

Course Section: ECON 101 0101
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS
 Instructor: CARROLL, KATHLE
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 482
 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	8	8	4.33	816/1669	3.75	4.20	4.23	4.02	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	6	8	4.22	922/1666	3.80	4.22	4.19	4.11	4.22	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	3	12	4.39	701/1421	3.94	4.27	4.24	4.11	4.39	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	0	3	3	5	3.92	1154/1617	3.54	4.04	4.15	3.99	3.92	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	7	7	4.06	741/1555	3.81	3.98	4.00	3.92	4.06	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	1195/1543	3.37	3.93	4.06	3.86	3.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	583/1647	3.82	4.31	4.12	4.06	4.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	10	4.56	1157/1668	4.58	4.67	4.67	4.62	4.56	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	1	5	1	8	4.07	877/1605	3.64	4.01	4.07	3.96	4.07	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	775/1514	4.21	4.53	4.39	4.32	4.53	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	973/1551	4.52	4.72	4.66	4.55	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	5	5	6	3.94	1127/1503	3.73	4.22	4.24	4.17	3.94	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	3	5	7	3.94	1132/1506	3.86	4.27	4.26	4.17	3.94	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	10	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	426/1311	3.76	3.81	3.85	3.68	4.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	0	2	3	3	3.50	1154/1490	3.46	3.86	4.05	3.85	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	3	4	2	3.60	1279/1502	3.71	4.02	4.26	4.06	3.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	1	3	2	3	3.50	1279/1489	3.79	4.10	4.29	4.07	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	7	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1006	3.83	4.05	4.00	3.81	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 3	A 3	Required for Majors 6	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 5	General 4	Under-grad 18 Non-major 17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 1	D 1		
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 7	
			? 0		

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	2	2	3	3	2	3.08	1590/1669	3.75	4.20	4.23	4.02	3.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	0	4	3	3.33	1527/1666	3.80	4.22	4.19	4.11	3.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	1	3	4	3.42	1273/1421	3.94	4.27	4.24	4.11	3.42	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	4	1	3	2	3.09	1501/1617	3.54	4.04	4.15	3.99	3.09	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	4	3	2	1	2.82	1480/1555	3.81	3.98	4.00	3.92	2.82	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	2	1	1	3	0	2.71	1492/1543	3.37	3.93	4.06	3.86	2.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	2	5	3	3.82	1241/1647	3.82	4.31	4.12	4.06	3.82	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	713/1668	4.58	4.67	4.67	4.62	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	3	1	5	0	3.22	1464/1605	3.64	4.01	4.07	3.96	3.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	1	4	6	4.17	1136/1514	4.21	4.53	4.39	4.32	4.17	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	1127/1551	4.52	4.72	4.66	4.55	4.58	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	3	1	2	4	2	3.08	1418/1503	3.73	4.22	4.24	4.17	3.08	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	2	2	3	3.00	1403/1506	3.86	4.27	4.26	4.17	3.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	10	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1311	3.76	3.81	3.85	3.68	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	3	3	1	2.91	1383/1490	3.46	3.86	4.05	3.85	2.91	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	3	3	5	0	3.18	1379/1502	3.71	4.02	4.26	4.06	3.18	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	3	1	2	5	3.82	1163/1489	3.79	4.10	4.29	4.07	3.82	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	9	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1006	3.83	4.05	4.00	3.81	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 226	****	4.83	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 233	****	4.83	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 225	****	4.33	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 223	****	4.80	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 206	****	5.00	4.15	4.01	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	3.50	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ECON 101 0301
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS
 Instructor: COOMBER, WILLIA
 Enrollment: 43
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 484
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	3	0	1	2	6	5	2	3.31	1547/1669	3.75	4.20	4.23	4.02	3.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	4	3	6	4	3.59	1438/1666	3.80	4.22	4.19	4.11	3.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	3	0	4	3	6	3.56	1202/1421	3.94	4.27	4.24	4.11	3.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	6	1	4	1	1	3	3.10	1500/1617	3.54	4.04	4.15	3.99	3.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	3	1	2	1	4	4	3.67	1133/1555	3.81	3.98	4.00	3.92	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	6	0	3	3	1	2	3.22	1352/1543	3.37	3.93	4.06	3.86	3.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	4	4	3	4	3.47	1411/1647	3.82	4.31	4.12	4.06	3.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	1	0	1	0	10	3	4.07	1492/1668	4.58	4.67	4.67	4.62	4.07
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	918/1605	3.64	4.01	4.07	3.96	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	2	1	7	4	3.73	1330/1514	4.21	4.53	4.39	4.32	3.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	1326/1551	4.52	4.72	4.66	4.55	4.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	3	2	7	2	3.57	1309/1503	3.73	4.22	4.24	4.17	3.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	1	6	5	3.93	1153/1506	3.86	4.27	4.26	4.17	3.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	2	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	587/1311	3.76	3.81	3.85	3.68	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	1	2	2	0	2.83	1391/1490	3.46	3.86	4.05	3.85	2.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	1	2	1	1	3.00	1395/1502	3.71	4.02	4.26	4.06	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	1	3	0	1	2.83	1433/1489	3.79	4.10	4.29	4.07	2.83
4. Were special techniques successful	14	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1006	3.83	4.05	4.00	3.81	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 3	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 19 Non-major 19
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 0	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 8	
			? 0		

Course Section: ECON 101 0401
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS
 Instructor: MITCH, DAVID F
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 485
 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	1	3	6	4.50	590/1669	3.75	4.20	4.23	4.02	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	814/1666	3.80	4.22	4.19	4.11	4.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	557/1421	3.94	4.27	4.24	4.11	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	583/1617	3.54	4.04	4.15	3.99	4.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	492/1555	3.81	3.98	4.00	3.92	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	723/1543	3.37	3.93	4.06	3.86	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	2	5	4.00	1043/1647	3.82	4.31	4.12	4.06	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	0	9	4.60	1125/1668	4.58	4.67	4.67	4.62	4.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	139/1605	3.64	4.01	4.07	3.96	4.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	408/1514	4.21	4.53	4.39	4.32	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	567/1551	4.52	4.72	4.66	4.55	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	800/1503	3.73	4.22	4.24	4.17	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	326/1506	3.86	4.27	4.26	4.17	4.78	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	189/1311	3.76	3.81	3.85	3.68	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	764/1490	3.46	3.86	4.05	3.85	4.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	938/1502	3.71	4.02	4.26	4.06	4.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	684/1489	3.79	4.10	4.29	4.07	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	307/1006	3.83	4.05	4.00	3.81	4.40	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 226	****	4.83	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.83	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 225	****	4.33	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 223	****	4.80	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 206	****	5.00	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 112	****	4.70	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 98	****	4.30	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 58	****	3.50	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: ECON 101 0401
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS
 Instructor: MITCH, DAVID F
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 485
 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	2	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course Section: ECON 101 0501
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS
 Instructor: MITCH, DAVID F
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 486
 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	1	5	9	8	4.04	1145/1669	3.75	4.20	4.23	4.02	4.04	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	9	10	4.26	868/1666	3.80	4.22	4.19	4.11	4.26	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	9	11	4.35	737/1421	3.94	4.27	4.24	4.11	4.35	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	1	6	4	9	3.90	1168/1617	3.54	4.04	4.15	3.99	3.90	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	5	4	12	4.33	492/1555	3.81	3.98	4.00	3.92	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	6	8	6	3.77	1123/1543	3.37	3.93	4.06	3.86	3.77	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	7	5	9	4.00	1043/1647	3.82	4.31	4.12	4.06	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1668	4.58	4.67	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	2	2	1	4	7	2	3.38	1412/1605	3.64	4.01	4.07	3.96	3.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	8	13	4.48	845/1514	4.21	4.53	4.39	4.32	4.48	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	8	13	4.48	1216/1551	4.52	4.72	4.66	4.55	4.48	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	7	10	5	3.78	1220/1503	3.73	4.22	4.24	4.17	3.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	5	5	12	4.17	973/1506	3.86	4.27	4.26	4.17	4.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	9	2	0	2	5	3	3.58	899/1311	3.76	3.81	3.85	3.68	3.58	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	3	7	7	4.06	828/1490	3.46	3.86	4.05	3.85	4.06	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	3	3	3	9	4.00	1013/1502	3.71	4.02	4.26	4.06	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	1	4	2	10	4.06	1025/1489	3.79	4.10	4.29	4.07	4.06	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	0	4	2	2	6	3.71	669/1006	3.83	4.05	4.00	3.81	3.71	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors 6	Graduate 0 Major 4
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 2	C 5	General 2	Under-grad 23 Non-major 19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
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 8	
			? 1		

Course Section: ECON 101 0701
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS
 Instructor: CARPENTER, ROBE
 Enrollment: 95
 Questionnaires: 51

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 487
 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	1	0	0	6	9	18	17	3.92	1265/1669	3.75	4.20	4.23	4.02	3.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	8	13	28	4.29	827/1666	3.80	4.22	4.19	4.11	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	8	10	31	4.35	728/1421	3.94	4.27	4.24	4.11	4.35	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	35	1	0	4	4	6	3.93	1126/1617	3.54	4.04	4.15	3.99	3.93	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	5	15	27	4.40	445/1555	3.81	3.98	4.00	3.92	4.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	41	2	0	1	2	3	3.50	****/1543	3.37	3.93	4.06	3.86	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	1	2	4	15	26	4.31	790/1647	3.82	4.31	4.12	4.06	4.31	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	1	0	1	46	1	3.94	1574/1668	4.58	4.67	4.67	4.62	3.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	0	0	8	18	13	4.13	830/1605	3.64	4.01	4.07	3.96	4.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	15	33	4.65	600/1514	4.21	4.53	4.39	4.32	4.65	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	1	10	39	4.69	1000/1551	4.52	4.72	4.66	4.55	4.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	6	18	26	4.40	719/1503	3.73	4.22	4.24	4.17	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	1	6	8	32	4.44	731/1506	3.86	4.27	4.26	4.17	4.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	1	0	6	11	28	4.41	326/1311	3.76	3.81	3.85	3.68	4.41	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	1	6	9	14	4.10	812/1490	3.46	3.86	4.05	3.85	4.10	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	2	2	7	6	14	3.90	1117/1502	3.71	4.02	4.26	4.06	3.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	2	2	11	16	4.32	874/1489	3.79	4.10	4.29	4.07	4.32	
4. Were special techniques successful	20	22	2	2	2	0	3	3.00	****/1006	3.83	4.05	4.00	3.81	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	45	4	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 226	****	4.83	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	47	0	1	0	0	3	0	3.25	****/ 233	****	4.83	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	48	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 225	****	4.33	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	48	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 223	****	4.80	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	48	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 206	****	5.00	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	47	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 112	****	4.70	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	48	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	48	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	48	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 98	****	4.30	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	49	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 58	****	3.50	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	49	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	48	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	48	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	48	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	49	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	49	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	49	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	49	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	49	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: ECON 101 0701
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS
 Instructor: CARPENTER, ROBE
 Enrollment: 95
 Questionnaires: 51

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 487
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	8	A	7	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	1	B	17						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	3	C	13	General	5	Under-grad	51	Non-major	46
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	2						
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	18				
				?	3						

Course Section: ECON 101 0901
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS
 Instructor: KAIKAI, ALPHA
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 488
 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	2	4	11	6	3.91	1276/1669	3.75	4.20	4.23	4.02	3.91	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	10	7	3.96	1164/1666	3.80	4.22	4.19	4.11	3.96	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	7	9	4.00	969/1421	3.94	4.27	4.24	4.11	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	1	3	6	1	3.64	1317/1617	3.54	4.04	4.15	3.99	3.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	4	9	7	4.05	747/1555	3.81	3.98	4.00	3.92	4.05	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	13	2	0	3	1	4	3.50	1260/1543	3.37	3.93	4.06	3.86	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	7	11	4.22	907/1647	3.82	4.31	4.12	4.06	4.22	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	21	2	4.09	1487/1668	4.58	4.67	4.67	4.62	4.09	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	7	10	3	3.80	1172/1605	3.64	4.01	4.07	3.96	3.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	5	8	9	4.18	1124/1514	4.21	4.53	4.39	4.32	4.18	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	9	10	4.32	1314/1551	4.52	4.72	4.66	4.55	4.32	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	2	2	5	9	3.85	1189/1503	3.73	4.22	4.24	4.17	3.85	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	4	5	11	4.14	1002/1506	3.86	4.27	4.26	4.17	4.14	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	14	0	1	3	2	2	3.63	875/1311	3.76	3.81	3.85	3.68	3.63	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	3	5	5	4.00	849/1490	3.46	3.86	4.05	3.85	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	5	2	6	3.93	1096/1502	3.71	4.02	4.26	4.06	3.93	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	0	8	5	4.21	941/1489	3.79	4.10	4.29	4.07	4.21	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	10	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/1006	3.83	4.05	4.00	3.81	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 233	****	4.83	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.33	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	4.80	4.35	4.19	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.70	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.30	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 58	****	3.50	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: ECON 101 0901
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS
 Instructor: KAIKAI, ALPHA
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 488
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	2	A	6	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1	B	11						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	3	Under-grad	23	Non-major	23
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	1						

Course Section: ECON 101 1001
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS
 Instructor: KAIKAI, ALPHA
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 489
 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	0	7	8	9	3.96	1219/1669	3.75	4.20	4.23	4.02	3.96	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	7	8	7	3.72	1348/1666	3.80	4.22	4.19	4.11	3.72	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	4	5	4	11	3.80	1118/1421	3.94	4.27	4.24	4.11	3.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	17	0	2	1	1	4	3.88	1184/1617	3.54	4.04	4.15	3.99	3.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	0	4	5	11	3.91	922/1555	3.81	3.98	4.00	3.92	3.91	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	15	0	0	4	4	2	3.80	1101/1543	3.37	3.93	4.06	3.86	3.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	4	8	9	3.84	1214/1647	3.82	4.31	4.12	4.06	3.84	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	21	4	4.16	1438/1668	4.58	4.67	4.67	4.62	4.16	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	9	7	5	3.73	1233/1605	3.64	4.01	4.07	3.96	3.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	12	11	4.32	1032/1514	4.21	4.53	4.39	4.32	4.32	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	9	13	4.46	1231/1551	4.52	4.72	4.66	4.55	4.46	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	6	5	11	4.00	1066/1503	3.73	4.22	4.24	4.17	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	4	8	10	4.08	1033/1506	3.86	4.27	4.26	4.17	4.08	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	21	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/1311	3.76	3.81	3.85	3.68	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	2	0	5	4	4	3.53	1142/1490	3.46	3.86	4.05	3.85	3.53	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	1	2	3	8	4.07	990/1502	3.71	4.02	4.26	4.06	4.07	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	2	1	6	6	4.07	1023/1489	3.79	4.10	4.29	4.07	4.07	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	10						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	3	Under-grad	25	Non-major	25
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	1						

