4.73	4.70	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	172/1486	4.91	4.81	4.32	4.32	4.91	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	97/1489	4.95	4.86	4.32	4.34	4.95	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	15	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	****/1277	****	4.39	4.03	4.11	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	413/1279	4.56	4.39	4.17	4.20	4.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.84	4.35	4.42	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	0	0	0	8	4.56	614/1269	4.56	4.77	4.35	4.41	4.56	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 878	****	4.67	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	193/ 379	4.14	4.07	4.20	4.17	4.14	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	9	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.00	3.00	4.01	4.12	3.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	9	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.00	3.00	4.03	4.23	3.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.83	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.89	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	6	4	0	3.40	235/ 382	3.40	3.40	4.08	4.24	3.40	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	5	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	24	Non-major	24
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	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: ECAC 351 0101  
 Title ADVANCED COST ACCT  
 Instructor: HARDY, TIMOTHY  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 507  
 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	3	5	4.63	471/1576	4.63	4.65	4.30	4.30	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	448/1576	4.63	4.77	4.27	4.28	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	972/1342	4.00	4.66	4.32	4.30	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	167/1520	4.86	4.69	4.25	4.25	4.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	137/1465	4.88	4.70	4.12	4.09	4.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	151/1434	4.80	4.65	4.14	4.15	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	0	6	4.38	718/1547	4.38	4.83	4.19	4.21	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	4.00	1459/1574	4.00	4.75	4.64	4.61	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	194/1554	4.75	4.55	4.10	4.09	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	324/1488	4.86	4.95	4.47	4.47	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.99	4.73	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	221/1486	4.86	4.81	4.32	4.32	4.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	251/1489	4.86	4.86	4.32	4.34	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	215/1277	4.67	4.39	4.03	4.11	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	381/1279	4.60	4.39	4.17	4.20	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.84	4.35	4.42	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.77	4.35	4.41	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.67	4.05	4.09	5.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.00	4.07	4.20	4.17	4.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.00	3.00	4.01	4.12	3.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 326	****	3.00	4.03	4.23	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.40	4.08	4.24	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ECAC 401 0101  
 Title ADVANCED ACCOUNTING  
 Instructor: HARDY, KENDRALL  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 508  
 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	1	0	2	5	4.38	818/1576	4.38	4.65	4.30	4.46	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	448/1576	4.63	4.77	4.27	4.35	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	298/1342	4.75	4.66	4.32	4.46	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	395/1520	4.60	4.69	4.25	4.38	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	231/1465	4.71	4.70	4.12	4.22	4.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.65	4.14	4.30	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.83	4.19	4.24	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	567/1574	4.86	4.75	4.64	4.69	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	1132/1554	3.80	4.55	4.10	4.24	3.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.95	4.47	4.55	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.99	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	393/1486	4.71	4.81	4.32	4.41	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	434/1489	4.71	4.86	4.32	4.38	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	916/1277	3.71	4.39	4.03	4.04	3.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	938/1279	3.80	4.39	4.17	4.31	3.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	559/1270	4.60	4.84	4.35	4.53	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	584/1269	4.60	4.77	4.35	4.55	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.67	4.05	4.33	5.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 379	****	4.07	4.20	4.19	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.00	3.00	4.01	3.90	3.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.00	3.00	4.03	3.97	3.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.40	4.08	3.88	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B 3	Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 2	General 0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D 0	Under-grad 8
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Major 0
				P 0	Non-major 8
				I 0	
				? 0	
					Electives 1
					Other 5

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant