

Course-Section: ECAD 210 0101  
 Title PRACTICE OF MANAGEMENT  
 Instructor: ARMOR, VIVIAN  
 Enrollment: 36  
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 436  
 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	1	2	9	20	4.50	549/1504	4.44	4.24	4.27	4.26	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	8	21	4.50	495/1503	4.57	4.22	4.20	4.18	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	11	18	4.44	601/1290	4.59	4.32	4.28	4.27	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	10	18	4.41	594/1453	4.46	4.22	4.21	4.20	4.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	1	9	6	12	3.83	919/1421	4.35	4.08	4.00	3.90	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	6	6	18	4.25	581/1365	4.20	4.11	4.08	4.00	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	2	5	22	4.41	591/1485	4.61	4.20	4.16	4.15	4.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	5.00	1/1504	4.87	4.68	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	0	1	12	10	4.39	469/1483	4.44	4.07	4.06	4.02	4.39
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	0	5	24	4.70	525/1425	4.74	4.41	4.41	4.40	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	4	25	4.77	808/1426	4.84	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	4	23	4.63	414/1418	4.64	4.29	4.25	4.22	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	3	25	4.77	310/1416	4.58	4.34	4.26	4.24	4.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	3	2	8	5	9	3.56	901/1199	4.02	3.95	3.97	3.95	3.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	2	4	5	9	4.05	702/1312	4.16	4.12	4.00	3.98	4.05
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	0	3	7	9	4.15	857/1303	4.41	4.39	4.24	4.23	4.15
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	1	5	7	7	4.00	922/1299	4.46	4.34	4.25	4.21	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	12	5	0	2	2	8	3	3.80	496/ 758	4.18	4.05	4.01	3.89	3.80
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	29	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.07	4.09	4.30	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 244	****	4.12	4.09	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	29	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.40	4.23	4.52	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 76	****	4.60	4.61	4.22	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 70	****	4.54	4.35	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 67	****	4.32	4.34	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 76	****	4.41	4.44	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 73	****	4.17	4.17	4.24	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 58	****	3.98	4.43	4.41	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 56	****	4.12	4.23	4.24	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	29	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	4.68	4.65	4.51	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	29	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	4.32	4.29	4.65	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	29	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.61	4.44	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 40	****	4.28	4.53	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 35	****	4.43	4.49	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 36	****	4.38	4.60	4.13	****

4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	29	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/	20	****	5.00	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	29	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/	16	****	5.00	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: ECAD 210 0101  
 Title PRACTICE OF MANAGEMENT  
 Instructor: ARMOR, VIVIAN  
 Enrollment: 36  
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 436  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	14	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	9	C	2	General	6	Under-grad	32	Non-major	4
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECAD 210 0201  
 Title PRACTICE OF MANAGEMENT  
 Instructor: ARMOR, VIVIAN  
 Enrollment: 35  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 437  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	1	6	18	4.68	347/1504	4.44	4.24	4.27	4.26	4.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	119/1503	4.57	4.22	4.20	4.18	4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	21	4.84	173/1290	4.59	4.32	4.28	4.27	4.84
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	19	4.72	222/1453	4.46	4.22	4.21	4.20	4.72
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	21	4.84	112/1421	4.35	4.08	4.00	3.90	4.84
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	5	17	4.63	211/1365	4.20	4.11	4.08	4.00	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	21	4.80	150/1485	4.61	4.20	4.16	4.15	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	263/1504	4.87	4.68	4.69	4.68	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	180/1483	4.44	4.07	4.06	4.02	4.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1425	4.74	4.41	4.41	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1426	4.84	4.72	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	5	19	4.79	205/1418	4.64	4.29	4.25	4.22	4.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	21	4.88	175/1416	4.58	4.34	4.26	4.24	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	0	1	3	3	10	4.29	463/1199	4.02	3.95	3.97	3.95	4.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	3	3	11	4.47	394/1312	4.16	4.12	4.00	3.98	4.47
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	344/1303	4.41	4.39	4.24	4.23	4.76
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	464/1299	4.46	4.34	4.25	4.21	4.65
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	0	3	8	4	4.07	379/ 758	4.18	4.05	4.01	3.89	4.07
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.07	4.09	4.30	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 244	****	4.12	4.09	4.24	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 207	****	4.22	4.09	4.22	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 76	****	4.60	4.61	4.22	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 70	****	4.54	4.35	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 67	****	4.32	4.34	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.41	4.44	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 73	****	4.17	4.17	4.24	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	3.98	4.43	4.41	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 56	****	4.12	4.23	4.24	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	4.68	4.65	4.51	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	4.32	4.29	4.65	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.61	4.44	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	4.28	4.53	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	4.43	4.49	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	4.38	4.60	4.13	****