Course Section: ECON 101 1101
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS
 Instructor: COBB, VINCENT
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 490
 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	1	0	3	1	5	5	6	3.50	1480/1669	3.75	4.20	4.23	4.02	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	4	3	8	3	3.30	1534/1666	3.80	4.22	4.19	4.11	3.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	4	3	6	4	3.20	1319/1421	3.94	4.27	4.24	4.11	3.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	4	1	5	0	4	2.93	1544/1617	3.54	4.04	4.15	3.99	2.93	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	5	5	6	1	3	2.60	1514/1555	3.81	3.98	4.00	3.92	2.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	4	2	5	5	2	2.94	1441/1543	3.37	3.93	4.06	3.86	2.94	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	4	2	7	3	3	2.95	1539/1647	3.82	4.31	4.12	4.06	2.95	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	731/1668	4.58	4.67	4.67	4.62	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	2	4	3	3	3	3.07	1498/1605	3.64	4.01	4.07	3.96	3.07	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	2	1	6	8	3.84	1292/1514	4.21	4.53	4.39	4.32	3.84	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	1000/1551	4.52	4.72	4.66	4.55	4.68	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	3	3	4	4	5	3.26	1392/1503	3.73	4.22	4.24	4.17	3.26	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	2	2	6	6	3.53	1315/1506	3.86	4.27	4.26	4.17	3.53	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	4	1	2	3	2	2.83	1178/1311	3.76	3.81	3.85	3.68	2.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	0	4	6	4	3.63	1107/1490	3.46	3.86	4.05	3.85	3.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	3	6	6	4.06	990/1502	3.71	4.02	4.26	4.06	4.06	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	2	1	6	4	3	3.31	1348/1489	3.79	4.10	4.29	4.07	3.31	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	11	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1006	3.83	4.05	4.00	3.81	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.83	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	****	4.83	4.19	4.09	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.70	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.30	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.50	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: ECON 101 1101
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS
 Instructor: COBB, VINCENT
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 490
 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	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	6	General	5	Under-grad	21	Non-major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	1						

Course Section: ECON 101 1401
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS
 Instructor: DASGUPTA, NANDI
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 491
 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	2	0	1	5	6	3.93	1265/1669	3.75	4.20	4.23	4.02	3.93	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	6	4.21	935/1666	3.80	4.22	4.19	4.11	4.21	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	657/1421	3.94	4.27	4.24	4.11	4.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	1425/1617	3.54	4.04	4.15	3.99	3.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	2	3	5	3.83	996/1555	3.81	3.98	4.00	3.92	3.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/1543	3.37	3.93	4.06	3.86	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	5	6	4.23	885/1647	3.82	4.31	4.12	4.06	4.23	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1668	4.58	4.67	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	2	0	9	3	3.93	1057/1605	3.64	4.01	4.07	3.96	3.93	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	424/1514	4.21	4.53	4.39	4.32	4.77	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	677/1551	4.52	4.72	4.66	4.55	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	742/1503	3.73	4.22	4.24	4.17	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	1	9	4.23	926/1506	3.86	4.27	4.26	4.17	4.23	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	995/1311	3.76	3.81	3.85	3.68	3.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	979/1490	3.46	3.86	4.05	3.85	3.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	438/1502	3.71	4.02	4.26	4.06	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	622/1489	3.79	4.10	4.29	4.07	4.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	4	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1006	3.83	4.05	4.00	3.81	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.83	4.19	4.09	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 112	****	4.70	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.22	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	3.50	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				

Course Section: ECON 101 1501
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS
 Instructor: COBB, VINCENT
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 492
 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	3	2	4	6	5	3.40	1525/1669	3.75	4.20	4.23	4.02	3.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	7	7	3	3.58	1442/1666	3.80	4.22	4.19	4.11	3.58	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	5	2	8	4	3.45	1250/1421	3.94	4.27	4.24	4.11	3.45	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	3	1	2	3	6	3.53	1360/1617	3.54	4.04	4.15	3.99	3.53	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	1	5	9	3.75	1062/1555	3.81	3.98	4.00	3.92	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	2	2	7	3	3.60	1226/1543	3.37	3.93	4.06	3.86	3.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	5	7	6	3.80	1250/1647	3.82	4.31	4.12	4.06	3.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	3	16	4.70	1039/1668	4.58	4.67	4.67	4.62	4.70	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	2	1	0	5	2	1	3.22	1464/1605	3.64	4.01	4.07	3.96	3.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	4	5	8	3.95	1241/1514	4.21	4.53	4.39	4.32	3.95	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	2	2	14	4.53	1176/1551	4.52	4.72	4.66	4.55	4.53	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	4	7	2	6	3.53	1324/1503	3.73	4.22	4.24	4.17	3.53	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	4	3	8	3.74	1250/1506	3.86	4.27	4.26	4.17	3.74	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	2	2	0	5	3	3.42	989/1311	3.76	3.81	3.85	3.68	3.42	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	3	2	2	5	3	3.20	1288/1490	3.46	3.86	4.05	3.85	3.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	4	1	3	6	3.60	1279/1502	3.71	4.02	4.26	4.06	3.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	3	2	3	5	3.57	1249/1489	3.79	4.10	4.29	4.07	3.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	8	0	2	0	1	3	3.83	632/1006	3.83	4.05	4.00	3.81	3.83	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 226	****	4.83	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	1	2	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 233	****	4.83	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	2	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 225	****	4.33	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	2	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 223	****	4.80	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	1	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	****/ 206	****	5.00	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.70	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	1	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/ 98	****	4.30	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 58	****	3.50	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	2	1	0	0	2.33	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	1	2	0	0	0	1.67	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	1	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: ECON 101 1501
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS
 Instructor: COBB, VINCENT
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 492
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	1	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	9	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course Section: ECON 101 1701
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS
 Instructor: APPIAH, ELIZABE
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 493
 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	3	0	2	8	6	6	2	2.92	1614/1669	3.75	4.20	4.23	4.02	2.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	3	7	7	6	1	2.79	1611/1666	3.80	4.22	4.19	4.11	2.79	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	5	5	10	3	3.38	1284/1421	3.94	4.27	4.24	4.11	3.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	1	5	6	4	5	3	2.78	1571/1617	3.54	4.04	4.15	3.99	2.78	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	2	9	4	7	3.61	1178/1555	3.81	3.98	4.00	3.92	3.61	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	3	3	7	10	0	1	2.48	1517/1543	3.37	3.93	4.06	3.86	2.48	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	2	7	8	4	2	2.87	1551/1647	3.82	4.31	4.12	4.06	2.87	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	357/1668	4.58	4.67	4.67	4.62	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	5	4	10	2	0	2.43	1566/1605	3.64	4.01	4.07	3.96	2.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	7	8	2	4	3.05	1453/1514	4.21	4.53	4.39	4.32	3.05	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	2	4	10	6	3.91	1443/1551	4.52	4.72	4.66	4.55	3.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	4	5	8	3	2	2.73	1454/1503	3.73	4.22	4.24	4.17	2.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	1	5	5	5	5	1	2.62	1446/1506	3.86	4.27	4.26	4.17	2.62	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	2	4	5	6	4	3.29	1048/1311	3.76	3.81	3.85	3.68	3.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	3	4	5	0	0	2.17	1466/1490	3.46	3.86	4.05	3.85	2.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	2	6	4	0	0	2.17	1491/1502	3.71	4.02	4.26	4.06	2.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	4	2	5	1	0	2.25	1477/1489	3.79	4.10	4.29	4.07	2.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	6	3	0	3	0	0	2.00	****/1006	3.83	4.05	4.00	3.81	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 226	****	4.83	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.83	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 225	****	4.33	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 223	****	4.80	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 206	****	5.00	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 112	****	4.70	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 98	****	4.30	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	3.50	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: ECON 101 1701
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS
 Instructor: APPIAH, ELIZABE
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 493
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	3	A	6	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	2	Under-grad	27	Non-major	25
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	1						

Course Section: ECON 101 1801
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS
 Instructor: APPIAH, ELIZABE
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 494
 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	1	0	0	1	4	8	5	3.94	1242/1669	3.75	4.20	4.23	4.02	3.94	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	2	8	6	3.84	1280/1666	3.80	4.22	4.19	4.11	3.84	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	5	10	4.33	746/1421	3.94	4.27	4.24	4.11	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	4	1	1	6	5	3.41	1419/1617	3.54	4.04	4.15	3.99	3.41	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	5	2	10	4.17	644/1555	3.81	3.98	4.00	3.92	4.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	4	0	4	5	3	3.19	1365/1543	3.37	3.93	4.06	3.86	3.19	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	1	2	6	6	3.76	1270/1647	3.82	4.31	4.12	4.06	3.76	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	0	1	16	4.72	1004/1668	4.58	4.67	4.67	4.62	4.72	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	2	5	5	2	3.50	1357/1605	3.64	4.01	4.07	3.96	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	8	7	4.22	1100/1514	4.21	4.53	4.39	4.32	4.22	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	6	10	4.39	1279/1551	4.52	4.72	4.66	4.55	4.39	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	4	2	4	7	3.67	1277/1503	3.73	4.22	4.24	4.17	3.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	4	0	6	6	3.56	1309/1506	3.86	4.27	4.26	4.17	3.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	2	3	4	7	3.82	751/1311	3.76	3.81	3.85	3.68	3.82	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	2	2	2	2	3.00	1328/1490	3.46	3.86	4.05	3.85	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	2	5	2	3.80	1179/1502	3.71	4.02	4.26	4.06	3.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	953/1489	3.79	4.10	4.29	4.07	4.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	2	0	2	1	3	3.38	823/1006	3.83	4.05	4.00	3.81	3.38	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	19	Non-major	16
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	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	9				
				?	2						

Course Section: ECON 101H 0101
 Title PRIN OF MICROECON-HONO
 Instructor: MCCONNELL, VIRG
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 495
 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	1	3	3	4.29	876/1669	4.29	4.20	4.23	4.02	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1094/1666	4.00	4.22	4.19	4.11	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	331/1421	4.71	4.27	4.24	4.11	4.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	922/1617	4.14	4.04	4.15	3.99	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	665/1555	4.14	3.98	4.00	3.92	4.14	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	1060/1543	3.86	3.93	4.06	3.86	3.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	481/1647	4.50	4.31	4.12	4.06	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.67	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	1132/1605	3.86	4.01	4.07	3.96	3.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	799/1514	4.50	4.53	4.39	4.32	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	1028/1551	4.67	4.72	4.66	4.55	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1066/1503	4.00	4.22	4.24	4.17	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	980/1506	4.17	4.27	4.26	4.17	4.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	939/1311	3.50	3.81	3.85	3.68	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	849/1490	4.00	3.86	4.05	3.85	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	632/1502	4.50	4.02	4.26	4.06	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1279/1489	3.50	4.10	4.29	4.07	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	923/1006	3.00	4.05	4.00	3.81	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ECON 102 0101
 Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS
 Instructor: THOMAS, MARK S
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 496
 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	3	2	4	3	3	3.07	1591/1669	3.97	4.20	4.23	4.02	3.07	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	4	3	5	3.60	1432/1666	4.10	4.22	4.19	4.11	3.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	701/1421	4.28	4.27	4.24	4.11	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	5	4	3	3.62	1328/1617	4.10	4.04	4.15	3.99	3.62	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	3	2	3	2	1	2.64	1509/1555	3.78	3.98	4.00	3.92	2.64	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	1	3	3	1	3.22	1352/1543	3.94	3.93	4.06	3.86	3.22	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	3	3	6	3.73	1285/1647	4.22	4.31	4.12	4.06	3.73	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	499/1668	4.55	4.67	4.67	4.62	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	4	1	5	3	3.36	1420/1605	3.88	4.01	4.07	3.96	3.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	1	3	8	4.31	1052/1514	4.54	4.53	4.39	4.32	4.31	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	2	1	2	8	4.23	1346/1551	4.68	4.72	4.66	4.55	4.23	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	4	0	2	7	3.92	1147/1503	4.24	4.22	4.24	4.17	3.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	757/1506	4.32	4.27	4.26	4.17	4.42	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	1	2	1	1	5	3.70	818/1311	3.83	3.81	3.85	3.68	3.70	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1117/1490	3.86	3.86	4.05	3.85	3.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	754/1502	3.93	4.02	4.26	4.06	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	800/1489	4.02	4.10	4.29	4.07	4.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1006	4.13	4.05	4.00	3.81	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 1	B 1		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 2	General 1	Under-grad 15 Non-major 15
84-150	3	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 5	
			? 0		

Course Section: ECON 102 0201
 Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS
 Instructor: THOMAS, MARK S
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 497
 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	2	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	478/1669	3.97	4.20	4.23	4.02	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	549/1666	4.10	4.22	4.19	4.11	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	356/1421	4.28	4.27	4.24	4.11	4.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	496/1617	4.10	4.04	4.15	3.99	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	0	5	3	4.11	698/1555	3.78	3.98	4.00	3.92	4.11	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	659/1543	3.94	3.93	4.06	3.86	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	270/1647	4.22	4.31	4.12	4.06	4.70	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1668	4.55	4.67	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	373/1605	3.88	4.01	4.07	3.96	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	223/1514	4.54	4.53	4.39	4.32	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	567/1551	4.68	4.72	4.66	4.55	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	254/1503	4.24	4.22	4.24	4.17	4.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	326/1506	4.32	4.27	4.26	4.17	4.78	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	305/1311	3.83	3.81	3.85	3.68	4.44	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	298/1490	3.86	3.86	4.05	3.85	4.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	859/1502	3.93	4.02	4.26	4.06	4.29	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1038/1489	4.02	4.10	4.29	4.07	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	143/1006	4.13	4.05	4.00	3.81	4.75	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.83	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.83	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.33	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 223	****	4.80	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 206	****	5.00	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 112	****	4.70	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 98	****	4.30	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 58	****	3.50	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: ECON 102 0201
 Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS
 Instructor: THOMAS, MARK S
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 497
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

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	2	0	0	1	1	6	7	4.27	901/1669	3.97	4.20	4.23	4.02	4.27	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	3	6	5	4.00	1094/1666	4.10	4.22	4.19	4.11	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	806/1421	4.28	4.27	4.24	4.11	4.27	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	4	1	0	3	1	6	4.00	1029/1617	4.10	4.04	4.15	3.99	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	1	2	2	7	4.00	773/1555	3.78	3.98	4.00	3.92	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	6	1	1	0	2	4	3.88	1043/1543	3.94	3.93	4.06	3.86	3.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	5	2	8	4.20	926/1647	4.22	4.31	4.12	4.06	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	1	0	0	11	3	4.00	1530/1668	4.55	4.67	4.67	4.62	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	666/1605	3.88	4.01	4.07	3.96	4.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	679/1514	4.54	4.53	4.39	4.32	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	1028/1551	4.68	4.72	4.66	4.55	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	719/1503	4.24	4.22	4.24	4.17	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	5	8	4.27	901/1506	4.32	4.27	4.26	4.17	4.27	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	2	0	1	3	7	4.00	587/1311	3.83	3.81	3.85	3.68	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	1	5	3	3.90	956/1490	3.86	3.86	4.05	3.85	3.90	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	2	4	3	3.80	1179/1502	3.93	4.02	4.26	4.06	3.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	953/1489	4.02	4.10	4.29	4.07	4.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	1	1	0	2	2	3.50	759/1006	4.13	4.05	4.00	3.81	3.50	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.83	4.19	4.09	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 58	****	3.50	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	5
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 17
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	7
			? 0		

Course Section: ECON 102 0401
 Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS
 Instructor: COOMBER, WILLIA
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 499
 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	1	0	1	3	7	5	3	3.32	1547/1669	3.97	4.20	4.23	4.02	3.32	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	7	7	4	3.68	1372/1666	4.10	4.22	4.19	4.11	3.68	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	3	5	8	3	3.58	1198/1421	4.28	4.27	4.24	4.11	3.58	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	9	1	1	4	3	1	3.20	1487/1617	4.10	4.04	4.15	3.99	3.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	2	2	6	5	3.75	1062/1555	3.78	3.98	4.00	3.92	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	15	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	****/1543	3.94	3.93	4.06	3.86	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	3	8	6	3.89	1169/1647	4.22	4.31	4.12	4.06	3.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	19	0	4.00	1530/1668	4.55	4.67	4.67	4.62	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	2	1	2	7	4	1	3.13	1488/1605	3.88	4.01	4.07	3.96	3.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	4	4	11	4.37	993/1514	4.54	4.53	4.39	4.32	4.37	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	2	2	14	4.47	1216/1551	4.68	4.72	4.66	4.55	4.47	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	3	3	9	4	3.74	1245/1503	4.24	4.22	4.24	4.17	3.74	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	2	0	6	7	3.67	1277/1506	4.32	4.27	4.26	4.17	3.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	1	1	4	2	6	3.79	774/1311	3.83	3.81	3.85	3.68	3.79	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	5	0	2	4	1	2.67	1417/1490	3.86	3.86	4.05	3.85	2.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	3	2	1	2	4	3.17	1382/1502	3.93	4.02	4.26	4.06	3.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	4	2	2	1	3	2.75	1441/1489	4.02	4.10	4.29	4.07	2.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	11	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1006	4.13	4.05	4.00	3.81	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 226	****	4.83	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.83	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 225	****	4.33	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 223	****	4.80	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 206	****	5.00	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	4.70	4.38	4.04	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 98	****	4.30	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	3.50	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: ECON 102 0401
 Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS
 Instructor: COOMBER, WILLIA
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 499
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 3	Required for Majors 5	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 2	C 4	General 3	Under-grad 20 Non-major 19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	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 7	
			? 0		

Course Section: ECON 102 0601
 Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS
 Instructor: FALCON, JAIME
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 500
 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	1	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	590/1669	3.97	4.20	4.23	4.02	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	173/1666	4.10	4.22	4.19	4.11	4.81	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	280/1421	4.28	4.27	4.24	4.11	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	382/1617	4.10	4.04	4.15	3.99	4.62	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	379/1555	3.78	3.98	4.00	3.92	4.47	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	3	9	4.31	598/1543	3.94	3.93	4.06	3.86	4.31	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	2	11	4.50	481/1647	4.22	4.31	4.12	4.06	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	15	1	4.06	1498/1668	4.55	4.67	4.67	4.62	4.06	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	486/1605	3.88	4.01	4.07	3.96	4.42	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	342/1514	4.54	4.53	4.39	4.32	4.81	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	358/1551	4.68	4.72	4.66	4.55	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	2	11	4.50	556/1503	4.24	4.22	4.24	4.17	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	273/1506	4.32	4.27	4.26	4.17	4.81	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	11	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1311	3.83	3.81	3.85	3.68	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	622/1490	3.86	3.86	4.05	3.85	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	818/1502	3.93	4.02	4.26	4.06	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	684/1489	4.02	4.10	4.29	4.07	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	4	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1006	4.13	4.05	4.00	3.81	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	6
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 7		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 17
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	6
			? 0		

Course Section: ECON 102 0701
 Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS
 Instructor: GINDLING, THOMA
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 501
 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	6	8	13	4.26	914/1669	3.97	4.20	4.23	4.02	4.26	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	7	16	4.44	634/1666	4.10	4.22	4.19	4.11	4.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	8	14	4.31	773/1421	4.28	4.27	4.24	4.11	4.31	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	3	5	12	4.45	583/1617	4.10	4.04	4.15	3.99	4.45	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	0	5	11	6	3.68	1118/1555	3.78	3.98	4.00	3.92	3.68	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	1	4	6	9	4.00	895/1543	3.94	3.93	4.06	3.86	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	5	18	4.52	469/1647	4.22	4.31	4.12	4.06	4.52	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/1668	4.55	4.67	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	3	12	4	4.05	884/1605	3.88	4.01	4.07	3.96	4.05	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	4	21	4.70	522/1514	4.54	4.53	4.39	4.32	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	24	4.85	650/1551	4.68	4.72	4.66	4.55	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	7	18	4.59	473/1503	4.24	4.22	4.24	4.17	4.59	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	20	4.67	471/1506	4.32	4.27	4.26	4.17	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	18	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	464/1311	3.83	3.81	3.85	3.68	4.22	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	1	1	2	8	4.15	771/1490	3.86	3.86	4.05	3.85	4.15	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	1	1	4	6	4.00	1013/1502	3.93	4.02	4.26	4.06	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	930/1489	4.02	4.10	4.29	4.07	4.23	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	10	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1006	4.13	4.05	4.00	3.81	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.83	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.33	4.50	4.42	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1	B	12						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	6	C	4	General	3	Under-grad	27	Non-major	27
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	D	1						
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	13				
				?	0						

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	2	9	9	9	3.77	1367/1669	3.97	4.20	4.23	4.02	3.77	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	14	9	6	3.67	1387/1666	4.10	4.22	4.19	4.11	3.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	3	14	10	3.97	1005/1421	4.28	4.27	4.24	4.11	3.97	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	3	5	8	4.31	739/1617	4.10	4.04	4.15	3.99	4.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	11	9	9	3.83	996/1555	3.78	3.98	4.00	3.92	3.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	19	1	1	1	2	6	4.00	895/1543	3.94	3.93	4.06	3.86	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	7	6	14	4.00	1043/1647	4.22	4.31	4.12	4.06	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	25	4.86	788/1668	4.55	4.67	4.67	4.62	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	2	11	12	1	3.46	1374/1605	3.88	4.01	4.07	3.96	3.46	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	5	15	9	4.07	1182/1514	4.54	4.53	4.39	4.32	4.07	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	7	22	4.70	986/1551	4.68	4.72	4.66	4.55	4.70	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	5	6	11	8	3.73	1245/1503	4.24	4.22	4.24	4.17	3.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	5	7	7	10	3.67	1277/1506	4.32	4.27	4.26	4.17	3.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	17	3	2	4	2	2	2.85	1175/1311	3.83	3.81	3.85	3.68	2.85	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	7	3	4	3.67	1088/1490	3.86	3.86	4.05	3.85	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	2	1	3	5	4	3.53	1294/1502	3.93	4.02	4.26	4.06	3.53	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	2	3	2	8	4.07	1023/1489	4.02	4.10	4.29	4.07	4.07	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	10	0	2	0	0	3	3.80	****/1006	4.13	4.05	4.00	3.81	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.83	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.83	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.33	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	4.80	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	5.00	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.70	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.30	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.50	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: ECON 102 0801
 Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS
 Instructor: TAKACS, WENDY E
 Enrollment: 78
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 502
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	10	General	6	Under-grad	30	Non-major	30
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course Section: ECON 121 0101
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I
 Instructor: ST MARTIN, JEAN
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 503
 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	2	0	0	0	2	1	19	4.77	244/1669	4.44	4.20	4.23	4.02	4.77	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	281/1666	4.54	4.22	4.19	4.11	4.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	151/1421	4.51	4.27	4.24	4.11	4.91		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	5	1	0	1	4	10	4.38	673/1617	4.22	4.04	4.15	3.99	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	5	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	324/1555	4.40	3.98	4.00	3.92	4.53	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	7	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	325/1543	4.18	3.93	4.06	3.86	4.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	161/1647	4.56	4.31	4.12	4.06	4.82	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	19	2	4.10	1482/1668	4.48	4.67	4.67	4.62	4.10	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	111/1605	4.32	4.01	4.07	3.96	4.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	189/1514	4.64	4.53	4.39	4.32	4.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1551	4.77	4.72	4.66	4.55	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	173/1503	4.49	4.22	4.24	4.17	4.85	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1506	4.45	4.27	4.26	4.17	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	15	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/1311	3.64	3.81	3.85	3.68	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	2	1	12	4.44	524/1490	3.88	3.86	4.05	3.85	4.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	5	1	11	4.35	800/1502	3.91	4.02	4.26	4.06	4.35	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	718/1489	3.95	4.10	4.29	4.07	4.47	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	10	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	110/1006	4.73	4.05	4.00	3.81	4.86	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.70	4.38	4.04	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	7	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	24	Non-major	23
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
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	16				
				?	0						

Course Section: ECON 121 0201
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I
 Instructor: ST MARTIN, JEAN
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 504
 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	0	0	2	15	4.67	389/1669	4.44	4.20	4.23	4.02	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	218/1666	4.54	4.22	4.19	4.11	4.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	392/1421	4.51	4.27	4.24	4.11	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	0	5	9	4.47	554/1617	4.22	4.04	4.15	3.99	4.47	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	508/1555	4.40	3.98	4.00	3.92	4.31	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	1	4	9	4.33	580/1543	4.18	3.93	4.06	3.86	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	241/1647	4.56	4.31	4.12	4.06	4.72	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	18	0	4.00	1530/1668	4.48	4.67	4.67	4.62	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	182/1605	4.32	4.01	4.07	3.96	4.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1514	4.64	4.53	4.39	4.32	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1551	4.77	4.72	4.66	4.55	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	144/1503	4.49	4.22	4.24	4.17	4.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	261/1506	4.45	4.27	4.26	4.17	4.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	12	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	764/1311	3.64	3.81	3.85	3.68	3.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	1	3	7	4.25	692/1490	3.88	3.86	4.05	3.85	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	632/1502	3.91	4.02	4.26	4.06	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	1	0	3	7	4.17	973/1489	3.95	4.10	4.29	4.07	4.17	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	7	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	199/1006	4.73	4.05	4.00	3.81	4.60	
Self Paced															
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	6	C	5	General	1	Under-grad	18	Non-major	12
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	1						

Course Section: ECON 121 0301
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I
 Instructor: CROTEAU, MARCIA
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 505
 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	1	2	4	18	4.56	522/1669	4.44	4.20	4.23	4.02	4.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	21	4.84	149/1666	4.54	4.22	4.19	4.11	4.84	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	16	4.56	502/1421	4.51	4.27	4.24	4.11	4.56	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	2	8	10	4.40	641/1617	4.22	4.04	4.15	3.99	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	5	6	12	4.30	516/1555	4.40	3.98	4.00	3.92	4.30	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	234/1543	4.18	3.93	4.06	3.86	4.69	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	4	19	4.75	213/1647	4.56	4.31	4.12	4.06	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1668	4.48	4.67	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	9	13	4.52	358/1605	4.32	4.01	4.07	3.96	4.52	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	6	18	4.68	569/1514	4.64	4.53	4.39	4.32	4.68	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	409/1551	4.77	4.72	4.66	4.55	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	8	17	4.68	373/1503	4.49	4.22	4.24	4.17	4.68	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	19	4.64	496/1506	4.45	4.27	4.26	4.17	4.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	9	2	1	2	6	5	3.69	832/1311	3.64	3.81	3.85	3.68	3.69	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	604/1490	3.88	3.86	4.05	3.85	4.35	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	3	6	7	4.12	968/1502	3.91	4.02	4.26	4.06	4.12	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	5	4	8	4.18	966/1489	3.95	4.10	4.29	4.07	4.18	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	11	2	1	2	1	0	2.33	****/1006	4.73	4.05	4.00	3.81	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	B 15		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 3	C 1	General 1	Under-grad 25 Non-major 25
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 7	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 0	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 20	
			? 1		

Course Section: ECON 121 0401
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I
 Instructor: MCBRIDE, CHUCK
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 506
 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	1	5	2	14	4.32	840/1669	4.44	4.20	4.23	4.02	4.32	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	12	4.36	740/1666	4.54	4.22	4.19	4.11	4.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	1	6	12	4.23	839/1421	4.51	4.27	4.24	4.11	4.23	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	5	4	11	4.19	863/1617	4.22	4.04	4.15	3.99	4.19	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	213/1555	4.40	3.98	4.00	3.92	4.68	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	3	1	3	11	4.05	863/1543	4.18	3.93	4.06	3.86	4.05	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	1	2	3	12	4.26	851/1647	4.56	4.31	4.12	4.06	4.26	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	13	6	4.32	1345/1668	4.48	4.67	4.67	4.62	4.32	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	5	6	6	3.94	1022/1605	4.32	4.01	4.07	3.96	3.94	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	3	5	9	4.22	1100/1514	4.64	4.53	4.39	4.32	4.22	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	539/1551	4.77	4.72	4.66	4.55	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	2	1	0	8	7	3.94	1127/1503	4.49	4.22	4.24	4.17	3.94	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	0	1	6	9	4.11	1017/1506	4.45	4.27	4.26	4.17	4.11	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	11	2	1	1	0	3	3.14	1091/1311	3.64	3.81	3.85	3.68	3.14	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	2	2	4	3	3.50	1154/1490	3.88	3.86	4.05	3.85	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	2	1	5	4	3.92	1106/1502	3.91	4.02	4.26	4.06	3.92	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	2	2	2	5	3.67	1223/1489	3.95	4.10	4.29	4.07	3.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	10	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1006	4.73	4.05	4.00	3.81	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 226	****	4.83	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.83	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 225	****	4.33	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 223	****	4.80	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 206	****	5.00	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 112	****	4.70	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 98	****	4.30	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	3.50	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: ECON 121 0401
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I
 Instructor: MCBRIDE, CHUCK
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 506
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	2	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C	6	General	2	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	2	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

Course Section: ECON 121 0501
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I
 Instructor: COLE, RICHARD
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 507
 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	1	0	0	0	6	4	10	4.20	988/1669	4.44	4.20	4.23	4.02	4.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	8	8	4.20	957/1666	4.54	4.22	4.19	4.11	4.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	4	4	11	4.20	863/1421	4.51	4.27	4.24	4.11	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	5	1	1	2	5	5	3.86	1196/1617	4.22	4.04	4.15	3.99	3.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	5	11	4.20	611/1555	4.40	3.98	4.00	3.92	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	2	2	2	3	6	3.60	1226/1543	4.18	3.93	4.06	3.86	3.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	3	15	4.60	367/1647	4.56	4.31	4.12	4.06	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1668	4.48	4.67	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	4	9	4	4.00	918/1605	4.32	4.01	4.07	3.96	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	631/1514	4.64	4.53	4.39	4.32	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	2	3	13	4.42	1254/1551	4.77	4.72	4.66	4.55	4.42	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	0	7	10	4.44	653/1503	4.49	4.22	4.24	4.17	4.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	5	10	4.32	858/1506	4.45	4.27	4.26	4.17	4.32	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	10	0	1	4	0	5	3.90	699/1311	3.64	3.81	3.85	3.68	3.90	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	1	5	2	2	3.08	1319/1490	3.88	3.86	4.05	3.85	3.08	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	3	5	0	3	3.08	1392/1502	3.91	4.02	4.26	4.06	3.08	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	7	1	3	3.42	1314/1489	3.95	4.10	4.29	4.07	3.42	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	11	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1006	4.73	4.05	4.00	3.81	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 2	B 10		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 7	C 4	General 4	Under-grad 21 Non-major 20
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 12	
			? 0		

Course Section: ECON 121 0601
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I
 Instructor: COLE, RICHARD
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 508
 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	2	0	0	1	3	6	9	4.21	963/1669	4.44	4.20	4.23	4.02	4.21	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	472/1666	4.54	4.22	4.19	4.11	4.58	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	493/1421	4.51	4.27	4.24	4.11	4.58	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	4	0	0	4	4	7	4.20	863/1617	4.22	4.04	4.15	3.99	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	2	1	0	3	2	10	4.25	558/1555	4.40	3.98	4.00	3.92	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	3	1	1	2	3	8	4.07	857/1543	4.18	3.93	4.06	3.86	4.07	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	123/1647	4.56	4.31	4.12	4.06	4.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	952/1668	4.48	4.67	4.67	4.62	4.76	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	3	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	565/1605	4.32	4.01	4.07	3.96	4.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	473/1514	4.64	4.53	4.39	4.32	4.74	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	1	4	12	4.50	1193/1551	4.77	4.72	4.66	4.55	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	451/1503	4.49	4.22	4.24	4.17	4.61	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	7	9	4.32	858/1506	4.45	4.27	4.26	4.17	4.32	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	1	1	4	2	5	3.69	825/1311	3.64	3.81	3.85	3.68	3.69	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	2	3	3	6	3.73	1049/1490	3.88	3.86	4.05	3.85	3.73	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	1	3	2	7	3.73	1219/1502	3.91	4.02	4.26	4.06	3.73	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	2	4	3	6	3.87	1142/1489	3.95	4.10	4.29	4.07	3.87	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	10	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	****/1006	4.73	4.05	4.00	3.81	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.83	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.83	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.33	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	4.80	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	5.00	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.70	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.30	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 58	****	3.50	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: ECON 121 0601
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I
 Instructor: COLE, RICHARD
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 508
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B	9						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	1						

Course Section: ECON 121 0701
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I
 Instructor: MCBRIDE, CHUCK
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 509
 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	0	3	7	14	4.32	828/1669	4.44	4.20	4.23	4.02	4.32	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	9	12	4.28	841/1666	4.54	4.22	4.19	4.11	4.28	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	8	14	4.40	683/1421	4.51	4.27	4.24	4.11	4.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	5	9	9	4.08	981/1617	4.22	4.04	4.15	3.99	4.08	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	4	3	16	4.52	324/1555	4.40	3.98	4.00	3.92	4.52	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	6	8	9	3.92	994/1543	4.18	3.93	4.06	3.86	3.92	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	6	6	10	3.88	1178/1647	4.56	4.31	4.12	4.06	3.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	19	5	4.21	1412/1668	4.48	4.67	4.67	4.62	4.21	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	1	5	6	4	3.81	1164/1605	4.32	4.01	4.07	3.96	3.81	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	2	8	13	4.33	1022/1514	4.64	4.53	4.39	4.32	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	6	17	4.67	1028/1551	4.77	4.72	4.66	4.55	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	4	11	8	4.04	1045/1503	4.49	4.22	4.24	4.17	4.04	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	5	5	10	3.91	1163/1506	4.45	4.27	4.26	4.17	3.91	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	13	0	1	4	3	2	3.60	890/1311	3.64	3.81	3.85	3.68	3.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	4	1	4	3.80	1003/1490	3.88	3.86	4.05	3.85	3.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	2	2	3	3	3.70	1237/1502	3.91	4.02	4.26	4.06	3.70	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	5	1	4	3.90	1125/1489	3.95	4.10	4.29	4.07	3.90	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	6	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1006	4.73	4.05	4.00	3.81	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.70	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.30	3.95	3.90	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 12	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 6	General	2
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 1		Under-grad 25
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0		
			? 2	Other	20

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	2	2	4	3	3.50	1480/1669	4.02	4.20	4.23	4.02	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	3	3	3.82	1303/1666	4.12	4.22	4.19	4.11	3.82	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	939/1421	4.10	4.27	4.24	4.11	4.08	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	1448/1617	3.77	4.04	4.15	3.99	3.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	3	4	2	3.45	1265/1555	3.91	3.98	4.00	3.92	3.45	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1543	3.69	3.93	4.06	3.86	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	2	3	3	3.45	1416/1647	4.07	4.31	4.12	4.06	3.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	1164/1668	4.65	4.67	4.67	4.62	4.55	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	1	4	2	1	3.38	1412/1605	3.81	4.01	4.07	3.96	3.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	2	4	4	3.83	1295/1514	4.35	4.53	4.39	4.32	3.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	1231/1551	4.75	4.72	4.66	4.55	4.45	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	3	3	3	3.64	1289/1503	4.08	4.22	4.24	4.17	3.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	3	0	6	3.91	1174/1506	4.01	4.27	4.26	4.17	3.91	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	995/1311	3.38	3.81	3.85	3.68	3.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	970/1490	3.83	3.86	4.05	3.85	3.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	3	1	3	3.75	1208/1502	3.99	4.02	4.26	4.06	3.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	3	0	3	3.57	1249/1489	3.78	4.10	4.29	4.07	3.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1006	3.63	4.05	4.00	3.81	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 226	****	4.83	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.83	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 225	****	4.33	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 223	****	4.80	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 206	****	5.00	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 112	****	4.70	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 98	****	4.30	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	3.50	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: ECON 122 0101
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING II
 Instructor: MALIN, BARRY
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 510
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	4	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	11
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	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: ECON 122 0201
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING II
 Instructor: DAVIS, MARY B
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 511
 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	0	2	8	12	4.30	852/1669	4.02	4.20	4.23	4.02	4.30	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	5	15	4.39	703/1666	4.12	4.22	4.19	4.11	4.39	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	6	14	4.39	692/1421	4.10	4.27	4.24	4.11	4.39	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	1	1	2	3	7	4.00	1029/1617	3.77	4.04	4.15	3.99	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	2	8	3	6	3.43	1287/1555	3.91	3.98	4.00	3.92	3.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	2	2	4	8	3.94	969/1543	3.69	3.93	4.06	3.86	3.94	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	7	13	4.35	744/1647	4.07	4.31	4.12	4.06	4.35	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	788/1668	4.65	4.67	4.67	4.62	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	10	6	4.16	800/1605	3.81	4.01	4.07	3.96	4.16	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	7	13	4.45	877/1514	4.35	4.53	4.39	4.32	4.45	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1551	4.75	4.72	4.66	4.55	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	8	11	4.43	686/1503	4.08	4.22	4.24	4.17	4.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	3	16	4.50	642/1506	4.01	4.27	4.26	4.17	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	9	1	1	4	3	3	3.50	939/1311	3.38	3.81	3.85	3.68	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	546/1490	3.83	3.86	4.05	3.85	4.42	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	427/1502	3.99	4.02	4.26	4.06	4.73	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	4	2	5	4.09	1015/1489	3.78	4.10	4.29	4.07	4.09	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	8	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1006	3.63	4.05	4.00	3.81	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	19
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

Course Section: ECON 122 0301
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING II
 Instructor: DAVIS, MARY B
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 512
 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	1	2	6	11	4.35	793/1669	4.02	4.20	4.23	4.02	4.35	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	0	5	12	4.42	662/1666	4.12	4.22	4.19	4.11	4.42	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	1	4	12	4.37	719/1421	4.10	4.27	4.24	4.11	4.37	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	7	1	2	2	1	6	3.75	1251/1617	3.77	4.04	4.15	3.99	3.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	4	4	9	4.29	524/1555	3.91	3.98	4.00	3.92	4.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	0	4	2	9	4.33	580/1543	3.69	3.93	4.06	3.86	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	4	3	11	4.39	682/1647	4.07	4.31	4.12	4.06	4.39	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	428/1668	4.65	4.67	4.67	4.62	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	2	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	591/1605	3.81	4.01	4.07	3.96	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	441/1514	4.35	4.53	4.39	4.32	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	594/1551	4.75	4.72	4.66	4.55	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	621/1503	4.08	4.22	4.24	4.17	4.47	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	4	11	4.56	585/1506	4.01	4.27	4.26	4.17	4.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	7	1	0	4	0	4	3.67	846/1311	3.38	3.81	3.85	3.68	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	2	1	2	4	3.60	1117/1490	3.83	3.86	4.05	3.85	3.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	1	2	4	2	3.50	1301/1502	3.99	4.02	4.26	4.06	3.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	2	2	3	2	3.30	1352/1489	3.78	4.10	4.29	4.07	3.30	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	4	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	729/1006	3.63	4.05	4.00	3.81	3.60	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 1	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 10	Graduate	0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 8	Under-grad	20
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0	Non-major	18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	19

Course Section: ECON 122 0401
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING II
 Instructor: HARDY, TIMOTHY
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 513
 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	5	6	1	3.67	1409/1669	4.02	4.20	4.23	4.02	3.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	5	2	3.67	1387/1666	4.12	4.22	4.19	4.11	3.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	5	1	3.42	1273/1421	4.10	4.27	4.24	4.11	3.42	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	2	4	1	3.63	1323/1617	3.77	4.04	4.15	3.99	3.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	5	3	3.75	1062/1555	3.91	3.98	4.00	3.92	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	3	1	3	1	0	2.25	1530/1543	3.69	3.93	4.06	3.86	2.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	3	2	4	3.58	1361/1647	4.07	4.31	4.12	4.06	3.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	0	4.00	1530/1668	4.65	4.67	4.67	4.62	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	3	3	4	1	3.27	1449/1605	3.81	4.01	4.07	3.96	3.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	5	3	3.91	1270/1514	4.35	4.53	4.39	4.32	3.91	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	1262/1551	4.75	4.72	4.66	4.55	4.42	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	1	6	2	3.50	1330/1503	4.08	4.22	4.24	4.17	3.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	3	3	2	3.08	1399/1506	4.01	4.27	4.26	4.17	3.08	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	1	1	3	0	1	2.83	1178/1311	3.38	3.81	3.85	3.68	2.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	0	2	1	1	2.83	1391/1490	3.83	3.86	4.05	3.85	2.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	1253/1502	3.99	4.02	4.26	4.06	3.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	2	1	1	2	3.50	1279/1489	3.78	4.10	4.29	4.07	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1006	3.63	4.05	4.00	3.81	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 233	****	4.83	4.19	4.09	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 206	****	5.00	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	4.70	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.22	3.79	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 98	****	4.30	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 58	****	3.50	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: ECON 122 0401
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING II
 Instructor: HARDY, TIMOTHY
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 513
 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	2	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	10
84-150	2	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	10				
				?	1						

Course Section: ECON 122 0501
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING II
 Instructor: HARDY, TIMOTHY
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 514
 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	1	0	4	5	4.30	852/1669	4.02	4.20	4.23	4.02	4.30	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	1	7	4.30	814/1666	4.12	4.22	4.19	4.11	4.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	839/1421	4.10	4.27	4.24	4.11	4.22	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	922/1617	3.77	4.04	4.15	3.99	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	262/1555	3.91	3.98	4.00	3.92	4.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	659/1543	3.69	3.93	4.06	3.86	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	367/1647	4.07	4.31	4.12	4.06	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	713/1668	4.65	4.67	4.67	4.62	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	1	4	3	3.89	1108/1605	3.81	4.01	4.07	3.96	3.89	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	360/1514	4.35	4.53	4.39	4.32	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1551	4.75	4.72	4.66	4.55	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	753/1503	4.08	4.22	4.24	4.17	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	0	2	6	4.00	1069/1506	4.01	4.27	4.26	4.17	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	5	1	3	3.50	939/1311	3.38	3.81	3.85	3.68	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	535/1490	3.83	3.86	4.05	3.85	4.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	859/1502	3.99	4.02	4.26	4.06	4.29	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	776/1489	3.78	4.10	4.29	4.07	4.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	694/1006	3.63	4.05	4.00	3.81	3.67	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ECON 301 0101
 Title INTERMED ACCOUNTING I
 Instructor: CROTEAU, MARCIA
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 515
 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	1	0	0	0	3	6	16	4.52	567/1669	4.58	4.20	4.23	4.28	4.52	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	5	17	4.56	483/1666	4.54	4.22	4.19	4.20	4.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	8	15	4.52	538/1421	4.55	4.27	4.24	4.25	4.52	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	3	12	8	4.22	841/1617	4.11	4.04	4.15	4.22	4.22	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	3	4	5	9	3.95	856/1555	4.26	3.98	4.00	4.03	3.95	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	6	3	5	7	3.50	1260/1543	3.75	3.93	4.06	4.14	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	6	18	4.68	292/1647	4.81	4.31	4.12	4.14	4.68	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	0	24	4.92	570/1668	4.87	4.67	4.67	4.68	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	5	14	4.50	373/1605	4.42	4.01	4.07	4.09	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	392/1514	4.86	4.53	4.39	4.46	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	2	20	4.83	732/1551	4.88	4.72	4.66	4.70	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	4	17	4.65	399/1503	4.76	4.22	4.24	4.28	4.65	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	6	15	4.48	680/1506	4.65	4.27	4.26	4.30	4.48	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	9	0	1	4	3	6	4.00	587/1311	4.20	3.81	3.85	3.97	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	3	0	3	2	11	3.95	913/1490	4.34	3.86	4.05	4.11	3.95	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	2	6	6	6	3.80	1179/1502	4.08	4.02	4.26	4.28	3.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	3	8	7	4.11	1013/1489	4.28	4.10	4.29	4.35	4.11	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	14	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	****/1006	****	4.05	4.00	4.10	****	

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	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 15		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 5	C 3	General 2	Under-grad 26 Non-major 26
84-150	8	3.00-3.49 7	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 21	
			? 0		

Course Section: ECON 301 0201
 Title INTERMED ACCOUNTING I
 Instructor: CROTEAU, MARCIA
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 516
 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	0	6	11	4.65	419/1669	4.58	4.20	4.23	4.28	4.65	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	11	4.53	527/1666	4.54	4.22	4.19	4.20	4.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	3	13	4.59	484/1421	4.55	4.27	4.24	4.25	4.59	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	2	5	8	4.00	1029/1617	4.11	4.04	4.15	4.22	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	293/1555	4.26	3.98	4.00	4.03	4.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	4	8	4.00	895/1543	3.75	3.93	4.06	4.14	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	67/1647	4.81	4.31	4.12	4.14	4.94	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	863/1668	4.87	4.67	4.67	4.68	4.82	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	8	4	4.33	591/1605	4.42	4.01	4.07	4.09	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	132/1514	4.86	4.53	4.39	4.46	4.94	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	358/1551	4.88	4.72	4.66	4.70	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	154/1503	4.76	4.22	4.24	4.28	4.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	273/1506	4.65	4.27	4.26	4.30	4.81	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	9	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	333/1311	4.20	3.81	3.85	3.97	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	289/1490	4.34	3.86	4.05	4.11	4.73	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	1	1	8	4.36	790/1502	4.08	4.02	4.26	4.28	4.36	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	1	0	9	4.45	742/1489	4.28	4.10	4.29	4.35	4.45	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	9	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1006	****	4.05	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.83	4.20	4.17	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.83	4.19	4.13	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.33	4.50	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	4.80	4.35	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	5.00	4.15	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.70	4.38	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.22	4.47	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.30	3.95	4.15	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.50	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****	

