

Course-Section: ECAC 351 0101
 Title ADVANCED COST ACCT
 Instructor: DAVIS, MARY B
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 434
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	2	3	12	4.59	442/1504	4.59	4.24	4.27	4.27	4.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	335/1503	4.65	4.22	4.20	4.22	4.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	4	7	3.88	1030/1290	3.88	4.32	4.28	4.31	3.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	352/1453	4.59	4.22	4.21	4.23	4.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	3	2	8	3.76	962/1421	3.76	4.08	4.00	4.01	3.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	407/1365	4.41	4.11	4.08	4.08	4.41
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	190/1485	4.76	4.20	4.16	4.17	4.76
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	394/1504	4.94	4.68	4.69	4.65	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	226/1483	4.64	4.07	4.06	4.08	4.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	456/1425	4.73	4.41	4.41	4.43	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	860/1426	4.73	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	378/1418	4.67	4.29	4.25	4.26	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	352/1416	4.73	4.34	4.26	4.27	4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	386/1199	4.38	3.95	3.97	4.02	4.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	651/1312	4.17	4.12	4.00	4.09	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	851/1303	4.17	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1025/1299	3.83	4.34	4.25	4.30	3.83
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	328/ 758	4.20	4.05	4.01	4.00	4.20

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	17	Non-major	2
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	8	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				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECAC 401 0101
 Title ADVANCED ACCOUNTING
 Instructor: DAVIS, MARY B
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 435
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	0	3	7	4.70	327/1504	4.70	4.24	4.27	4.33	4.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	279/1503	4.70	4.22	4.20	4.18	4.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	201/1290	4.80	4.32	4.28	4.32	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	331/1453	4.60	4.22	4.21	4.22	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	90/1421	4.90	4.08	4.00	4.02	4.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	223/1365	4.60	4.11	4.08	4.09	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1485	5.00	4.20	4.16	4.14	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	830/1504	4.80	4.68	4.69	4.73	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	187/1483	4.70	4.07	4.06	4.11	4.70
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	665/1425	4.60	4.41	4.41	4.38	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	450/1418	4.60	4.29	4.25	4.25	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	255/1416	4.80	4.34	4.26	4.26	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	394/1199	4.38	3.95	3.97	4.05	4.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	196/1312	4.75	4.12	4.00	4.07	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	356/1303	4.75	4.39	4.24	4.34	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	570/1299	4.50	4.34	4.25	4.38	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	273/ 758	4.33	4.05	4.01	4.17	4.33

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	0
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	0	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	9				
				?	1						