Course-Section: ECAD 210 0201  
 Title PRACTICE OF MANAGEMENT  
 Instructor: ARMOR, VIVIAN  
 Enrollment: 35  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 437  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General	6	Under-grad	25	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECAD 210 0301  
 Title PRACTICE OF MANAGEMENT  
 Instructor: NOBLE, ROBERT  
 Enrollment: 36  
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 438  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	1	0	3	5	23	4.53	509/1504	4.44	4.24	4.27	4.26	4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	7	21	4.47	556/1503	4.57	4.22	4.20	4.18	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	8	19	4.38	671/1290	4.59	4.32	4.28	4.27	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	11	17	4.38	631/1453	4.46	4.22	4.21	4.20	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	1	10	18	4.39	429/1421	4.35	4.08	4.00	3.90	4.39
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	11	17	4.41	420/1365	4.20	4.11	4.08	4.00	4.41
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	5	7	20	4.47	509/1485	4.61	4.20	4.16	4.15	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	21	4.66	991/1504	4.87	4.68	4.69	4.68	4.66
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	1	10	18	4.47	385/1483	4.44	4.07	4.06	4.02	4.47
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	7	20	4.57	712/1425	4.74	4.41	4.41	4.40	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	4	25	4.77	808/1426	4.84	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	7	21	4.63	414/1418	4.64	4.29	4.25	4.22	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	9	19	4.50	623/1416	4.58	4.34	4.26	4.24	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	2	5	6	15	4.21	527/1199	4.02	3.95	3.97	3.95	4.21
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	228/1312	4.16	4.12	4.00	3.98	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	1	1	3	12	4.53	551/1303	4.41	4.39	4.24	4.23	4.53
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	354/1299	4.46	4.34	4.25	4.21	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	16	0	0	0	4	3	9	4.31	281/ 758	4.18	4.05	4.01	3.89	4.31

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	2	A	13	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	2	B	16						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	7	C	1	General	3	Under-grad	32	Non-major	10
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	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	21				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECAD 210 0401  
 Title PRACTICE OF MANAGEMENT  
 Instructor: SKLAMM, STEWART  
 Enrollment: 31  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 439  
 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	1	1	1	6	10	4.21	940/1504	4.44	4.24	4.27	4.26	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	1	15	4.63	346/1503	4.57	4.22	4.20	4.18	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	270/1290	4.59	4.32	4.28	4.27	4.74
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	13	4.47	486/1453	4.46	4.22	4.21	4.20	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	2	2	13	4.44	374/1421	4.35	4.08	4.00	3.90	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	2	4	10	4.11	717/1365	4.20	4.11	4.08	4.00	4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	220/1485	4.61	4.20	4.16	4.15	4.74
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	760/1504	4.87	4.68	4.69	4.68	4.84
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	2	0	1	1	7	5	4.14	751/1483	4.44	4.07	4.06	4.02	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	0	15	4.76	402/1425	4.74	4.41	4.41	4.40	4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	690/1426	4.84	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	1	14	4.65	402/1418	4.64	4.29	4.25	4.22	4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	1	4	10	4.24	887/1416	4.58	4.34	4.26	4.24	4.24
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	2	0	3	10	4.19	548/1199	4.02	3.95	3.97	3.95	4.19
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	1	5	0	6	3.50	1011/1312	4.16	4.12	4.00	3.98	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	1	2	2	8	4.07	893/1303	4.41	4.39	4.24	4.23	4.07
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	1	1	0	11	4.36	723/1299	4.46	4.34	4.25	4.21	4.36
4. Were special techniques successful	5	9	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	328/ 758	4.18	4.05	4.01	3.89	4.20
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.07	4.09	4.30	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	4.12	4.09	4.24	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	4.49	4.40	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.40	4.23	4.52	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	4.22	4.09	4.22	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.60	4.61	4.22	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.54	4.35	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	4.32	4.34	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.41	4.44	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	4.17	4.17	4.24	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.98	4.43	4.41	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	4.12	4.23	4.24	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.68	4.65	4.51	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.32	4.29	4.65	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.61	4.44	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.28	4.53	4.44	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	35	****	4.43	4.49	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	36	****	4.38	4.60	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	20	****	5.00	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	5.00	4.51	5.00	****



Course-Section: ECAD 210 0401  
 Title PRACTICE OF MANAGEMENT  
 Instructor: SKLAMM, STEWART  
 Enrollment: 31  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 439  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	11	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	19	Non-major	4
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	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	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECAD 210 0501  
 Title PRACTICE OF MANAGEMENT  
 Instructor: SUGAR, STEVE  
 Enrollment: 37  
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 440  
 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	5	14	14	4.27	864/1504	4.44	4.24	4.27	4.26	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	12	17	4.39	663/1503	4.57	4.22	4.20	4.18	4.39
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	8	22	4.55	469/1290	4.59	4.32	4.28	4.27	4.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	4	9	16	4.33	680/1453	4.46	4.22	4.21	4.20	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	4	7	18	4.25	548/1421	4.35	4.08	4.00	3.90	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	12	9	8	3.61	1104/1365	4.20	4.11	4.08	4.00	3.61
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	4	25	4.64	319/1485	4.61	4.20	4.16	4.15	4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	0	32	4.91	657/1504	4.87	4.68	4.69	4.68	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	2	9	14	4.48	361/1483	4.44	4.07	4.06	4.02	4.48
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	5	24	4.68	556/1425	4.74	4.41	4.41	4.40	4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	1	28	4.84	667/1426	4.84	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	4	7	20	4.52	565/1418	4.64	4.29	4.25	4.22	4.52
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	9	20	4.52	613/1416	4.58	4.34	4.26	4.24	4.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	7	3	0	2	10	8	3.87	766/1199	4.02	3.95	3.97	3.95	3.87
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	7	5	11	4.08	694/1312	4.16	4.12	4.00	3.98	4.08
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	3	5	15	4.52	551/1303	4.41	4.39	4.24	4.23	4.52
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	3	4	16	4.57	530/1299	4.46	4.34	4.25	4.21	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	0	1	3	2	17	4.52	178/ 758	4.18	4.05	4.01	3.89	4.52
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	30	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 233	****	4.07	4.09	4.30	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 244	****	4.12	4.09	4.24	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	30	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 227	****	4.49	4.40	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	30	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 225	****	4.40	4.23	4.52	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	30	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 207	****	4.22	4.09	4.22	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	31	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 76	****	4.60	4.61	4.22	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	31	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 70	****	4.54	4.35	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 67	****	4.32	4.34	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 76	****	4.41	4.44	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 73	****	4.17	4.17	4.24	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	3.98	4.43	4.41	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 56	****	4.12	4.23	4.24	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	4.68	4.65	4.51	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	4.32	4.29	4.65	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	4.61	4.44	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	4.28	4.53	4.44	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	35	****	4.43	4.49	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	36	****	4.38	4.60	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	20	****	5.00	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	16	****	5.00	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: ECAD 210 0501  
 Title PRACTICE OF MANAGEMENT  
 Instructor: SUGAR, STEVE  
 Enrollment: 37  
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 440  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	9	C	3	General	2	Under-grad	33	Non-major	5
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	22				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECAD 310 0101  
 Title HUMAN RESOURCE MGT  
 Instructor: Sadler, Patrici  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 441  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	3	2	4	5	6	3.45	1372/1504	3.45	4.24	4.27	4.27	3.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	4	0	4	8	3	3.32	1369/1503	3.32	4.22	4.20	4.22	3.32
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	4	1	1	10	3	3.37	1185/1290	3.37	4.32	4.28	4.31	3.37
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	4	0	4	7	3	3.28	1361/1453	3.28	4.22	4.21	4.23	3.28
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	4	5	8	3.85	903/1421	3.85	4.08	4.00	4.01	3.85
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	4	5	5	3	3.16	1273/1365	3.16	4.11	4.08	4.08	3.16
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	2	2	5	6	3	3.33	1330/1485	3.33	4.20	4.16	4.17	3.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	2	6	11	0	3.47	1481/1504	3.47	4.68	4.69	4.65	3.47
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	3	1	7	5	1	3.00	1379/1483	3.00	4.07	4.06	4.08	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	4	2	5	5	3	3.05	1365/1425	3.05	4.41	4.41	4.43	3.05
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	3	3	6	6	3.68	1372/1426	3.68	4.72	4.69	4.71	3.68