Course Section: ECON 301 0201
 Title INTERMED ACCOUNTING I
 Instructor: CROTEAU, MARCIA
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 516
 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	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Course Section: ECON 311 0101
 Title INTERM MICROECON ANALY
 Instructor: COATES, DENNIS
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 517
 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	1	6	12	4.58	511/1669	4.27	4.20	4.23	4.28	4.58	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	6	8	4.22	922/1666	4.18	4.22	4.19	4.20	4.22	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	5	9	4.16	894/1421	4.20	4.27	4.24	4.25	4.16	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	863/1617	3.86	4.04	4.15	4.22	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	2	7	5	4.07	734/1555	3.85	3.98	4.00	4.03	4.07	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	13	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1076/1543	3.92	3.93	4.06	4.14	3.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	2	15	4.63	334/1647	4.57	4.31	4.12	4.14	4.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	11	7	4.26	1376/1668	4.51	4.67	4.67	4.68	4.26	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	11	4	4.06	884/1605	4.22	4.01	4.07	4.09	4.06	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	553/1514	4.61	4.53	4.39	4.46	4.68	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	1069/1551	4.69	4.72	4.66	4.70	4.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	7	10	4.42	686/1503	4.30	4.22	4.24	4.28	4.42	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	394/1506	4.44	4.27	4.26	4.30	4.72	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	264/1311	3.92	3.81	3.85	3.97	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	1	1	2	4	3.78	1022/1490	3.76	3.86	4.05	4.11	3.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	2	3	1	3	3.56	1290/1502	3.68	4.02	4.26	4.28	3.56	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	1006/1489	3.83	4.10	4.29	4.35	4.11	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	5	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	199/1006	4.60	4.05	4.00	4.10	4.60	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 226	****	4.83	4.20	4.17	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.83	4.19	4.13	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 225	****	4.33	4.50	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 223	****	4.80	4.35	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 206	****	5.00	4.15	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 112	****	4.70	4.38	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.22	4.47	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 98	****	4.30	3.95	4.15	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A 8	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 6			
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C 3	General 1	Under-grad 19	Non-major 14
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 18		
				? 1			

Course Section: ECON 311 0201
 Title INTERM MICROECON ANALY
 Instructor: TAKACS, WENDY E
 Enrollment: 43
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 518
 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	2	0	7	15	9	3.88	1307/1669	4.27	4.20	4.23	4.28	3.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	15	12	4.12	1019/1666	4.18	4.22	4.19	4.20	4.12	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	12	16	4.27	797/1421	4.20	4.27	4.24	4.25	4.27	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	17	1	0	4	6	4	3.80	1224/1617	3.86	4.04	4.15	4.22	3.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	3	5	6	10	6	3.37	1316/1555	3.85	3.98	4.00	4.03	3.37	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	19	0	1	1	8	4	4.07	850/1543	3.92	3.93	4.06	4.14	4.07	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	12	18	4.45	566/1647	4.57	4.31	4.12	4.14	4.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	5.00	1/1668	4.51	4.67	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	4	14	10	4.14	820/1605	4.22	4.01	4.07	4.09	4.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	16	15	4.41	955/1514	4.61	4.53	4.39	4.46	4.41	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	0	4	27	4.75	880/1551	4.69	4.72	4.66	4.70	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	19	10	4.22	914/1503	4.30	4.22	4.24	4.28	4.22	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	11	16	4.31	858/1506	4.44	4.27	4.26	4.30	4.31	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	19	1	1	3	4	3	3.58	899/1311	3.92	3.81	3.85	3.97	3.58	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	2	2	3	5	4	3.44	1196/1490	3.76	3.86	4.05	4.11	3.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	1	0	8	2	5	3.63	1270/1502	3.68	4.02	4.26	4.28	3.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	3	1	4	3	5	3.38	1328/1489	3.83	4.10	4.29	4.35	3.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	13	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1006	4.60	4.05	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 226	****	4.83	4.20	4.17	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.83	4.19	4.13	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 225	****	4.33	4.50	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 223	****	4.80	4.35	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	5.00	4.15	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 112	****	4.70	4.38	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.22	4.47	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.30	3.95	4.15	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	3.50	3.50	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****	

Course Section: ECON 311 0201
 Title INTERM MICROECON ANALY
 Instructor: TAKACS, WENDY E
 Enrollment: 43
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 518
 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	12	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	4	C	8	General	2	Under-grad	33	Non-major	26
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	28				
				?	1						

Course Section: ECON 311 0301
 Title INTERM MICROECON ANALY
 Instructor: BRADLEY, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 519
 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	1	0	1	1	3	3	8	4.00	1173/1669	4.27	4.20	4.23	4.28	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	4	9	4.06	1065/1666	4.18	4.22	4.19	4.20	4.06	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	2	10	4.18	878/1421	4.20	4.27	4.24	4.25	4.18	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	1	1	2	0	3	3.43	1414/1617	3.86	4.04	4.15	4.22	3.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	2	4	8	4.06	734/1555	3.85	3.98	4.00	4.03	4.06	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1543	3.92	3.93	4.06	4.14	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	389/1647	4.57	4.31	4.12	4.14	4.59	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	863/1668	4.51	4.67	4.67	4.68	4.82	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	918/1605	4.22	4.01	4.07	4.09	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	763/1514	4.61	4.53	4.39	4.46	4.54	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	1097/1551	4.69	4.72	4.66	4.70	4.62	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	1	2	3	6	3.92	1147/1503	4.30	4.22	4.24	4.28	3.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	5	6	4.23	926/1506	4.44	4.27	4.26	4.30	4.23	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	2	0	4	1	2	3.11	1100/1311	3.92	3.81	3.85	3.97	3.11	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	3	1	5	3.73	1055/1490	3.76	3.86	4.05	4.11	3.73	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	4	0	0	6	3.55	1292/1502	3.68	4.02	4.26	4.28	3.55	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	3	2	1	4	3.60	1237/1489	3.83	4.10	4.29	4.35	3.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	8	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1006	4.60	4.05	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.83	4.19	4.13	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.33	4.50	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	4.80	4.35	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	5.00	4.15	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.70	4.38	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.22	4.47	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.30	3.95	4.15	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	3.50	3.50	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****	

Course Section: ECON 311 0301
 Title INTERM MICROECON ANALY
 Instructor: BRADLEY, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 519
 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	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	B	7						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	13
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	1						

Course Section: ECON 311 0401
 Title INTERM MICROECON ANALY
 Instructor: COATES, DENNIS
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 520
 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	1	4	11	4.63	448/1669	4.27	4.20	4.23	4.28	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	801/1666	4.18	4.22	4.19	4.20	4.31	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	4	9	4.19	871/1421	4.20	4.27	4.24	4.25	4.19	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	1	1	3	6	4.00	1029/1617	3.86	4.04	4.15	4.22	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	1	0	5	4	3.91	939/1555	3.85	3.98	4.00	4.03	3.91	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	1060/1543	3.92	3.93	4.06	4.14	3.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	367/1647	4.57	4.31	4.12	4.14	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	14	1	3.94	1574/1668	4.51	4.67	4.67	4.68	3.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	210/1605	4.22	4.01	4.07	4.09	4.70	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	342/1514	4.61	4.53	4.39	4.46	4.81	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	880/1551	4.69	4.72	4.66	4.70	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	438/1503	4.30	4.22	4.24	4.28	4.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	642/1506	4.44	4.27	4.26	4.30	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	10	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	264/1311	3.92	3.81	3.85	3.97	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	800/1490	3.76	3.86	4.05	4.11	4.11	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	1013/1502	3.68	4.02	4.26	4.28	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	936/1489	3.83	4.10	4.29	4.35	4.22	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1006	4.60	4.05	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.83	4.20	4.17	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 233	****	4.83	4.19	4.13	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.33	4.50	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	4.80	4.35	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	5.00	4.15	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.70	4.38	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.12	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.30	3.95	4.15	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	46/ 58	3.50	3.50	4.22	4.29	3.50	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****	

Course Section: ECON 311 0401
 Title INTERM MICROECON ANALY
 Instructor: COATES, DENNIS
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 520
 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	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	10
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	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	13				
				?	0						

Course Section: ECON 312 0101
 Title INTERM MACROECON ANALY
 Instructor: CINYABUGUMA, MA
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 521
 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	1	0	0	1	4	10	11	4.19	988/1669	4.01	4.20	4.23	4.28	4.19	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	5	12	8	4.04	1076/1666	4.05	4.22	4.19	4.20	4.04	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	5	11	9	4.08	943/1421	4.01	4.27	4.24	4.25	4.08	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	7	2	3	2	7	5	3.53	1364/1617	3.96	4.04	4.15	4.22	3.53	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	3	3	6	10	4.05	747/1555	4.04	3.98	4.00	4.03	4.05	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	13	3	0	2	3	4	3.42	1298/1543	3.81	3.93	4.06	4.14	3.42	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	3	4	7	11	4.04	1022/1647	4.13	4.31	4.12	4.14	4.04	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	8	16	4.67	1068/1668	4.84	4.67	4.67	4.68	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	7	10	2	3.74	1225/1605	3.69	4.01	4.07	4.09	3.74	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	4	7	12	4.35	1013/1514	4.58	4.53	4.39	4.46	4.35	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	2	4	17	4.65	1042/1551	4.74	4.72	4.66	4.70	4.65	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	5	8	9	4.09	1025/1503	4.11	4.22	4.24	4.28	4.09	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	1	0	4	7	10	4.14	1002/1506	4.21	4.27	4.26	4.30	4.14	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	10	3	0	2	1	5	3.45	967/1311	3.51	3.81	3.85	3.97	3.45	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	622/1490	3.99	3.86	4.05	4.11	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	586/1502	4.15	4.02	4.26	4.28	4.56	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	640/1489	4.25	4.10	4.29	4.35	4.56	
4. Were special techniques successful	18	3	1	0	2	0	3	3.67	****/1006	4.00	4.05	4.00	4.10	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 15	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 3	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 27 Non-major 21
84-150	7	3.00-3.49 8	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 19	
			? 0		

Course Section: ECON 312 0201
 Title INTERM MACROECON ANALY
 Instructor: CINYABUGUMA, MA
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 522
 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	0	3	13	5	3.95	1230/1669	4.01	4.20	4.23	4.28	3.95	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	10	7	4.09	1042/1666	4.05	4.22	4.19	4.20	4.09	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	9	11	4.41	683/1421	4.01	4.27	4.24	4.25	4.41	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	445/1617	3.96	4.04	4.15	4.22	4.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	3	6	9	4.21	592/1555	4.04	3.98	4.00	4.03	4.21	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	1	1	0	4	5	4.00	895/1543	3.81	3.93	4.06	4.14	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	3	5	12	4.33	759/1647	4.13	4.31	4.12	4.14	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	1039/1668	4.84	4.67	4.67	4.68	4.70	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	1	4	9	3	3.67	1274/1605	3.69	4.01	4.07	4.09	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	9	10	4.38	974/1514	4.58	4.53	4.39	4.46	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	7	12	4.48	1216/1551	4.74	4.72	4.66	4.70	4.48	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	6	5	10	4.19	932/1503	4.11	4.22	4.24	4.28	4.19	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	11	8	4.29	884/1506	4.21	4.27	4.26	4.30	4.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	11	2	2	1	3	1	2.89	1165/1311	3.51	3.81	3.85	3.97	2.89	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	2	6	5	4.00	849/1490	3.99	3.86	4.05	4.11	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	6	2	5	3.71	1231/1502	4.15	4.02	4.26	4.28	3.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	5	2	6	3.86	1146/1489	4.25	4.10	4.29	4.35	3.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	8	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	479/1006	4.00	4.05	4.00	4.10	4.00	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.83	4.19	4.13	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	3.50	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	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	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	22	Non-major	13
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	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	15				
				?	0						

Course Section: ECON 312 0301
 Title INTERM MACROECON ANALY
 Instructor: PARK, KIYOUNG
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 523
 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	1	2	5	5	4.08	1124/1669	4.01	4.20	4.23	4.28	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	4	4.00	1094/1666	4.05	4.22	4.19	4.20	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	969/1421	4.01	4.27	4.24	4.25	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	899/1617	3.96	4.04	4.15	4.22	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	715/1555	4.04	3.98	4.00	4.03	4.09	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	3	4	2	3.70	1175/1543	3.81	3.93	4.06	4.14	3.70	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	0	2	9	4.38	682/1647	4.13	4.31	4.12	4.14	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1668	4.84	4.67	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	4	1	4	4.00	918/1605	3.69	4.01	4.07	4.09	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	441/1514	4.58	4.53	4.39	4.46	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	460/1551	4.74	4.72	4.66	4.70	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	1025/1503	4.11	4.22	4.24	4.28	4.08	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	838/1506	4.21	4.27	4.26	4.30	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	0	3	1	4	3.78	780/1311	3.51	3.81	3.85	3.97	3.78	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	849/1490	3.99	3.86	4.05	4.11	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	900/1502	4.15	4.02	4.26	4.28	4.22	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	936/1489	4.25	4.10	4.29	4.35	4.22	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	6	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1006	4.00	4.05	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.83	4.20	4.17	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.83	4.19	4.13	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.33	4.50	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	4.80	4.35	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	5.00	4.15	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.70	4.38	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.22	4.47	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.30	3.95	4.15	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.50	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****	

Course Section: ECON 312 0301
 Title INTERM MACROECON ANALY
 Instructor: PARK, KIYOUNG
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 523
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	12
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	13				
				?	0						

Course Section: ECON 312 0401
 Title INTERM MACROECON ANALY
 Instructor: PARK, KIYOUNG
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 524
 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	2	3	5	3.83	1332/1669	4.01	4.20	4.23	4.28	3.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	1	7	4.08	1048/1666	4.05	4.22	4.19	4.20	4.08	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	0	1	2	5	3.55	1208/1421	4.01	4.27	4.24	4.25	3.55	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	2	1	2	4	3.60	1334/1617	3.96	4.04	4.15	4.22	3.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	2	1	5	3.80	1021/1555	4.04	3.98	4.00	4.03	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	807/1543	3.81	3.93	4.06	4.14	4.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	1	0	7	3.75	1275/1647	4.13	4.31	4.12	4.14	3.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1668	4.84	4.67	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	3	3	1	3.38	1412/1605	3.69	4.01	4.07	4.09	3.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	308/1514	4.58	4.53	4.39	4.46	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	460/1551	4.74	4.72	4.66	4.70	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	2	1	7	4.08	1025/1503	4.11	4.22	4.24	4.28	4.08	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	1	1	7	4.09	1029/1506	4.21	4.27	4.26	4.30	4.09	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	1	2	0	6	3.90	699/1311	3.51	3.81	3.85	3.97	3.90	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	1	2	3	3.63	1107/1490	3.99	3.86	4.05	4.11	3.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	962/1502	4.15	4.02	4.26	4.28	4.13	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	827/1489	4.25	4.10	4.29	4.35	4.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	6	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1006	4.00	4.05	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.83	4.20	4.17	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 233	****	4.83	4.19	4.13	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.33	4.50	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	4.80	4.35	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	5.00	4.15	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.70	4.38	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.22	4.47	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.30	3.95	4.15	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.50	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****	

Course Section: ECON 312 0401
 Title INTERM MACROECON ANALY
 Instructor: PARK, KIYOUNG
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 524
 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	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	12	Non-major	11
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	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	10				
				?	2						

Course Section: ECON 320 0101
 Title QUANT MTHDS:MANAGEMENT
 Instructor: PALMATEER, JASO
 Enrollment: 46
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 525
 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	0	4	10	15	4.27	901/1669	4.27	4.20	4.23	4.28	4.27	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	8	18	4.40	691/1666	4.40	4.22	4.19	4.20	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	5	19	4.33	746/1421	4.33	4.27	4.24	4.25	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	3	3	17	4.61	394/1617	4.61	4.04	4.15	4.22	4.61	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	1	2	8	4	8	3.70	1111/1555	3.70	3.98	4.00	4.03	3.70	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	9	0	0	4	4	11	4.37	552/1543	4.37	3.93	4.06	4.14	4.37	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	3	22	4.53	446/1647	4.53	4.31	4.12	4.14	4.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	16	13	4.40	1274/1668	4.40	4.67	4.67	4.68	4.40	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	7	10	6	3.88	1116/1605	3.88	4.01	4.07	4.09	3.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	0	1	5	19	4.58	715/1514	4.58	4.53	4.39	4.46	4.58	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	1	4	20	4.65	1042/1551	4.65	4.72	4.66	4.70	4.65	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	2	9	14	4.38	742/1503	4.38	4.22	4.24	4.28	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	1	0	7	16	4.31	868/1506	4.31	4.27	4.26	4.30	4.31	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	6	1	0	3	5	8	4.12	531/1311	4.12	3.81	3.85	3.97	4.12	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	2	1	3	7	3.73	1049/1490	3.73	3.86	4.05	4.11	3.73	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	2	1	1	4	7	3.87	1141/1502	3.87	4.02	4.26	4.28	3.87	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	1	2	3	8	4.07	1023/1489	4.07	4.10	4.29	4.35	4.07	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	8	0	1	1	0	5	4.29	****/1006	****	4.05	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 233	****	4.83	4.19	4.13	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 225	****	4.33	4.50	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 223	****	4.80	4.35	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 206	****	5.00	4.15	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 112	****	4.70	4.38	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.22	4.47	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 98	****	4.30	3.95	4.15	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 58	****	3.50	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	28	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	28	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	28	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	28	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	28	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****	

Course Section: ECON 320 0101
 Title QUANT MTHDS:MANAGEMENT
 Instructor: PALMATEER, JASO
 Enrollment: 46
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 525
 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	13	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	30	Non-major	27
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	20				
				?	0						

Course Section: ECON 374 0101
 Title FUND FINANCIAL MGMT
 Instructor: LAMDIN, DOUGLAS
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 526
 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	0	1	8	14	4.42	719/1669	4.38	4.20	4.23	4.28	4.42	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	17	4.67	359/1666	4.58	4.22	4.19	4.20	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	9	13	4.42	670/1421	4.48	4.27	4.24	4.25	4.42	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	2	0	0	8	12	4.27	780/1617	4.22	4.04	4.15	4.22	4.27	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	1	7	8	4	3.62	1170/1555	3.72	3.98	4.00	4.03	3.62	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	0	5	10	4	3.67	1195/1543	3.88	3.93	4.06	4.14	3.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	161/1647	4.56	4.31	4.12	4.14	4.82	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	882/1668	4.80	4.67	4.67	4.68	4.82	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	4	10	8	4.18	769/1605	4.06	4.01	4.07	4.09	4.18	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	342/1514	4.78	4.53	4.39	4.46	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	1000/1551	4.74	4.72	4.66	4.70	4.68	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	3	8	9	4.09	1020/1503	4.24	4.22	4.24	4.28	4.09	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	4	14	4.32	858/1506	4.40	4.27	4.26	4.30	4.32	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	2	1	4	6	5	3.61	882/1311	3.88	3.81	3.85	3.97	3.61	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	3	1	3	3	2	3.00	1328/1490	3.71	3.86	4.05	4.11	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	1	3	4	3	3.58	1283/1502	3.86	4.02	4.26	4.28	3.58	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	1	2	3	5	3.83	1155/1489	4.17	4.10	4.29	4.35	3.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	7	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	****/1006	****	4.05	4.00	4.10	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 11	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 7		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 5	General	0
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 24
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	23
			? 1		

Course Section: ECON 374 0102
 Title FUND FINANCIAL MGMT
 Instructor: LAMDIN, DOUGLAS
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 527
 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	4	5	11	4.35	793/1669	4.38	4.20	4.23	4.28	4.35	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	14	4.50	549/1666	4.58	4.22	4.19	4.20	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	14	4.55	511/1421	4.48	4.27	4.24	4.25	4.55	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	1	1	3	12	4.16	911/1617	4.22	4.04	4.15	4.22	4.16	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	1	4	4	6	3.81	1012/1555	3.72	3.98	4.00	4.03	3.81	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	0	2	2	6	4.09	838/1543	3.88	3.93	4.06	4.14	4.09	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	2	0	15	4.30	806/1647	4.56	4.31	4.12	4.14	4.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	939/1668	4.80	4.67	4.67	4.68	4.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	1	3	10	4	3.94	1022/1605	4.06	4.01	4.07	4.09	3.94	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	473/1514	4.78	4.53	4.39	4.46	4.74	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	825/1551	4.74	4.72	4.66	4.70	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	6	10	4.39	742/1503	4.24	4.22	4.24	4.28	4.39	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	4	13	4.47	680/1506	4.40	4.27	4.26	4.30	4.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	1	1	1	2	8	4.15	507/1311	3.88	3.81	3.85	3.97	4.15	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	535/1490	3.71	3.86	4.05	4.11	4.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	950/1502	3.86	4.02	4.26	4.28	4.14	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	684/1489	4.17	4.10	4.29	4.35	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1006	****	4.05	4.00	4.10	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 20 Non-major 19
84-150	7	3.00-3.49 10	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 18	
			? 0		

Course Section: ECON 408 0101
 Title: MANAGERIAL ECONOMICS
 Instructor: DASGUPTA, NANDI
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 528
 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	1	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	345/1669	4.74	4.20	4.23	4.39	4.70	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	494/1666	4.64	4.22	4.19	4.22	4.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	557/1421	4.56	4.27	4.24	4.38	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	717/1617	4.40	4.04	4.15	4.22	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	955/1555	4.14	3.98	4.00	4.08	3.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1138/1543	4.26	3.93	4.06	4.18	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	167/1647	4.71	4.31	4.12	4.14	4.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1668	4.72	4.67	4.67	4.70	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	690/1605	4.47	4.01	4.07	4.16	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1514	4.89	4.53	4.39	4.45	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1551	4.94	4.72	4.66	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	347/1503	4.74	4.22	4.24	4.27	4.70	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	433/1506	4.77	4.27	4.26	4.29	4.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1311	3.00	3.81	3.85	3.88	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	764/1490	4.40	3.86	4.05	4.26	4.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	1013/1502	4.31	4.02	4.26	4.46	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	865/1489	4.60	4.10	4.29	4.52	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1006	3.83	4.05	4.00	4.21	****	

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 3		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 11
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	7
			? 0		

Course Section: ECON 408 0201
 Title: MANAGERIAL ECONOMICS
 Instructor: DICKSON, LISA
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 529
 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	0	4	14	4.78	244/1669	4.74	4.20	4.23	4.39	4.78	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	281/1666	4.64	4.22	4.19	4.22	4.72	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	13	4.61	453/1421	4.56	4.27	4.24	4.38	4.61	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	0	5	11	4.47	539/1617	4.40	4.04	4.15	4.22	4.47	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	6	10	4.39	453/1555	4.14	3.98	4.00	4.08	4.39	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	164/1543	4.26	3.93	4.06	4.18	4.78	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	4	13	4.61	356/1647	4.71	4.31	4.12	4.14	4.61	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	8	4.44	1240/1668	4.72	4.67	4.67	4.70	4.44	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	220/1605	4.47	4.01	4.07	4.16	4.69	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	408/1514	4.89	4.53	4.39	4.45	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	567/1551	4.94	4.72	4.66	4.73	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	254/1503	4.74	4.22	4.24	4.27	4.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	249/1506	4.77	4.27	4.26	4.29	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	10	3	1	0	1	3	3.00	1115/1311	3.00	3.81	3.85	3.88	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	372/1490	4.40	3.86	4.05	4.26	4.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	522/1502	4.31	4.02	4.26	4.46	4.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	309/1489	4.60	4.10	4.29	4.52	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	632/1006	3.83	4.05	4.00	4.21	3.83	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 1
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	3
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 17
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	14
			? 0		

Course Section: ECON 410A 0101
 Title GLOBAL AGING AND SOC.I
 Instructor: GRIBBIN, JOSEPH
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 530
 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	0	0	10	5.00	1/1669	5.00	4.20	4.23	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	319/1666	4.70	4.22	4.19	4.22	4.70	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	511/1421	4.56	4.27	4.24	4.38	4.56	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	445/1617	4.56	4.04	4.15	4.22	4.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	262/1555	4.60	3.98	4.00	4.08	4.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	344/1543	4.56	3.93	4.06	4.18	4.56	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	481/1647	4.50	4.31	4.12	4.14	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.67	4.67	4.70	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	373/1605	4.50	4.01	4.07	4.16	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	189/1514	4.90	4.53	4.39	4.45	4.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.72	4.66	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	347/1503	4.70	4.22	4.24	4.27	4.70	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	164/1506	4.90	4.27	4.26	4.29	4.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1311	5.00	3.81	3.85	3.88	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	512/1490	4.44	3.86	4.05	4.26	4.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	818/1502	4.33	4.02	4.26	4.46	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	1	0	7	4.44	753/1489	4.44	4.10	4.29	4.52	4.44	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1006	****	4.05	4.00	4.21	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	50/ 112	4.70	4.70	4.38	4.74	4.70	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 97	5.00	5.00	4.36	4.69	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	42/ 92	4.50	4.50	4.22	4.48	4.50	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	45/ 105	4.60	4.60	4.20	4.27	4.60	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	39/ 98	4.30	4.30	3.95	3.86	4.30	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ECON 410B 0101
 Title ECONOMICS OF RISK MGMT
 Instructor: FARROW, SCOTT
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 531
 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	3	2	9	6	3.90	1288/1669	3.90	4.20	4.23	4.39	3.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	5	5	4	6	3.55	1449/1666	3.55	4.22	4.19	4.22	3.55	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	11	5	4.00	969/1421	4.00	4.27	4.24	4.38	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	8	7	4.05	999/1617	4.05	4.04	4.15	4.22	4.05	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	6	5	7	3.80	1021/1555	3.80	3.98	4.00	4.08	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	5	8	5	3.89	1027/1543	3.89	3.93	4.06	4.18	3.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	5	11	4.35	728/1647	4.35	4.31	4.12	4.14	4.35	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	13	4.65	1077/1668	4.65	4.67	4.67	4.70	4.65	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	1	4	6	6	4.00	918/1605	4.00	4.01	4.07	4.16	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	7	10	4.42	923/1514	4.42	4.53	4.39	4.45	4.42	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	917/1551	4.74	4.72	4.66	4.73	4.74	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	4	3	7	4	3.61	1297/1503	3.61	4.22	4.24	4.27	3.61	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	4	5	8	4.00	1069/1506	4.00	4.27	4.26	4.29	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	3	5	9	4.22	464/1311	4.22	3.81	3.85	3.88	4.22	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	4	3	5	3.85	984/1490	3.85	3.86	4.05	4.26	3.85	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	4	2	6	4.00	1013/1502	4.00	4.02	4.26	4.46	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	4	1	8	4.31	893/1489	4.31	4.10	4.29	4.52	4.31	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	459/1006	4.10	4.05	4.00	4.21	4.10	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.83	4.20	4.61	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.83	4.19	4.40	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.33	4.50	4.39	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	4.80	4.35	4.56	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	5.00	4.15	4.20	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.70	4.38	4.74	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.22	4.48	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	4.27	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.30	3.95	3.86	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.50	4.22	3.94	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.80	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.78	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.81	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.50	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.92	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	2.00	****	

Course Section: ECON 410B 0101
 Title: ECONOMICS OF RISK MGMT
 Instructor: FARROW, SCOTT
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 531
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	1	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	9	Under-grad	19	Non-major	16
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	1						

Course Section: ECON 410C 010
 Title HEALTH CARE FINANCING
 Instructor: COOPER, PHILIP
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 532
 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	1	0	0	1	1	7	4	4.08	1124/1669	4.08	4.20	4.23	4.39	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	8	5	4.38	715/1666	4.38	4.22	4.19	4.22	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	701/1421	4.38	4.27	4.24	4.38	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	2	7	2	4.00	1029/1617	4.00	4.04	4.15	4.22	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	0	6	4	3.92	922/1555	3.92	3.98	4.00	4.08	3.92	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	1	5	4	4.09	838/1543	4.09	3.93	4.06	4.18	4.09	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	885/1647	4.23	4.31	4.12	4.14	4.23	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	952/1668	4.77	4.67	4.67	4.70	4.77	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	2	7	2	3.83	1148/1605	3.83	4.01	4.07	4.16	3.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	1	3	7	4.15	1142/1514	4.15	4.53	4.39	4.45	4.15	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	1346/1551	4.23	4.72	4.66	4.73	4.23	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	835/1503	4.31	4.22	4.24	4.27	4.31	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	2	7	4.08	1038/1506	4.08	4.27	4.26	4.29	4.08	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	1057/1311	3.25	3.81	3.85	3.88	3.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	3	5	4.22	718/1490	4.22	3.86	4.05	4.26	4.22	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	586/1502	4.56	4.02	4.26	4.46	4.56	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	753/1489	4.44	4.10	4.29	4.52	4.44	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	479/1006	4.00	4.05	4.00	4.21	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 1
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	2
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 13
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	7
			? 0		

Course Section: ECON 415 0101
 Title PRPRTY RIGHTS,ORGAN,MG
 Instructor: CARROLL, KATHLE
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 533
 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	1	4	8	4.54	556/1669	4.54	4.20	4.23	4.39	4.54	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	10	2	4.08	1054/1666	4.08	4.22	4.19	4.22	4.08	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	5	4	3.92	1042/1421	3.92	4.27	4.24	4.38	3.92	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	4	4.00	1029/1617	4.00	4.04	4.15	4.22	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	5	1	6	3.85	988/1555	3.85	3.98	4.00	4.08	3.85	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	4	5	3	3.92	1006/1543	3.92	3.93	4.06	4.18	3.92	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	0	1	10	4.46	549/1647	4.46	4.31	4.12	4.14	4.46	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	1115/1668	4.62	4.67	4.67	4.70	4.62	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	918/1605	4.00	4.01	4.07	4.16	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	424/1514	4.77	4.53	4.39	4.45	4.77	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	1	11	4.69	986/1551	4.69	4.72	4.66	4.73	4.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	2	8	2	3.77	1230/1503	3.77	4.22	4.24	4.27	3.77	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	2	7	4.00	1069/1506	4.00	4.27	4.26	4.29	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	11	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1311	****	3.81	3.85	3.88	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1036/1490	3.75	3.86	4.05	4.26	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	393/1502	4.75	4.02	4.26	4.46	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	434/1489	4.75	4.10	4.29	4.52	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1006	****	4.05	4.00	4.21	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 9		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	6
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 13
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	7
			? 0		