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	4	2	5	2	4	3.00	1330/1418	3.00	4.29	4.25	4.26	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	4	4	2	5	3.00	1324/1416	3.00	4.34	4.26	4.27	3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	11	3	2	0	2	0	2.14	1176/1199	2.14	3.95	3.97	4.02	2.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	2	1	2	4	1	3.10	1131/1312	3.10	4.12	4.00	4.09	3.10
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	0	2	2	5	4.00	910/1303	4.00	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	1	2	2	4	3.70	1069/1299	3.70	4.34	4.25	4.30	3.70
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	1	1	2	3	2	3.44	600/ 758	3.44	4.05	4.01	4.00	3.44
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.60	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.54	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	4.32	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.41	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 73	****	4.17	4.17	4.25	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	20	Non-major	6
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECAD 360 0101  
 Title BUSINESS LAW  
 Instructor: COHEN, HYMAN K.  
 Enrollment: 32  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 442  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	10	8	4.25	889/1504	4.25	4.24	4.27	4.27	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	0	1	11	5	3.75	1207/1503	3.75	4.22	4.20	4.22	3.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	6	6	6	3.70	1095/1290	3.70	4.32	4.28	4.31	3.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	3	3	2	6	4	3.28	1361/1453	3.28	4.22	4.21	4.23	3.28
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	9	11	4.55	283/1421	4.55	4.08	4.00	4.01	4.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	4	2	1	6	4	3.24	1254/1365	3.24	4.11	4.08	4.08	3.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	0	4	14	4.50	455/1485	4.50	4.20	4.16	4.17	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	830/1504	4.80	4.68	4.69	4.65	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	6	9	2	3.67	1170/1483	3.67	4.07	4.06	4.08	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	2	3	13	4.42	876/1425	4.42	4.41	4.41	4.43	4.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	1	2	15	4.58	1073/1426	4.58	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	1	4	5	6	3.67	1201/1418	3.67	4.29	4.25	4.26	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	4	5	4	4	3.21	1302/1416	3.21	4.34	4.26	4.27	3.21
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	16	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/1199	****	3.95	3.97	4.02	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	0	5	2	5	3.57	986/1312	3.57	4.12	4.00	4.09	3.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	2	0	2	9	4.14	863/1303	4.14	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	1	2	10	4.50	570/1299	4.50	4.34	4.25	4.30	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	6	11	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 758	****	4.05	4.01	4.00	****
Seminar														
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 67	****	4.32	4.34	3.98	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	6	C	3	General	3	Under-grad	20	Non-major	1
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	6	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	15				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECAD 385 0101  
 Title BUSINESS ETHICS & SOC  
 Instructor: BRENNER, THOMAS  
 Enrollment: 43  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 443  
 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	1	0	4	9	10	4.13	1029/1504	4.13	4.24	4.27	4.27	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	6	11	4.13	972/1503	4.13	4.22	4.20	4.22	4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	8	12	4.25	783/1290	4.25	4.32	4.28	4.31	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	6	15	4.57	374/1453	4.57	4.22	4.21	4.23	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	7	5	12	4.21	587/1421	4.21	4.08	4.00	4.01	4.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	7	10	5	3.78	981/1365	3.78	4.11	4.08	4.08	3.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	5	16	4.50	455/1485	4.50	4.20	4.16	4.17	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	6	12	4	3.83	1072/1483	3.83	4.07	4.06	4.08	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	8	14	4.57	712/1425	4.57	4.41	4.41	4.43	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	6	16	4.65	981/1426	4.65	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.65
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	9	11	4.35	763/1418	4.35	4.29	4.25	4.26	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	9	12	4.43	714/1416	4.43	4.34	4.26	4.27	4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	2	0	6	5	3	3.44	950/1199	3.44	3.95	3.97	4.02	3.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	1	7	9	4.33	530/1312	4.33	4.12	4.00	4.09	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	1	4	12	4.44	630/1303	4.44	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	494/1299	4.61	4.34	4.25	4.30	4.61
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	1	0	2	7	7	4.12	369/ 758	4.12	4.05	4.01	4.00	4.12
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.07	4.09	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 244	****	4.12	4.09	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 227	****	4.49	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.40	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 207	****	4.22	4.09	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.60	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.54	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	4.32	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.41	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	4.17	4.17	4.25	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	7	Under-grad	24	Non-major	6
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			