Course Section: ECON 421 0101
 Title INTRO TO ECONOMETRICS
 Instructor: DASGUPTA, NANDI
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 534
 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	0	0	1	4	4.17	1026/1669	4.17	4.20	4.23	4.39	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1387/1666	3.67	4.22	4.19	4.22	3.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	886/1421	4.17	4.27	4.24	4.38	4.17	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	0	3	3.67	1301/1617	3.67	4.04	4.15	4.22	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	0	1	2.67	1505/1555	2.67	3.98	4.00	4.08	2.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	1260/1543	3.50	3.93	4.06	4.18	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	1043/1647	4.00	4.31	4.12	4.14	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	4.00	1530/1668	4.00	4.67	4.67	4.70	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	139/1605	4.80	4.01	4.07	4.16	4.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	1199/1514	4.00	4.53	4.39	4.45	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.72	4.66	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	1066/1503	4.00	4.22	4.24	4.27	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	1069/1506	4.00	4.27	4.26	4.29	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	587/1311	4.00	3.81	3.85	3.88	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1233/1490	3.33	3.86	4.05	4.26	3.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1357/1502	3.33	4.02	4.26	4.46	3.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1341/1489	3.33	4.10	4.29	4.52	3.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1006	****	4.05	4.00	4.21	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		6
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	Non-major
			P 0		6
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	
					4

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course Section: ECON 439 0101
 Title ENVIRONMENTAL ECONOMIC
 Instructor: MCCONNELL, VIRG
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 535
 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	4	10	9	4.22	963/1669	4.22	4.20	4.23	4.39	4.22	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	5	13	4.35	764/1666	4.35	4.22	4.19	4.22	4.35	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	2	7	11	4.13	909/1421	4.13	4.27	4.24	4.38	4.13	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	5	7	8	3.95	1098/1617	3.95	4.04	4.15	4.22	3.95	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	2	9	9	4.04	747/1555	4.04	3.98	4.00	4.08	4.04	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	7	7	7	3.83	1084/1543	3.83	3.93	4.06	4.18	3.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	5	9	9	4.17	940/1647	4.17	4.31	4.12	4.14	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	1	21	4.87	788/1668	4.87	4.67	4.67	4.70	4.87	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	5	12	2	3.84	1140/1605	3.84	4.01	4.07	4.16	3.84	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	6	13	4.39	964/1514	4.39	4.53	4.39	4.45	4.39	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	4	17	4.65	1042/1551	4.65	4.72	4.66	4.73	4.65	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	6	5	10	4.00	1066/1503	4.00	4.22	4.24	4.27	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	7	2	13	4.13	1002/1506	4.13	4.27	4.26	4.29	4.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	3	0	3	2	5	3.46	961/1311	3.46	3.81	3.85	3.88	3.46	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	675/1490	4.27	3.86	4.05	4.26	4.27	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	595/1502	4.55	4.02	4.26	4.46	4.55	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	648/1489	4.55	4.10	4.29	4.52	4.55	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	0	1	3	2	3	3.78	651/1006	3.78	4.05	4.00	4.21	3.78	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.83	4.19	4.40	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	4.70	4.38	4.74	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	4.27	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 8		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 6	General	5
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 23
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	16
			? 1		

Course Section: ECON 442 0101
 Title EUROPEAN ECONOMIC HIST
 Instructor: MITCH, DAVID F
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 536
 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	1	5	5	4.36	781/1669	4.36	4.20	4.23	4.39	4.36	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	620/1666	4.45	4.22	4.19	4.22	4.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	318/1421	4.73	4.27	4.24	4.38	4.73	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	455/1617	4.55	4.04	4.15	4.22	4.55	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	5	4	4.09	715/1555	4.09	3.98	4.00	4.08	4.09	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	638/1543	4.27	3.93	4.06	4.18	4.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	435/1647	4.55	4.31	4.12	4.14	4.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	713/1668	4.91	4.67	4.67	4.70	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	918/1605	4.00	4.01	4.07	4.16	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	631/1514	4.64	4.53	4.39	4.45	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	760/1551	4.82	4.72	4.66	4.73	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	425/1503	4.64	4.22	4.24	4.27	4.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	394/1506	4.73	4.27	4.26	4.29	4.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	587/1311	4.00	3.81	3.85	3.88	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	340/1490	4.67	3.86	4.05	4.26	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	306/1502	4.83	4.02	4.26	4.46	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	348/1489	4.83	4.10	4.29	4.52	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1006	5.00	4.05	4.00	4.21	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 11
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	8
			? 0		

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	2	3	14	5	3.92	1276/1669	3.98	4.20	4.23	4.39	3.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	9	10	4.17	984/1666	4.18	4.22	4.19	4.22	4.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	8	12	4.29	781/1421	4.27	4.27	4.24	4.38	4.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	1029/1617	4.06	4.04	4.15	4.22	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	3	6	4	8	3.81	1021/1555	3.76	3.98	4.00	4.08	3.81	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	18	1	0	2	0	3	3.67	1195/1543	3.67	3.93	4.06	4.18	3.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	6	15	4.50	481/1647	4.57	4.31	4.12	4.14	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	8	15	4.65	1077/1668	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.70	4.65	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	7	7	3	3.67	1274/1605	3.65	4.01	4.07	4.16	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	9	12	4.38	984/1514	4.56	4.53	4.39	4.45	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4	18	4.74	917/1551	4.83	4.72	4.66	4.73	4.74	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	0	2	10	10	4.08	1025/1503	4.15	4.22	4.24	4.27	4.08	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	3	5	12	4.00	1069/1506	4.08	4.27	4.26	4.29	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	1	2	7	3	7	3.65	854/1311	3.83	3.81	3.85	3.88	3.65	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	3	2	1	2	5	3.31	1242/1490	3.59	3.86	4.05	4.26	3.31	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	772/1502	4.43	4.02	4.26	4.46	4.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	2	2	8	4.31	893/1489	4.35	4.10	4.29	4.52	4.31	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	7	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	759/1006	3.25	4.05	4.00	4.21	3.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.83	4.20	4.61	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.83	4.19	4.40	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.33	4.50	4.39	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	4.80	4.35	4.56	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	5.00	4.15	4.20	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.70	4.38	4.74	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.22	4.48	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	4.27	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 98	****	4.30	3.95	3.86	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.50	4.22	3.94	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.80	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.78	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.81	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.50	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.92	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	2.00	****	

Course Section: ECON 453 0101
 Title HOUSEHOLD ECONOMICS
 Instructor: LORD, WILLIAM
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 537
 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	9	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	1	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	2	Under-grad	23	Non-major	15
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	20				
				?	1						

Course Section: ECON 453 0201
 Title HOUSEHOLD ECONOMICS
 Instructor: LORD, WILLIAM
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 538
 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	2	5	8	10	4.04	1145/1669	3.98	4.20	4.23	4.39	4.04	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	8	4	13	4.20	957/1666	4.18	4.22	4.19	4.22	4.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	7	5	13	4.24	831/1421	4.27	4.27	4.24	4.38	4.24	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	16	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	958/1617	4.06	4.04	4.15	4.22	4.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	1	7	6	6	3.71	1095/1555	3.76	3.98	4.00	4.08	3.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	20	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/1543	3.67	3.93	4.06	4.18	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	5	18	4.64	324/1647	4.57	4.31	4.12	4.14	4.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	21	4.84	825/1668	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.70	4.84	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	9	11	3	3.63	1299/1605	3.65	4.01	4.07	4.16	3.63	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	6	18	4.75	441/1514	4.56	4.53	4.39	4.45	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	460/1551	4.83	4.72	4.66	4.73	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	3	2	6	13	4.21	923/1503	4.15	4.22	4.24	4.27	4.21	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	3	8	11	4.17	980/1506	4.08	4.27	4.26	4.29	4.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	1	2	3	4	10	4.00	587/1311	3.83	3.81	3.85	3.88	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	2	0	3	3	7	3.87	974/1490	3.59	3.86	4.05	4.26	3.87	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	2	1	11	4.47	680/1502	4.43	4.02	4.26	4.46	4.47	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	1	3	10	4.40	800/1489	4.35	4.10	4.29	4.52	4.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	8	1	1	4	1	1	3.00	923/1006	3.25	4.05	4.00	4.21	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 3 Major 3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 13		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 5	C 4	General 7	Under-grad 22 Non-major 22
84-150	17	3.00-3.49 13	D 0		
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 18	
			? 0		

Course Section: ECON 454 0101
 Title ECON:EDUC/HUMAN CAPITA
 Instructor: DICKSON, LISA
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 539
 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	0	5	11	4.69	360/1669	4.69	4.20	4.23	4.39	4.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	243/1666	4.75	4.22	4.19	4.22	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	280/1421	4.75	4.27	4.24	4.38	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	300/1617	4.69	4.04	4.15	4.22	4.69	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	213/1555	4.69	3.98	4.00	4.08	4.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	4	9	4.33	580/1543	4.33	3.93	4.06	4.18	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	161/1647	4.81	4.31	4.12	4.14	4.81	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	7	4.44	1248/1668	4.44	4.67	4.67	4.70	4.44	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	373/1605	4.50	4.01	4.07	4.16	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	553/1514	4.69	4.53	4.39	4.45	4.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	358/1551	4.94	4.72	4.66	4.73	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	556/1503	4.50	4.22	4.24	4.27	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	286/1506	4.80	4.27	4.26	4.29	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	10	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	483/1311	4.20	3.81	3.85	3.88	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	1	3	7	4.25	692/1490	4.25	3.86	4.05	4.26	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	393/1502	4.75	4.02	4.26	4.46	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	0	4	7	4.42	788/1489	4.42	4.10	4.29	4.52	4.42	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	0	0	4	1	3	3.88	617/1006	3.88	4.05	4.00	4.21	3.88	
Field Work															
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.78	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	2	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	6	Under-grad	14	Non-major	13
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	3						

Course Section: ECON 463 0101
 Title THEORY OF PUBLIC FINAN
 Instructor: COATES, DENNIS
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 540
 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	0	3	5	9	4.17	1026/1669	4.17	4.20	4.23	4.39	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	9	4.28	854/1666	4.28	4.22	4.19	4.22	4.28	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	3	10	4.17	886/1421	4.17	4.27	4.24	4.38	4.17	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	0	2	4	8	4.20	863/1617	4.20	4.04	4.15	4.22	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	1	5	7	3.94	889/1555	3.94	3.98	4.00	4.08	3.94	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	4	4	6	3.93	981/1543	3.93	3.93	4.06	4.18	3.93	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	3	12	4.44	583/1647	4.44	4.31	4.12	4.14	4.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	428/1668	4.94	4.67	4.67	4.70	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	9	4	4.06	877/1605	4.06	4.01	4.07	4.16	4.06	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	424/1514	4.76	4.53	4.39	4.45	4.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	1055/1551	4.65	4.72	4.66	4.73	4.65	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	2	2	12	4.41	702/1503	4.41	4.22	4.24	4.27	4.41	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	3	11	4.29	876/1506	4.29	4.27	4.26	4.29	4.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	718/1311	3.88	3.81	3.85	3.88	3.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	2	3	3	3.78	1022/1490	3.78	3.86	4.05	4.26	3.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	1	1	3	3	3.67	1253/1502	3.67	4.02	4.26	4.46	3.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	2	1	2	4	3.89	1133/1489	3.89	4.10	4.29	4.52	3.89	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	7	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1006	****	4.05	4.00	4.21	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 226	****	4.83	4.20	4.61	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.83	4.19	4.40	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 225	****	4.33	4.50	4.39	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 223	****	4.80	4.35	4.56	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 206	****	5.00	4.15	4.20	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 112	****	4.70	4.38	4.74	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.22	4.48	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	4.27	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 98	****	4.30	3.95	3.86	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 58	****	3.50	4.22	3.94	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.80	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.78	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.81	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.50	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.92	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	2.00	****	

Course Section: ECON 463 0101
 Title THEORY OF PUBLIC FINAN
 Instructor: COATES, DENNIS
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 540
 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	5	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	1	Under-grad	18	Non-major	15
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	5	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	14				
				?	0						

Course Section: ECON 467 0101
 Title HEALTH ECONOMICS
 Instructor: GOLDFARB, MARSH
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 541
 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	2	0	0	1	7	7	17	4.25	914/1669	4.63	4.20	4.23	4.39	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	7	8	16	4.15	993/1666	4.58	4.22	4.19	4.22	4.15	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	5	10	16	4.18	871/1421	4.49	4.27	4.24	4.38	4.18	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	18	0	0	3	2	9	4.43	612/1617	4.71	4.04	4.15	4.22	4.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	3	6	5	7	10	3.48	1242/1555	4.24	3.98	4.00	4.08	3.48	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	22	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	690/1543	4.41	3.93	4.06	4.18	4.22	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	2	4	8	17	4.09	997/1647	4.55	4.31	4.12	4.14	4.09	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	0	0	0	2	28	4.93	499/1668	4.97	4.67	4.67	4.70	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	1	7	8	10	4.04	897/1605	4.52	4.01	4.07	4.16	4.04	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	2	6	21	4.57	727/1514	4.78	4.53	4.39	4.45	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	1	1	5	22	4.66	1042/1551	4.83	4.72	4.66	4.73	4.66	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	6	4	18	4.43	686/1503	4.71	4.22	4.24	4.27	4.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	0	2	5	20	4.67	471/1506	4.83	4.27	4.26	4.29	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	21	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	****/1311	4.00	3.81	3.85	3.88	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	26	0	2	0	0	1	5	3.88	****/1490	5.00	3.86	4.05	4.26	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	26	0	2	0	1	0	5	3.75	****/1502	4.80	4.02	4.26	4.46	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	26	0	1	2	0	0	5	3.75	****/1489	5.00	4.10	4.29	4.52	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	26	4	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/1006	4.50	4.05	4.00	4.21	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.70	4.38	4.74	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	4.27	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.30	3.95	3.86	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 16		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 8	C 5	General 2	Under-grad 34 Non-major 31
84-150	19	3.00-3.49 10	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 25	
			? 0		

Course Section: ECON 467 0201
 Title HEALTH ECONOMICS
 Instructor: GOLDFARB, MARSH
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 542
 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	0	0	5	5.00	1/1669	4.63	4.20	4.23	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1666	4.58	4.22	4.19	4.22	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	217/1421	4.49	4.27	4.24	4.38	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1617	4.71	4.04	4.15	4.22	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1555	4.24	3.98	4.00	4.08	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	298/1543	4.41	3.93	4.06	4.18	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1647	4.55	4.31	4.12	4.14	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1668	4.97	4.67	4.67	4.70	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1605	4.52	4.01	4.07	4.16	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1514	4.78	4.53	4.39	4.45	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1551	4.83	4.72	4.66	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1503	4.71	4.22	4.24	4.27	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1506	4.83	4.27	4.26	4.29	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	587/1311	4.00	3.81	3.85	3.88	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1490	5.00	3.86	4.05	4.26	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	336/1502	4.80	4.02	4.26	4.46	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.10	4.29	4.52	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	235/1006	4.50	4.05	4.00	4.21	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 226	****	4.83	4.20	4.61	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.92	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	2.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ECON 475 0101
 Title FINANCIAL INVSTMNT ANA
 Instructor: ANORUO, EMMANUE
 Enrollment: 63
 Questionnaires: 37