P 0  
I 0  
? 0

Other

17

responses to be significant



Course-Section: ECAD 410 0101  
 Title PRODUCTION MANAGEMENT  
 Instructor: ROE, DAVID  
 Enrollment: 38  
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 444  
 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	4	0	3	2	12	3	5	3.20	1426/1504	3.20	4.24	4.27	4.33	3.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	3	2	8	9	4	3.35	1362/1503	3.35	4.22	4.20	4.18	3.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	2	4	11	8	3.88	1030/1290	3.88	4.32	4.28	4.32	3.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	15	0	2	5	1	3	3.45	1307/1453	3.45	4.22	4.21	4.22	3.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	2	2	4	9	2	6	3.26	1235/1421	3.26	4.08	4.00	4.02	3.26
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	15	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	782/1365	4.00	4.11	4.08	4.09	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	4	3	11	8	3.88	1098/1485	3.88	4.20	4.16	4.14	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	1	17	7	4.24	1287/1504	4.24	4.68	4.69	4.73	4.24
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	2	3	12	6	1	3.04	1375/1483	3.04	4.07	4.06	4.11	3.04
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	2	2	6	7	7	3.63	1286/1425	3.63	4.41	4.41	4.38	3.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	1	1	5	6	10	4.00	1319/1426	4.00	4.72	4.69	4.72	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	5	6	6	5	3.39	1283/1418	3.39	4.29	4.25	4.25	3.39
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	2	10	3	7	3.57	1228/1416	3.57	4.34	4.26	4.26	3.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	17	1	1	2	0	4	3.63	876/1199	3.63	3.95	3.97	4.05	3.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	2	3	1	3	3.56	993/1312	3.56	4.12	4.00	4.07	3.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	815/1303	4.22	4.39	4.24	4.34	4.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	1	1	4	1	2	3.22	1171/1299	3.22	4.34	4.25	4.38	3.22
4. Were special techniques successful	20	7	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 758	****	4.05	4.01	4.17	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 244	****	4.12	4.09	3.56	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	3.98	4.43	4.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 56	****	4.12	4.23	4.37	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 40	****	4.28	4.53	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 12	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 11		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 2	C 2	General	1
84-150	17	3.00-3.49 9	D 0		Under-grad 29
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 11	F 0		Non-major 6
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
				Electives	0
				Other	26
				#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	

Course-Section: ECAD 489 0101  
 Title MGMT & ADMIN SEMINAR  
 Instructor: SILBERG, STUART  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 445  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	146/1504	4.30	4.24	4.27	4.33	4.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	119/1503	4.55	4.22	4.20	4.18	4.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	180/1290	4.78	4.32	4.28	4.32	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	140/1453	4.61	4.22	4.21	4.22	4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	8	10	4.56	283/1421	4.69	4.08	4.00	4.02	4.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	199/1365	4.38	4.11	4.08	4.09	4.65
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	3	12	4.50	455/1485	4.83	4.20	4.16	4.14	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	394/1504	4.81	4.68	4.69	4.73	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	101/1483	4.29	4.07	4.06	4.11	4.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	107/1425	4.55	4.41	4.41	4.38	4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	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	0	2	16	4.89	139/1418	4.52	4.29	4.25	4.25	4.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	85/1416	4.10	4.34	4.26	4.26	4.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	1	4	12	4.50	271/1199	4.33	3.95	3.97	4.05	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	330/1312	4.47	4.12	4.00	4.07	4.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	737/1303	4.68	4.39	4.24	4.34	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	741/1299	4.59	4.34	4.25	4.38	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	231/ 758	4.71	4.05	4.01	4.17	4.43
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	5.00	4.60	4.61	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	4.75	4.54	4.35	4.63	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	4.80	4.32	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	4.80	4.41	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	4.80	4.17	4.17	4.29	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	18	Non-major	1
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECAD 489 0201  
 Title MGMT & ADMIN SEMINAR  
 Instructor: Boulay, William (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 446  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	1092/1504	4.30	4.24	4.27	4.33	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	692/1503	4.55	4.22	4.20	4.18	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	250/1290	4.78	4.32	4.28	4.32	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	440/1453	4.61	4.22	4.21	4.22	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	158/1421	4.69	4.08	4.00	4.02	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	581/1365	4.38	4.11	4.08	4.09	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1485	4.83	4.20	4.16	4.14	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	891/1504	4.81	4.68	4.69	4.73	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	850/1483	4.29	4.07	4.06	4.11	4.00
-----														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	0	0	6	4.13	1117/1425	4.55	4.41	4.41	4.38	4.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	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	1	1	1	5	4.25	848/1418	4.52	4.29	4.25	4.25	4.34
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	1	2	3	3.50	1248/1416	4.10	4.34	4.26	4.26	3.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	574/1199	4.33	3.95	3.97	4.05	4.24
-----														
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	444/1312	4.47	4.12	4.00	4.07	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	248/1303	4.68	4.39	4.24	4.34	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	395/1299	4.59	4.34	4.25	4.38	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	73/ 758	4.71	4.05	4.01	4.17	4.86
-----														
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 76	5.00	4.60	4.61	4.63	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	30/ 70	4.75	4.54	4.35	4.63	4.75
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	27/ 67	4.80	4.32	4.34	4.34	4.80
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	28/ 76	4.80	4.41	4.44	4.51	4.80
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	22/ 73	4.80	4.17	4.17	4.29	4.80
-----														
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.28	4.53	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.43	4.49	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	4.38	4.60	4.83	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	5.00	4.24	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	5.00	4.51	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	0
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			

P 0  
I 0  
? 0

Other

8

responses to be significant

Course-Section: ECAD 489 0201  
 Title MGMT & ADMIN SEMINAR  
 Instructor: RAUDENBUSH, LIN (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 447  
 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	3	2	3	4.00	1092/1504	4.30	4.24	4.27	4.33	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	692/1503	4.55	4.22	4.20	4.18	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	250/1290	4.78	4.32	4.28	4.32	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	440/1453	4.61	4.22	4.21	4.22	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	158/1421	4.69	4.08	4.00	4.02	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	581/1365	4.38	4.11	4.08	4.09	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1485	4.83	4.20	4.16	4.14	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	891/1504	4.81	4.68	4.69	4.73	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	850/1483	4.29	4.07	4.06	4.11	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	700/1425	4.55	4.41	4.41	4.38	4.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	682/1418	4.52	4.29	4.25	4.25	4.34
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	1122/1416	4.10	4.34	4.26	4.26	3.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	429/1199	4.33	3.95	3.97	4.05	4.24
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	444/1312	4.47	4.12	4.00	4.07	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	248/1303	4.68	4.39	4.24	4.34	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	395/1299	4.59	4.34	4.25	4.38	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	73/ 758	4.71	4.05	4.01	4.17	4.86
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 76	5.00	4.60	4.61	4.63	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	30/ 70	4.75	4.54	4.35	4.63	4.75
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	27/ 67	4.80	4.32	4.34	4.34	4.80
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	28/ 76	4.80	4.41	4.44	4.51	4.80
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	22/ 73	4.80	4.17	4.17	4.29	4.80
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.28	4.53	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.43	4.49	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	4.38	4.60	4.83	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	5.00	4.24	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	5.00	4.51	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 2		0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		8
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
#### - Means there are not enough					

P 0  
I 0  
? 0

Other

8

responses to be significant