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 543
 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	5	15	15	4.14	1064/1669	4.14	4.20	4.23	4.39	4.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	11	22	4.43	648/1666	4.43	4.22	4.19	4.22	4.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	8	23	4.47	594/1421	4.47	4.27	4.24	4.38	4.47	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	2	4	11	17	4.26	790/1617	4.26	4.04	4.15	4.22	4.26	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	2	3	5	7	14	3.90	939/1555	3.90	3.98	4.00	4.08	3.90	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	3	5	9	14	4.10	838/1543	4.10	3.93	4.06	4.18	4.10	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	4	7	23	4.32	775/1647	4.32	4.31	4.12	4.14	4.32	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	12	24	4.67	1068/1668	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.70	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	2	0	1	4	15	8	4.07	871/1605	4.07	4.01	4.07	4.16	4.07	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	5	7	24	4.46	877/1514	4.46	4.53	4.39	4.45	4.46	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	5	5	25	4.57	1135/1551	4.57	4.72	4.66	4.73	4.57	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	8	8	18	4.20	932/1503	4.20	4.22	4.24	4.27	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	2	1	8	7	16	4.00	1069/1506	4.00	4.27	4.26	4.29	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	6	1	0	8	4	13	4.08	552/1311	4.08	3.81	3.85	3.88	4.08	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	5	2	5	3.77	1029/1490	3.77	3.86	4.05	4.26	3.77	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	1	1	3	2	6	3.85	1154/1502	3.85	4.02	4.26	4.46	3.85	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	930/1489	4.23	4.10	4.29	4.52	4.23	
4. Were special techniques successful	24	6	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	****/1006	****	4.05	4.00	4.21	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 23	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 37 Non-major 36
84-150	19	3.00-3.49 17	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 31	
			? 0		

Course Section: ECON 477 0101
 Title DERIVATIVE SECURITIES
 Instructor: GETTER, DARYL
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 544
 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	1	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	183/1669	4.83	4.20	4.23	4.39	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	281/1666	4.72	4.22	4.19	4.22	4.72	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	557/1421	4.50	4.27	4.24	4.38	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	750/1617	4.31	4.04	4.15	4.22	4.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	6	0	2	1	1	7	4.18	622/1555	4.18	3.98	4.00	4.08	4.18	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	1	1	1	1	8	4.17	759/1543	4.17	3.93	4.06	4.18	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	532/1647	4.47	4.31	4.12	4.14	4.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.67	4.67	4.70	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	201/1605	4.71	4.01	4.07	4.16	4.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	223/1514	4.89	4.53	4.39	4.45	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	567/1551	4.89	4.72	4.66	4.73	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	0	4	12	4.59	482/1503	4.59	4.22	4.24	4.27	4.59	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	326/1506	4.78	4.27	4.26	4.29	4.78	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	10	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	426/1311	4.29	3.81	3.85	3.88	4.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	7	4.50	445/1490	4.50	3.86	4.05	4.26	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.02	4.26	4.46	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.10	4.29	4.52	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	307/1006	4.40	4.05	4.00	4.21	4.40	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate 1
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 5	General	2
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 18
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	14
			? 0		

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	1	7	24	4.72	318/1669	4.72	4.20	4.23	4.39	4.72	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	8	20	4.50	549/1666	4.50	4.22	4.19	4.22	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	8	20	4.47	607/1421	4.47	4.27	4.24	4.38	4.47	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	2	7	13	4.50	496/1617	4.50	4.04	4.15	4.22	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	3	4	11	12	3.97	839/1555	3.97	3.98	4.00	4.08	3.97	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	1	0	5	5	11	4.14	795/1543	4.14	3.93	4.06	4.18	4.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	3	6	22	4.50	481/1647	4.50	4.31	4.12	4.14	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	25	4.78	926/1668	4.78	4.67	4.67	4.70	4.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	11	13	4.54	343/1605	4.54	4.01	4.07	4.16	4.54	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	28	4.90	189/1514	4.90	4.53	4.39	4.45	4.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	28	4.90	512/1551	4.90	4.72	4.66	4.73	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	4	25	4.74	289/1503	4.74	4.22	4.24	4.27	4.74	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	7	23	4.68	458/1506	4.68	4.27	4.26	4.29	4.68	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	18	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	214/1311	4.62	3.81	3.85	3.88	4.62	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	2	2	9	4.29	667/1490	4.29	3.86	4.05	4.26	4.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	1	0	2	3	8	4.21	907/1502	4.21	4.02	4.26	4.46	4.21	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	1	0	1	4	8	4.29	903/1489	4.29	4.10	4.29	4.52	4.29	
4. Were special techniques successful	19	8	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/1006	****	4.05	4.00	4.21	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.70	4.38	4.74	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.22	4.48	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	4.27	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.30	3.95	3.86	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.50	4.22	3.94	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.80	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.78	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.81	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.50	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.92	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	2.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	1	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	17						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	6	General	7	Under-grad	31	Non-major	30
84-150	15	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	24	
?	0			

Course Section: ECON 490 0101
 Title ANALYTIC METHODS IN EC
 Instructor: THOMAS, MARK S
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 546
 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	0	5	12	14	4.19	1001/1669	4.34	4.20	4.23	4.39	4.19	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	12	15	4.25	881/1666	4.29	4.22	4.19	4.22	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	10	18	4.48	582/1421	4.58	4.27	4.24	4.38	4.48	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	16	1	0	2	4	9	4.25	801/1617	4.46	4.04	4.15	4.22	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	12	1	0	5	3	9	4.06	741/1555	3.96	3.98	4.00	4.08	4.06	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	18	1	1	1	3	7	4.08	850/1543	4.37	3.93	4.06	4.18	4.08	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	4	8	16	4.16	948/1647	4.54	4.31	4.12	4.14	4.16	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	31	5.00	1/1668	4.95	4.67	4.67	4.70	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	1	0	9	9	6	3.76	1202/1605	3.99	4.01	4.07	4.16	3.76	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	3	5	19	4.59	691/1514	4.60	4.53	4.39	4.45	4.59	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	2	6	19	4.63	1083/1551	4.76	4.72	4.66	4.73	4.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	4	5	18	4.52	546/1503	4.61	4.22	4.24	4.27	4.52	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	6	4	17	4.41	770/1506	4.50	4.27	4.26	4.29	4.41	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	2	1	3	3	16	4.20	483/1311	3.77	3.81	3.85	3.88	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	2	4	6	4.08	820/1490	3.54	3.86	4.05	4.26	4.08	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	2	0	2	3	6	3.85	1154/1502	4.17	4.02	4.26	4.46	3.85	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	818/1489	4.69	4.10	4.29	4.52	4.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	19	6	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	****/1006	****	4.05	4.00	4.21	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 10	Required for Majors	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 12		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 6	General	2
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 32
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	23
			? 1		

Course Section: ECON 490 0201
 Title ANALYTIC METHODS IN EC
 Instructor: THOMAS, MARK S
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 547
 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	8	4.50	590/1669	4.34	4.20	4.23	4.39	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	6	4.33	777/1666	4.29	4.22	4.19	4.22	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	392/1421	4.58	4.27	4.24	4.38	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	323/1617	4.46	4.04	4.15	4.22	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	1	0	1	4	3.86	980/1555	3.96	3.98	4.00	4.08	3.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	250/1543	4.37	3.93	4.06	4.18	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	100/1647	4.54	4.31	4.12	4.14	4.92	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	713/1668	4.95	4.67	4.67	4.70	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	725/1605	3.99	4.01	4.07	4.16	4.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	679/1514	4.60	4.53	4.39	4.45	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	512/1551	4.76	4.72	4.66	4.73	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	347/1503	4.61	4.22	4.24	4.27	4.70	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	547/1506	4.50	4.27	4.26	4.29	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	1	2	0	0	3	3.33	1027/1311	3.77	3.81	3.85	3.88	3.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	0	1	0	2	3.00	1328/1490	3.54	3.86	4.05	4.26	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	632/1502	4.17	4.02	4.26	4.46	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1489	4.69	4.10	4.29	4.52	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1006	****	4.05	4.00	4.21	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 12
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	10
			? 0		

Course Section: ECON 600 0101
 Title POLICY CONSQ:ECON ANAL
 Instructor: MUTTER, RYAN L
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 548
 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	2	0	7	9	4.28	889/1669	4.28	4.20	4.23	4.35	4.28	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	494/1666	4.56	4.22	4.19	4.19	4.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	594/1421	4.47	4.27	4.24	4.33	4.47	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	841/1617	4.21	4.04	4.15	4.24	4.21	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	3	10	4.11	698/1555	4.11	3.98	4.00	4.07	4.11	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	832/1543	4.10	3.93	4.06	4.27	4.10	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	7	9	4.33	759/1647	4.33	4.31	4.12	4.15	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.67	4.67	4.83	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	4	7	5	4.06	877/1605	4.06	4.01	4.07	4.13	4.06	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	739/1514	4.56	4.53	4.39	4.37	4.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	307/1551	4.94	4.72	4.66	4.72	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	6	8	4.22	905/1503	4.22	4.22	4.24	4.22	4.22	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	642/1506	4.50	4.27	4.26	4.24	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	3	1	5	0	3	2.92	1155/1311	2.92	3.81	3.85	3.89	2.92	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	5	4	5	3.69	1078/1490	3.69	3.86	4.05	4.18	3.69	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	2	4	1	8	3.81	1172/1502	3.81	4.02	4.26	4.46	3.81	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	920/1489	4.25	4.10	4.29	4.44	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	15	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1006	****	4.05	4.00	4.11	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.83	4.20	4.47	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.83	4.19	4.41	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 225	****	4.33	4.50	4.65	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 223	****	4.80	4.35	4.48	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 112	****	4.70	4.38	4.39	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.38	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.22	4.36	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	4.23	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 98	****	4.30	3.95	3.93	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	3.50	4.22	4.53	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	4.57	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.90	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.31	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.55	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.45	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.40	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.61	****	

Course Section: ECON 600 0101
 Title POLICY CONSQ:ECON ANAL
 Instructor: MUTTER, RYAN L
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 548
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	2	A	10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	13	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	5	Non-major	18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	13	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Course Section: ECON 601 0101
 Title MICROECONOMIC ANALYSIS
 Instructor: BRADLEY, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 549
 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	3	4.10	1103/1669	4.10	4.20	4.23	4.35	4.10	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	3	3	3.60	1432/1666	3.60	4.22	4.19	4.19	3.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	863/1421	4.20	4.27	4.24	4.33	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	0	3	1	2	3.43	1414/1617	3.43	4.04	4.15	4.24	3.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	5	3	0	3.22	1373/1555	3.22	3.98	4.00	4.07	3.22	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1226/1543	3.60	3.93	4.06	4.27	3.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	896/1647	4.22	4.31	4.12	4.15	4.22	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	2	4.22	1400/1668	4.22	4.67	4.67	4.83	4.22	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	2	2	2	0	3.00	1501/1605	3.00	4.01	4.07	4.13	3.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	1118/1514	4.20	4.53	4.39	4.37	4.20	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	788/1551	4.80	4.72	4.66	4.72	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	2	5	1	3.50	1330/1503	3.50	4.22	4.24	4.22	3.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	1	2	3	3.30	1368/1506	3.30	4.27	4.26	4.24	3.30	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	3	1	2	2	3.11	1100/1311	3.11	3.81	3.85	3.89	3.11	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	1	3	0	3.00	1328/1490	3.00	3.86	4.05	4.18	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	2	0	4	0	3.33	1357/1502	3.33	4.02	4.26	4.46	3.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	2	2	1	1	3.17	1379/1489	3.17	4.10	4.29	4.44	3.17	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1006	****	4.05	4.00	4.11	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.38	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.22	4.36	****	
Field Work															
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.90	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 1	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 7		Graduate 6
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 4
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	7
			? 1		

Course Section: ECON 611 0101
 Title: ECONOMETRICS I
 Instructor: GINDLING, THOMA
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 550
 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	0	4	11	4.73	293/1669	4.73	4.20	4.23	4.35	4.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	439/1666	4.60	4.22	4.19	4.19	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	5	6	4.00	969/1421	4.00	4.27	4.24	4.33	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	3	10	4.57	424/1617	4.57	4.04	4.15	4.24	4.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	316/1555	4.54	3.98	4.00	4.07	4.54	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	290/1543	4.62	3.93	4.06	4.27	4.62	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	0	4	8	4.21	907/1647	4.21	4.31	4.12	4.15	4.21	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.67	4.67	4.83	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	268/1605	4.64	4.01	4.07	4.13	4.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	360/1514	4.80	4.53	4.39	4.37	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	917/1551	4.73	4.72	4.66	4.72	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	412/1503	4.64	4.22	4.24	4.22	4.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	471/1506	4.67	4.27	4.26	4.24	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	214/1311	4.62	3.81	3.85	3.89	4.62	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	445/1490	4.50	3.86	4.05	4.18	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	632/1502	4.50	4.02	4.26	4.46	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	596/1489	4.60	4.10	4.29	4.44	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	307/1006	4.40	4.05	4.00	4.11	4.40	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	37/ 226	4.83	4.83	4.20	4.47	4.83	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	40/ 233	4.83	4.83	4.19	4.41	4.83	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	146/ 225	4.33	4.33	4.50	4.65	4.33	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	61/ 223	4.80	4.80	4.35	4.48	4.80	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 206	5.00	5.00	4.15	4.39	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.70	4.38	4.39	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.38	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.22	4.36	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	4.23	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.30	3.95	3.93	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.50	4.22	4.53	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	4.57	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.90	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.31	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.55	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.45	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.40	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.61	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.60	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	5.00	****	

Course Section: ECON 611 0101
 Title ECONOMETRICS I
 Instructor: GINDLING, THOMA
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 550
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	3	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	5	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	10	Non-major	15
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	1						

Course Section: ECON 652 0101
 Title: ECONOMICS OF HEALTH
 Instructor: GOLDFARB, MARSH
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 551
 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	1	4	8	4.54	556/1669	4.54	4.20	4.23	4.35	4.54	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	425/1666	4.62	4.22	4.19	4.19	4.62	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	607/1421	4.46	4.27	4.24	4.33	4.46	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	496/1617	4.50	4.04	4.15	4.24	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	516/1555	4.31	3.98	4.00	4.07	4.31	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	783/1543	4.14	3.93	4.06	4.27	4.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	270/1647	4.69	4.31	4.12	4.15	4.69	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	570/1668	4.92	4.67	4.67	4.83	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	8	3	4.27	666/1605	4.27	4.01	4.07	4.13	4.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	663/1514	4.62	4.53	4.39	4.37	4.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	986/1551	4.69	4.72	4.66	4.72	4.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	742/1503	4.38	4.22	4.24	4.22	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	789/1506	4.38	4.27	4.26	4.24	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	333/1311	4.40	3.81	3.85	3.89	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	2	2	4	3.80	1003/1490	3.80	3.86	4.05	4.18	3.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	1117/1502	3.90	4.02	4.26	4.46	3.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	800/1489	4.40	4.10	4.29	4.44	4.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	9	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1006	****	4.05	4.00	4.11	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.70	4.38	4.39	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.38	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	4.23	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.30	3.95	3.93	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	9	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	4	Non-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course Section: ECON 661 0101
 Title MICROECON:PUBLIC FINAN
 Instructor: COATES, DENNIS
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 552
 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	0	0	3	5.00	1/1669	5.00	4.20	4.23	4.35	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.22	4.19	4.19	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.27	4.24	4.33	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	717/1617	4.33	4.04	4.15	4.24	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1555	5.00	3.98	4.00	4.07	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1543	5.00	3.93	4.06	4.27	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1647	5.00	4.31	4.12	4.15	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.67	4.67	4.83	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	239/1605	4.67	4.01	4.07	4.13	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.53	4.39	4.37	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.72	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.22	4.24	4.22	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.27	4.26	4.24	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1311	5.00	3.81	3.85	3.89	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1490	5.00	3.86	4.05	4.18	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.02	4.26	4.46	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.10	4.29	4.44	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1006	5.00	4.05	4.00	4.11	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant