

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	4	9	16	4.19	1037/1649	4.05	4.23	4.28	4.11	4.19	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	4	12	13	4.03	1106/1648	4.00	4.24	4.23	4.16	4.03	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	3	6	18	4.09	918/1375	4.10	4.32	4.27	4.10	4.09	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	4	6	9	4.26	806/1595	3.75	4.06	4.20	4.03	4.26	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	1	4	10	12	4.00	815/1533	3.89	4.04	4.04	3.87	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	20	4	0	0	5	3	3.25	1375/1512	3.50	3.93	4.10	3.86	3.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	13	16	4.34	708/1623	4.12	4.29	4.16	4.08	4.34	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	20	4.63	1081/1646	4.44	4.57	4.69	4.67	4.63	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	1	8	10	8	3.82	1132/1621	3.75	4.05	4.06	3.96	3.82	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	9	19	4.52	839/1568	4.43	4.53	4.43	4.39	4.52	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	6	24	4.80	840/1572	4.65	4.73	4.70	4.64	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	4	2	6	17	4.24	950/1564	4.15	4.28	4.28	4.20	4.24	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	4	4	19	4.34	891/1559	4.31	4.34	4.29	4.20	4.34	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	12	2	0	3	7	5	3.76	907/1352	3.40	3.57	3.98	3.86	3.76	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	2	6	2	11	3.91	886/1384	3.70	3.79	4.08	3.86	3.91	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	2	0	8	4	8	3.73	1116/1382	3.52	3.91	4.29	4.03	3.73	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	3	5	5	8	3.73	1110/1368	3.81	4.08	4.30	4.01	3.73	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	11	2	1	1	3	3	3.40	746/ 948	3.93	3.94	3.95	3.75	3.40	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	28	1	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	29	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	30	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	0	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	****/ 555	4.38	4.38	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	30	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	3.29	3.29	3.68	3.54	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	3.86	4.30	4.17	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	11	0.00-0.99 2	A 6	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 12		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 8	General 6	Under-grad 32 Non-major 32
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 11	
			? 1		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR NA		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	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	2	16	12	4.16	1067/1649	4.05	4.23	4.28	4.11	4.16
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	5	14	11	4.03	1106/1648	4.00	4.24	4.23	4.16	4.03
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	3	11	16	4.25	806/1375	4.10	4.32	4.27	4.10	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	1	1	4	12	11	4.07	1032/1595	3.75	4.06	4.20	4.03	4.07
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	1	2	9	15	4.29	594/1533	3.89	4.04	4.04	3.87	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	2	3	11	11	4.04	868/1512	3.50	3.93	4.10	3.86	4.04
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	9	11	11	4.00	1029/1623	4.12	4.29	4.16	4.08	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	2	0	0	0	2	28	4.93	465/1646	4.44	4.57	4.69	4.67	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	1	1	5	14	2	3.65	1268/1621	3.75	4.05	4.06	3.96	3.65
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	9	8	14	4.16	1191/1568	4.43	4.53	4.43	4.39	4.16
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	10	20	4.61	1133/1572	4.65	4.73	4.70	4.64	4.61
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	2	6	13	9	3.97	1163/1564	4.15	4.28	4.28	4.20	3.97
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	4	11	14	4.19	1009/1559	4.31	4.34	4.29	4.20	4.19
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	12	3	1	5	3	7	3.53	1039/1352	3.40	3.57	3.98	3.86	3.53
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	4	10	9	4.08	767/1384	3.70	3.79	4.08	3.86	4.08
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	2	2	5	10	6	3.64	1156/1382	3.52	3.91	4.29	4.03	3.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	1	4	10	8	3.96	990/1368	3.81	4.08	4.30	4.01	3.96
4. Were special techniques successful	8	4	0	3	3	8	7	3.90	533/ 948	3.93	3.94	3.95	3.75	3.90
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	4.38	4.38	4.29	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	3.29	3.29	3.68	3.54	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 312	3.20	3.73	3.68	3.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	3.86	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****

Course-Section: ECON 101 0401
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS
 Instructor: MITCH, DAVID F
 Enrollment: 48
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 510
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	2	A	11	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	33	Non-major	32
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 101 0701
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS
 Instructor: CARPENTER, ROBE
 Enrollment: 80
 Questionnaires: 38

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 511
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	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	14	7	14	3.82	1343/1649	4.05	4.23	4.28	4.11	3.82	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	11	14	9	3.68	1395/1648	4.00	4.24	4.23	4.16	3.68	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	9	11	15	3.97	975/1375	4.10	4.32	4.27	4.10	3.97	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	24	2	3	3	3	3	3.14	1516/1595	3.75	4.06	4.20	4.03	3.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	5	10	8	11	3.74	1084/1533	3.89	4.04	4.04	3.87	3.74	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	28	0	3	2	4	1	3.30	1356/1512	3.50	3.93	4.10	3.86	3.30	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	4	6	7	17	3.84	1222/1623	4.12	4.29	4.16	4.08	3.84	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	16	21	4.50	1193/1646	4.44	4.57	4.69	4.67	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	1	1	1	9	9	4	3.58	1310/1621	3.75	4.05	4.06	3.96	3.58	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	4	12	20	4.35	1031/1568	4.43	4.53	4.43	4.39	4.35	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	4	5	27	4.64	1108/1572	4.65	4.73	4.70	4.64	4.64	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	9	12	14	4.00	1127/1564	4.15	4.28	4.28	4.20	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	2	6	12	15	4.06	1098/1559	4.31	4.34	4.29	4.20	4.06	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	3	6	10	13	4.03	672/1352	3.40	3.57	3.98	3.86	4.03	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	2	7	11	5	3.65	1016/1384	3.70	3.79	4.08	3.86	3.65	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	3	8	8	7	3.73	1110/1382	3.52	3.91	4.29	4.03	3.73	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	2	7	7	10	3.96	981/1368	3.81	4.08	4.30	4.01	3.96	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	18	3	1	2	1	0	2.14	****/ 948	3.93	3.94	3.95	3.75	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	33	0	2	0	2	1	0	2.40	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.08	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	3	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 555	4.38	4.38	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	31	6	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.31	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	33	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	4	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 288	3.29	3.29	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	36	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	36	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	35	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	36	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 53	****	3.86	4.30	4.17	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	35	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	34	2	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	8
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 14		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 5	General	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 2		Under-grad 38
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 1	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	22

Course-Section: ECON 101 0901
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS
 Instructor: KAIKAI, ALPHA
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 512
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	3	5	13	8	3.90	1279/1649	4.05	4.23	4.28	4.11	3.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	9	13	5	3.72	1368/1648	4.00	4.24	4.23	4.16	3.72	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	4	6	12	5	3.48	1215/1375	4.10	4.32	4.27	4.10	3.48	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	17	2	2	4	4	0	2.83	1562/1595	3.75	4.06	4.20	4.03	2.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	1	3	14	6	3.92	895/1533	3.89	4.04	4.04	3.87	3.92	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	18	1	2	3	2	2	3.20	1395/1512	3.50	3.93	4.10	3.86	3.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	3	12	10	3.93	1134/1623	4.12	4.29	4.16	4.08	3.93	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	26	2	4.00	1544/1646	4.44	4.57	4.69	4.67	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	1	5	12	1	3.68	1247/1621	3.75	4.05	4.06	3.96	3.68	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	2	7	17	4.48	878/1568	4.43	4.53	4.43	4.39	4.48	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	1	5	20	4.63	1121/1572	4.65	4.73	4.70	4.64	4.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	3	4	13	8	3.93	1200/1564	4.15	4.28	4.28	4.20	3.93	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	1	0	1	8	14	4.42	818/1559	4.31	4.34	4.29	4.20	4.42	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	17	1	1	6	0	3	3.27	1153/1352	3.40	3.57	3.98	3.86	3.27	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	4	3	4	6	6	3.30	1175/1384	3.70	3.79	4.08	3.86	3.30	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	3	1	4	6	9	3.74	1110/1382	3.52	3.91	4.29	4.03	3.74	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	2	8	12	4.30	816/1368	3.81	4.08	4.30	4.01	4.30	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	20	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/ 948	3.93	3.94	3.95	3.75	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	2	0	0	2	0	2.50	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	2	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 555	4.38	4.38	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 288	3.29	3.29	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 312	3.20	3.73	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 53	****	3.86	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: ECON 101 0901
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS
 Instructor: KAIKAI, ALPHA
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 512
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	4	A	7	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	6	General	4	Under-grad	29	Non-major	29
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	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	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 101 1001
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS
 Instructor: KAIKAI, ALPHA
 Enrollment: 50
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 513
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	3	12	6	10	3.58	1479/1649	4.05	4.23	4.28	4.11	3.58	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	6	9	10	6	3.36	1538/1648	4.00	4.24	4.23	4.16	3.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	13	9	7	3.52	1204/1375	4.10	4.32	4.27	4.10	3.52	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	17	2	2	7	3	2	3.06	1531/1595	3.75	4.06	4.20	4.03	3.06	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	2	9	8	9	3.76	1065/1533	3.89	4.04	4.04	3.87	3.76	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	20	5	4	1	1	2	2.31	1503/1512	3.50	3.93	4.10	3.86	2.31	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	3	9	8	12	3.91	1180/1623	4.12	4.29	4.16	4.08	3.91	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	4	25	3	3.88	1608/1646	4.44	4.57	4.69	4.67	3.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	2	3	15	6	3	3.17	1470/1621	3.75	4.05	4.06	3.96	3.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	10	9	11	3.88	1358/1568	4.43	4.53	4.43	4.39	3.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	4	10	18	4.44	1297/1572	4.65	4.73	4.70	4.64	4.44	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	6	9	10	6	3.44	1415/1564	4.15	4.28	4.28	4.20	3.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	3	6	8	12	3.72	1301/1559	4.31	4.34	4.29	4.20	3.72	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	24	1	2	2	2	1	3.00	****/1352	3.40	3.57	3.98	3.86	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	4	0	6	5	0	2.80	1314/1384	3.70	3.79	4.08	3.86	2.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	1	3	4	4	3	3.33	1251/1382	3.52	3.91	4.29	4.03	3.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	7	2	6	3.93	1006/1368	3.81	4.08	4.30	4.01	3.93	
4. Were special techniques successful	18	12	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/ 948	3.93	3.94	3.95	3.75	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	29	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	29	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	2	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 555	4.38	4.38	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	3.29	3.29	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	30	0	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	29	1	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	30	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	29	3	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 312	3.20	3.73	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 53	****	3.86	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	1	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	29	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	29	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: ECON 101 1001
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS
 Instructor: KAIKAI, ALPHA
 Enrollment: 50
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 513
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	15	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	5	General	3	Under-grad	33	Non-major	33
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	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	16				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 101 1101
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS
 Instructor: DICKSON, LISA
 Enrollment: 80
 Questionnaires: 46

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 514
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	8	16	20	4.17	1047/1649	4.05	4.23	4.28	4.11	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	17	22	4.30	839/1648	4.00	4.24	4.23	4.16	4.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	8	19	17	4.09	922/1375	4.10	4.32	4.27	4.10	4.09	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	1	1	7	15	12	4.00	1067/1595	3.75	4.06	4.20	4.03	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	2	4	9	13	12	3.72	1093/1533	3.89	4.04	4.04	3.87	3.72	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	6	2	12	7	9	3.31	1356/1512	3.50	3.93	4.10	3.86	3.31	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	7	14	21	4.09	989/1623	4.12	4.29	4.16	4.08	4.09	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	40	6	4.13	1484/1646	4.44	4.57	4.69	4.67	4.13	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	0	0	8	21	6	3.94	1001/1621	3.75	4.05	4.06	3.96	3.94	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	2	6	33	4.69	588/1568	4.43	4.53	4.43	4.39	4.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	0	7	34	4.76	912/1572	4.65	4.73	4.70	4.64	4.76	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	5	12	25	4.48	689/1564	4.15	4.28	4.28	4.20	4.48	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	4	9	27	4.45	763/1559	4.31	4.34	4.29	4.20	4.45	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	22	2	3	5	2	6	3.39	1109/1352	3.40	3.57	3.98	3.86	3.39	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	4	4	7	2	7	3.17	1224/1384	3.70	3.79	4.08	3.86	3.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	3	3	10	3	5	3.17	1298/1382	3.52	3.91	4.29	4.03	3.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	1	5	7	3	8	3.50	1181/1368	3.81	4.08	4.30	4.01	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	22	14	3	0	5	1	1	2.70	****/ 948	3.93	3.94	3.95	3.75	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	43	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	44	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	44	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	44	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	41	1	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	****/ 555	4.38	4.38	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	44	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	44	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	44	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	44	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	42	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 288	3.29	3.29	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	44	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	44	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	44	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	44	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	42	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 312	3.20	3.73	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	44	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 53	****	3.86	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	44	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	44	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	44	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	44	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: ECON 101 1101
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS
 Instructor: DICKSON, LISA
 Enrollment: 80
 Questionnaires: 46

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 514
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	2	A	13	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	9	General	6	Under-grad	46	Non-major	44
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	1	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 101 1401
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS
 Instructor: THOMAS, MARK S
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 515
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	4	7	10	4.09	1129/1649	4.05	4.23	4.28	4.11	4.09	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	4	14	4.35	784/1648	4.00	4.24	4.23	4.16	4.35	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	8	12	4.35	723/1375	4.10	4.32	4.27	4.10	4.35	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	16	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	1435/1595	3.75	4.06	4.20	4.03	3.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	12	3	1	1	2	4	3.27	1358/1533	3.89	4.04	4.04	3.87	3.27	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	1	0	2	3	3	3.78	1107/1512	3.50	3.93	4.10	3.86	3.78	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	3	15	4.39	647/1623	4.12	4.29	4.16	4.08	4.39	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	12	4.52	1175/1646	4.44	4.57	4.69	4.67	4.52	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	5	10	4	3.85	1105/1621	3.75	4.05	4.06	3.96	3.85	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	1	3	17	4.59	743/1568	4.43	4.53	4.43	4.39	4.59	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	4	16	4.59	1155/1572	4.65	4.73	4.70	4.64	4.59	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	5	14	4.50	651/1564	4.15	4.28	4.28	4.20	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	2	17	4.57	629/1559	4.31	4.34	4.29	4.20	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	14	1	1	3	1	1	3.00	1219/1352	3.40	3.57	3.98	3.86	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	1	3	3	3	3.55	1064/1384	3.70	3.79	4.08	3.86	3.55	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	2	3	4	2	3.55	1199/1382	3.52	3.91	4.29	4.03	3.55	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	3	3	2	3	3.45	1193/1368	3.81	4.08	4.30	4.01	3.45	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	6	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	****/ 948	3.93	3.94	3.95	3.75	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors	5
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 3	C 3	General	5
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		Under-grad 23
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	10
			? 0		

Course-Section: ECON 101 1501
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS
 Instructor: MUTTER, RYAN L
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 516
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	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	2	22	4.59	536/1649	4.05	4.23	4.28	4.11	4.59	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	2	23	4.62	414/1648	4.00	4.24	4.23	4.16	4.62	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	20	4.62	443/1375	4.10	4.32	4.27	4.10	4.62	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	5	0	2	1	4	15	4.45	566/1595	3.75	4.06	4.20	4.03	4.45	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	5	0	0	3	7	12	4.41	476/1533	3.89	4.04	4.04	3.87	4.41	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	13	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	436/1512	3.50	3.93	4.10	3.86	4.47	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	3	23	4.75	220/1623	4.12	4.29	4.16	4.08	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	5	22	4.81	816/1646	4.44	4.57	4.69	4.67	4.81	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	7	14	4.67	234/1621	3.75	4.05	4.06	3.96	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	28	4.93	171/1568	4.43	4.53	4.43	4.39	4.93	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	28	4.97	237/1572	4.65	4.73	4.70	4.64	4.97	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	23	4.76	342/1564	4.15	4.28	4.28	4.20	4.76	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	26	4.86	250/1559	4.31	4.34	4.29	4.20	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	1	2	3	3	13	4.14	607/1352	3.40	3.57	3.98	3.86	4.14	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	3	5	14	4.50	437/1384	3.70	3.79	4.08	3.86	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	1	5	15	4.55	585/1382	3.52	3.91	4.29	4.03	4.55	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	0	5	16	4.64	550/1368	3.81	4.08	4.30	4.01	4.64	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	14	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	203/ 948	3.93	3.94	3.95	3.75	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	3	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/ 555	4.38	4.38	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	3.29	3.29	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/ 312	3.20	3.73	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 53	****	3.86	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: ECON 101 1501
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS
 Instructor: MUTTER, RYAN L
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 516
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	7	General	4	Under-grad	29	Non-major	29
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	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	14				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ECON 101 1701
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS
 Instructor: THOMAS, MARK S
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 517
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	1	2	2	6	6	3.82	1335/1649	4.05	4.23	4.28	4.11	3.82	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	2	2	3	5	5	3.53	1474/1648	4.00	4.24	4.23	4.16	3.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	1	1	0	1	7	7	4.19	862/1375	4.10	4.32	4.27	4.10	4.19	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	9	0	0	4	3	1	3.63	1359/1595	3.75	4.06	4.20	4.03	3.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	11	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	986/1533	3.89	4.04	4.04	3.87	3.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	12	0	1	0	4	1	3.83	1068/1512	3.50	3.93	4.10	3.86	3.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	2	2	2	7	4	3.53	1379/1623	4.12	4.29	4.16	4.08	3.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	9	9	4.50	1193/1646	4.44	4.57	4.69	4.67	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	2	1	3	7	1	3.29	1444/1621	3.75	4.05	4.06	3.96	3.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	2	1	5	7	3.94	1326/1568	4.43	4.53	4.43	4.39	3.94	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	2	1	3	10	4.31	1377/1572	4.65	4.73	4.70	4.64	4.31	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	2	0	1	7	6	3.94	1191/1564	4.15	4.28	4.28	4.20	3.94	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	1	1	4	8	3.94	1174/1559	4.31	4.34	4.29	4.20	3.94	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	5	4	1	1	1	4	3.00	1219/1352	3.40	3.57	3.98	3.86	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	1	4	3	3.89	896/1384	3.70	3.79	4.08	3.86	3.89	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	3	3	2	0	1	2.22	1372/1382	3.52	3.91	4.29	4.03	2.22	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	3	1	2	2	1	2.67	1339/1368	3.81	4.08	4.30	4.01	2.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	8	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 948	3.93	3.94	3.95	3.75	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	1	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	329/ 555	4.38	4.38	4.29	4.14	4.38	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	2	0	2	1	4	0	3.29	212/ 288	3.29	3.29	3.68	3.54	3.29	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	1	0	2	0	3	0	3.20	251/ 312	3.20	3.73	3.68	3.51	3.20	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	3.86	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	1	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: ECON 101 1701
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS
 Instructor: THOMAS, MARK S
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 517
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	3	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	3	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	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	6				
				?	1						

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	0	8	11	4.24	986/1649	4.05	4.23	4.28	4.11	4.24	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	8	11	4.38	729/1648	4.00	4.24	4.23	4.16	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	12	4.48	581/1375	4.10	4.32	4.27	4.10	4.48	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	321/1595	3.75	4.06	4.20	4.03	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	815/1533	3.89	4.04	4.04	3.87	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	18	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1512	3.50	3.93	4.10	3.86	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	5	3	13	4.38	659/1623	4.12	4.29	4.16	4.08	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	10	9	4.47	1221/1646	4.44	4.57	4.69	4.67	4.47	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	6	7	4	3.88	1078/1621	3.75	4.05	4.06	3.96	3.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	480/1568	4.43	4.53	4.43	4.39	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	840/1572	4.65	4.73	4.70	4.64	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	9	9	4.30	887/1564	4.15	4.28	4.28	4.20	4.30	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	5	14	4.60	586/1559	4.31	4.34	4.29	4.20	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	10	3	2	3	1	1	2.50	1301/1352	3.40	3.57	3.98	3.86	2.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	726/1384	3.70	3.79	4.08	3.86	4.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	1	4	2	4	3.58	1183/1382	3.52	3.91	4.29	4.03	3.58	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	2	4	4	3.91	1032/1368	3.81	4.08	4.30	4.01	3.91	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	10	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 948	3.93	3.94	3.95	3.75	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	4.38	4.38	4.29	4.14	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 53	****	3.86	4.30	4.17	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	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	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 101H 0101
 Title PRIN OF MICROECON-HONO
 Instructor: MCCONNELL, VIRG
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 519
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.23	4.28	4.11	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	182/1648	4.86	4.24	4.23	4.16	4.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	199/1375	4.86	4.32	4.27	4.10	4.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	321/1595	4.67	4.06	4.20	4.03	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.04	4.04	3.87	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	331/1512	4.57	3.93	4.10	3.86	4.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1623	5.00	4.29	4.16	4.08	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.57	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	313/1621	4.57	4.05	4.06	3.96	4.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.53	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.73	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.28	4.28	4.20	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.34	4.29	4.20	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	326/1384	4.67	3.79	4.08	3.86	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1382	5.00	3.91	4.29	4.03	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	654/1368	4.50	4.08	4.30	4.01	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	****	3.94	3.95	3.75	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.43	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ECON 102 0101
 Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS
 Instructor: PAPADANTONAKIS,
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 520
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	6	4	10	4.10	1122/1649	4.14	4.23	4.28	4.11	4.10	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	9	9	4.19	966/1648	4.11	4.24	4.23	4.16	4.19	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	8	9	4.19	855/1375	4.21	4.32	4.27	4.10	4.19	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	2	6	10	4.20	890/1595	4.12	4.06	4.20	4.03	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	5	13	4.38	495/1533	4.20	4.04	4.04	3.87	4.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	7	9	4.19	755/1512	3.99	3.93	4.10	3.86	4.19	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3	5	11	4.14	936/1623	4.18	4.29	4.16	4.08	4.14	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	10	10	4.38	1302/1646	4.30	4.57	4.69	4.67	4.38	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	1	2	9	4	3.82	1132/1621	3.94	4.05	4.06	3.96	3.82	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	3	5	11	4.19	1169/1568	4.35	4.53	4.43	4.39	4.19	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	840/1572	4.74	4.73	4.70	4.64	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	0	5	6	8	3.86	1246/1564	4.22	4.28	4.28	4.20	3.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	5	2	5	2	7	3.19	1450/1559	4.15	4.34	4.29	4.20	3.19	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	4	3	0	3	2	2.67	1287/1352	3.63	3.57	3.98	3.86	2.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	5	3	0	3	2.77	1320/1384	3.72	3.79	4.08	3.86	2.77	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	4	4	2	2	3.00	1316/1382	3.69	3.91	4.29	4.03	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	948/1368	4.06	4.08	4.30	4.01	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	11	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 948	3.63	3.94	3.95	3.75	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 555	****	4.38	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 288	****	3.29	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 312	****	3.73	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	3.86	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: ECON 102 0101
 Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS
 Instructor: PAPANANTONAKIS,
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 520
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	4	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	21	Non-major	20
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	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				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 102 0201
 Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS
 Instructor: DASGUPTA, NANDI
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 521
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	230/1649	4.14	4.23	4.28	4.11	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	234/1648	4.11	4.24	4.23	4.16	4.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	133/1375	4.21	4.32	4.27	4.10	4.93
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	362/1595	4.12	4.06	4.20	4.03	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	280/1533	4.20	4.04	4.04	3.87	4.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	651/1512	3.99	3.93	4.10	3.86	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	261/1623	4.18	4.29	4.16	4.08	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	10	3	4.14	1476/1646	4.30	4.57	4.69	4.67	4.14
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	159/1621	3.94	4.05	4.06	3.96	4.77
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	424/1568	4.35	4.53	4.43	4.39	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	473/1572	4.74	4.73	4.70	4.64	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1564	4.22	4.28	4.28	4.20	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	164/1559	4.15	4.34	4.29	4.20	4.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	534/1352	3.63	3.57	3.98	3.86	4.22
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	201/1384	3.72	3.79	4.08	3.86	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	946/1382	3.69	3.91	4.29	4.03	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	579/1368	4.06	4.08	4.30	4.01	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	10	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 948	3.63	3.94	3.95	3.75	****
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.73	3.68	3.51	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ECON 102 0301
 Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS
 Instructor: COOMBER, WILLIA
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 522
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	1	6	5	9	3.91	1272/1649	4.14	4.23	4.28	4.11	3.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	6	5	10	3.96	1176/1648	4.11	4.24	4.23	4.16	3.96
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	3	4	3	11	3.91	1034/1375	4.21	4.32	4.27	4.10	3.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	6	4	10	3.95	1134/1595	4.12	4.06	4.20	4.03	3.95
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	4	1	6	11	4.09	754/1533	4.20	4.04	4.04	3.87	4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	1	6	4	7	3.79	1101/1512	3.99	3.93	4.10	3.86	3.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	2	3	3	12	3.95	1104/1623	4.18	4.29	4.16	4.08	3.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	1	16	4	4.05	1528/1646	4.30	4.57	4.69	4.67	4.05
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	1	7	7	4	3.60	1302/1621	3.94	4.05	4.06	3.96	3.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	2	6	11	4.35	1031/1568	4.35	4.53	4.43	4.39	4.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	5	15	4.59	1155/1572	4.74	4.73	4.70	4.64	4.59
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	6	3	11	4.00	1127/1564	4.22	4.28	4.28	4.20	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	2	3	13	4.05	1102/1559	4.15	4.34	4.29	4.20	4.05
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	4	1	2	5	8	3.60	1002/1352	3.63	3.57	3.98	3.86	3.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	4	2	7	4.07	771/1384	3.72	3.79	4.08	3.86	4.07
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	2	0	2	3	7	3.93	1014/1382	3.69	3.91	4.29	4.03	3.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	2	1	10	4.43	732/1368	4.06	4.08	4.30	4.01	4.43
4. Were special techniques successful	9	5	0	2	1	1	5	4.00	431/ 948	3.63	3.94	3.95	3.75	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 555	****	4.38	4.29	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 288	****	3.29	3.68	3.54	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/ 312	****	3.73	3.68	3.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 53	****	3.86	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****

Course-Section: ECON 102 0301
 Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS
 Instructor: COOMBER, WILLIA
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 522
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	9	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	23	Non-major	20
84-150	1	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	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 102 0401
 Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS
 Instructor: COOMBER, WILLIA
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 523
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	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	8	8	3	3.25	1560/1649	4.14	4.23	4.28	4.11	3.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	4	7	6	4	3.17	1577/1648	4.11	4.24	4.23	4.16	3.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	1	5	10	5	3.54	1192/1375	4.21	4.32	4.27	4.10	3.54	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	3	5	2	11	2	3.17	1507/1595	4.12	4.06	4.20	4.03	3.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	3	2	7	7	3.43	1296/1533	4.20	4.04	4.04	3.87	3.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	6	0	6	4	5	3.10	1418/1512	3.99	3.93	4.10	3.86	3.10	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	5	2	7	4	5	3.09	1525/1623	4.18	4.29	4.16	4.08	3.09	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	2	4	20	0	3.83	1613/1646	4.30	4.57	4.69	4.67	3.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	2	3	3	7	2	3.24	1456/1621	3.94	4.05	4.06	3.96	3.24	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	2	1	6	5	7	3.67	1426/1568	4.35	4.53	4.43	4.39	3.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	1	5	5	9	3.95	1477/1572	4.74	4.73	4.70	4.64	3.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	2	0	7	7	4	3.55	1374/1564	4.22	4.28	4.28	4.20	3.55	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	3	6	4	4	3.15	1458/1559	4.15	4.34	4.29	4.20	3.15	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	4	2	4	3	4	3.06	1213/1352	3.63	3.57	3.98	3.86	3.06	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	5	0	5	4	3	3.00	1254/1384	3.72	3.79	4.08	3.86	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	2	4	2	9	0	3.06	1313/1382	3.69	3.91	4.29	4.03	3.06	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	4	3	2	5	3	3.00	1286/1368	4.06	4.08	4.30	4.01	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	11	0	2	2	0	2	3.33	776/ 948	3.63	3.94	3.95	3.75	3.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	2	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	****/ 555	****	4.38	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 288	****	3.29	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 312	****	3.73	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 53	****	3.86	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: ECON 102 0401
 Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS
 Instructor: COOMBER, WILLIA
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 523
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	5	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	1	Under-grad	24	Non-major	19
84-150	1	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	14				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ECON 102 0601
 Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS
 Instructor: FALCON, HAROLD
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 524
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	9	10	4.26	954/1649	4.14	4.23	4.28	4.11	4.26	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	14	4.43	658/1648	4.11	4.24	4.23	4.16	4.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	3	14	4.26	797/1375	4.21	4.32	4.27	4.10	4.26	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	608/1595	4.12	4.06	4.20	4.03	4.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	1	3	8	7	4.11	748/1533	4.20	4.04	4.04	3.87	4.11	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	1	2	6	6	4.13	808/1512	3.99	3.93	4.10	3.86	4.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	3	5	14	4.35	708/1623	4.18	4.29	4.16	4.08	4.35	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	7	15	4.68	1015/1646	4.30	4.57	4.69	4.67	4.68	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	3	8	6	4.18	777/1621	3.94	4.05	4.06	3.96	4.18	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	2	5	12	4.40	983/1568	4.35	4.53	4.43	4.39	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	931/1572	4.74	4.73	4.70	4.64	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	1	6	12	4.40	780/1564	4.22	4.28	4.28	4.20	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	1	0	2	15	4.53	673/1559	4.15	4.34	4.29	4.20	4.53	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	9	2	1	1	2	4	3.50	1049/1352	3.63	3.57	3.98	3.86	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	708/1384	3.72	3.79	4.08	3.86	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	923/1382	3.69	3.91	4.29	4.03	4.10	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	816/1368	4.06	4.08	4.30	4.01	4.30	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	6	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 948	3.63	3.94	3.95	3.75	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors 5	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 2	C 1	General 3	Under-grad 23 Non-major 23
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 3	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 10	
			? 2		

Course-Section: ECON 102 0701
 Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS
 Instructor: GINDLING, THOMA
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 525
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	8	16	4.48	670/1649	4.14	4.23	4.28	4.11	4.48	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	10	13	4.33	797/1648	4.11	4.24	4.23	4.16	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	11	15	4.48	569/1375	4.21	4.32	4.27	4.10	4.48	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	2	7	12	4.36	685/1595	4.12	4.06	4.20	4.03	4.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	6	7	11	3.93	895/1533	4.20	4.04	4.04	3.87	3.93	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	3	6	9	4.33	595/1512	3.99	3.93	4.10	3.86	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	7	16	4.44	581/1623	4.18	4.29	4.16	4.08	4.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1646	4.30	4.57	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	2	0	0	2	10	8	4.30	632/1621	3.94	4.05	4.06	3.96	4.30	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	21	4.81	387/1568	4.35	4.53	4.43	4.39	4.81	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	24	4.92	473/1572	4.74	4.73	4.70	4.64	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	6	19	4.69	434/1564	4.22	4.28	4.28	4.20	4.69	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	20	4.76	376/1559	4.15	4.34	4.29	4.20	4.76	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	14	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	280/1352	3.63	3.57	3.98	3.86	4.55	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	561/1384	3.72	3.79	4.08	3.86	4.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	799/1382	3.69	3.91	4.29	4.03	4.31	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	522/1368	4.06	4.08	4.30	4.01	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	7	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/ 948	3.63	3.94	3.95	3.75	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.08	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	5
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	B 13		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 4	General	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 27
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	16
			? 0		

Course-Section: ECON 102 0801
 Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS
 Instructor: PAPADANTONAKIS,
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 526
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	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	6	4	10	10	3.80	1351/1649	4.14	4.23	4.28	4.11	3.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	6	8	13	4.03	1106/1648	4.11	4.24	4.23	4.16	4.03	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	4	13	10	4.00	950/1375	4.21	4.32	4.27	4.10	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	3	8	16	4.23	841/1595	4.12	4.06	4.20	4.03	4.23	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	8	19	4.50	366/1533	4.20	4.04	4.04	3.87	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	3	11	13	4.13	808/1512	3.99	3.93	4.10	3.86	4.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	6	5	17	4.23	838/1623	4.18	4.29	4.16	4.08	4.23	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	14	16	4.53	1166/1646	4.30	4.57	4.69	4.67	4.53	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	1	3	6	5	7	3.64	1281/1621	3.94	4.05	4.06	3.96	3.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	4	11	12	4.14	1213/1568	4.35	4.53	4.43	4.39	4.14	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	28	4.93	414/1572	4.74	4.73	4.70	4.64	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	4	5	9	11	3.93	1191/1564	4.22	4.28	4.28	4.20	3.93	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	3	8	5	12	3.93	1181/1559	4.15	4.34	4.29	4.20	3.93	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	16	2	1	3	2	4	3.42	1095/1352	3.63	3.57	3.98	3.86	3.42	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	5	3	5	6	3.38	1132/1384	3.72	3.79	4.08	3.86	3.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	6	3	3	4	5	2.95	1330/1382	3.69	3.91	4.29	4.03	2.95	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	3	1	3	4	10	3.81	1071/1368	4.06	4.08	4.30	4.01	3.81	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	11	1	2	1	1	4	3.56	688/ 948	3.63	3.94	3.95	3.75	3.56	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	26	2	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	27	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	27	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 555	****	4.38	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.29	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 312	****	3.73	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	****/ 53	****	3.86	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	1	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	1	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	1	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: ECON 102 0801
 Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS
 Instructor: PAPANANTONAKIS,
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 526
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	General	8	Under-grad	30	Non-major	27
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	710/1649	4.14	4.23	4.28	4.11	4.45	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	2	5	4.00	1124/1648	4.11	4.24	4.23	4.16	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	704/1375	4.21	4.32	4.27	4.10	4.36	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1067/1595	4.12	4.06	4.20	4.03	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	334/1533	4.20	4.04	4.04	3.87	4.55	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1512	3.99	3.93	4.10	3.86	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	459/1623	4.18	4.29	4.16	4.08	4.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	9	0	3.82	1615/1646	4.30	4.57	4.69	4.67	3.82	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	7	2	4.00	914/1621	3.94	4.05	4.06	3.96	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	917/1568	4.35	4.53	4.43	4.39	4.45	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1572	4.74	4.73	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	822/1564	4.22	4.28	4.28	4.20	4.36	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	549/1559	4.15	4.34	4.29	4.20	4.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	690/1352	3.63	3.57	3.98	3.86	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	1	0	2	2	3.14	1232/1384	3.72	3.79	4.08	3.86	3.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	899/1382	3.69	3.91	4.29	4.03	4.14	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	1115/1368	4.06	4.08	4.30	4.01	3.71	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.08	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	****	3.29	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	3.86	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	1	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	3				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 121 0101
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I
 Instructor: CROTEAU, MARCIA
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 528
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	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	2	2	4	18	4.46	696/1649	4.18	4.23	4.28	4.11	4.46	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	8	15	4.42	672/1648	4.30	4.24	4.23	4.16	4.42	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	1	1	2	20	4.42	641/1375	4.17	4.32	4.27	4.10	4.42	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	1	3	7	11	4.27	794/1595	4.04	4.06	4.20	4.03	4.27	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	2	3	3	16	4.24	643/1533	4.27	4.04	4.04	3.87	4.24	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	2	4	4	10	4.10	835/1512	4.06	3.93	4.10	3.86	4.10	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	4	4	17	4.42	608/1623	4.27	4.29	4.16	4.08	4.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	1	24	4.88	697/1646	4.85	4.57	4.69	4.67	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	4	9	6	4.11	859/1621	4.07	4.05	4.06	3.96	4.11	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	1	21	4.72	554/1568	4.64	4.53	4.43	4.39	4.72	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	2	21	4.76	912/1572	4.69	4.73	4.70	4.64	4.76	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	3	5	16	4.44	728/1564	4.32	4.28	4.28	4.20	4.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	4	6	14	4.28	945/1559	4.43	4.34	4.29	4.20	4.28	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	1	1	5	6	7	3.85	848/1352	3.83	3.57	3.98	3.86	3.85	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	2	3	3	8	4.06	774/1384	3.91	3.79	4.08	3.86	4.06	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	2	5	1	7	3.69	1137/1382	3.82	3.91	4.29	4.03	3.69	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	3	3	9	4.25	844/1368	4.13	4.08	4.30	4.01	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	8	1	2	2	0	2	3.00	844/ 948	3.79	3.94	3.95	3.75	3.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 555	****	4.38	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 288	****	3.29	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 312	****	3.73	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 53	3.86	3.86	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: ECON 121 0101
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I
 Instructor: CROTEAU, MARCIA
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 528
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	7	C	7	General	2	Under-grad	27	Non-major	24
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	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	18				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 121 0201
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I
 Instructor: COLE, RICHARD
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 529
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	2	5	11	12	4.00	1183/1649	4.18	4.23	4.28	4.11	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	5	13	12	4.16	999/1648	4.30	4.24	4.23	4.16	4.16	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	8	5	17	4.19	855/1375	4.17	4.32	4.27	4.10	4.19	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	1	4	6	9	4.15	943/1595	4.04	4.06	4.20	4.03	4.15	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	0	1	2	5	18	4.54	342/1533	4.27	4.04	4.04	3.87	4.54	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	15	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	595/1512	4.06	3.93	4.10	3.86	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	5	9	15	4.34	708/1623	4.27	4.29	4.16	4.08	4.34	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	1	28	4.97	266/1646	4.85	4.57	4.69	4.67	4.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	2	5	9	8	3.96	987/1621	4.07	4.05	4.06	3.96	3.96	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	4	5	20	4.55	791/1568	4.64	4.53	4.43	4.39	4.55	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	3	3	3	21	4.40	1321/1572	4.69	4.73	4.70	4.64	4.40	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	4	7	18	4.40	780/1564	4.32	4.28	4.28	4.20	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	2	1	7	18	4.34	891/1559	4.43	4.34	4.29	4.20	4.34	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	13	3	2	4	2	6	3.35	1122/1352	3.83	3.57	3.98	3.86	3.35	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	2	1	3	3	4	3.46	1097/1384	3.91	3.79	4.08	3.86	3.46	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	3	0	3	0	7	3.62	1170/1382	3.82	3.91	4.29	4.03	3.62	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	3	0	2	1	7	3.69	1122/1368	4.13	4.08	4.30	4.01	3.69	
4. Were special techniques successful	19	8	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/ 948	3.79	3.94	3.95	3.75	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.08	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	30	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.38	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 288	****	3.29	3.68	3.54	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	8	C	9	General	0	Under-grad	32	Non-major	32
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	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	23				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 121 0601
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I
 Instructor: COLE, RICHARD
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 530
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	2	3	8	12	4.08	1136/1649	4.18	4.23	4.28	4.11	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	2	3	5	14	4.04	1106/1648	4.30	4.24	4.23	4.16	4.04	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	5	7	12	4.08	925/1375	4.17	4.32	4.27	4.10	4.08	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	8	1	1	5	3	8	3.89	1213/1595	4.04	4.06	4.20	4.03	3.89	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	2	1	4	6	10	3.91	905/1533	4.27	4.04	4.04	3.87	3.91	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	16	1	0	2	2	5	4.00	883/1512	4.06	3.93	4.10	3.86	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	7	9	10	4.12	968/1623	4.27	4.29	4.16	4.08	4.12	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	9	17	4.65	1048/1646	4.85	4.57	4.69	4.67	4.65	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	0	3	9	5	4.12	847/1621	4.07	4.05	4.06	3.96	4.12	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	8	14	4.44	930/1568	4.64	4.53	4.43	4.39	4.44	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	2	7	16	4.46	1273/1572	4.69	4.73	4.70	4.64	4.46	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	2	1	9	12	4.29	897/1564	4.32	4.28	4.28	4.20	4.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	8	15	4.42	804/1559	4.43	4.34	4.29	4.20	4.42	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	13	1	1	5	2	4	3.54	1034/1352	3.83	3.57	3.98	3.86	3.54	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	3	1	2	3	6	3.53	1068/1384	3.91	3.79	4.08	3.86	3.53	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	5	1	2	3	4	3.00	1316/1382	3.82	3.91	4.29	4.03	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	4	3	3	5	3.60	1143/1368	4.13	4.08	4.30	4.01	3.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	11	0	2	1	2	0	3.00	****/ 948	3.79	3.94	3.95	3.75	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	7	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	2	1	0	1	2	3.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.38	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 288	****	3.29	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	1	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	****/ 312	****	3.73	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	40/ 53	3.86	3.86	4.30	4.17	3.86	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	1	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	2	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: ECON 121 0601
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I
 Instructor: COLE, RICHARD
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 530
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	2	Under-grad	27	Non-major	26
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	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				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 121 0701
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I
 Instructor: MEDICUS, SUZANN
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 531
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	3	2	10	11	3.89	1279/1649	4.18	4.23	4.28	4.11	3.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	3	10	12	4.36	756/1648	4.30	4.24	4.23	4.16	4.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	12	11	4.19	862/1375	4.17	4.32	4.27	4.10	4.19	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	2	2	2	7	6	3.68	1323/1595	4.04	4.06	4.20	4.03	3.68	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	5	7	12	4.08	768/1533	4.27	4.04	4.04	3.87	4.08	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	12	3	0	0	7	4	3.64	1180/1512	4.06	3.93	4.10	3.86	3.64	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	1	2	9	12	4.20	883/1623	4.27	4.29	4.16	4.08	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	697/1646	4.85	4.57	4.69	4.67	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	1	4	9	4	3.89	1078/1621	4.07	4.05	4.06	3.96	3.89	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	8	17	4.62	715/1568	4.64	4.53	4.43	4.39	4.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	4	22	4.85	740/1572	4.69	4.73	4.70	4.64	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	3	13	8	4.00	1127/1564	4.32	4.28	4.28	4.20	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	8	14	4.27	959/1559	4.43	4.34	4.29	4.20	4.27	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	2	0	3	7	10	4.05	667/1352	3.83	3.57	3.98	3.86	4.05	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	0	2	6	6	3.88	901/1384	3.91	3.79	4.08	3.86	3.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	2	8	6	4.25	831/1382	3.82	3.91	4.29	4.03	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	654/1368	4.13	4.08	4.30	4.01	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	1	0	2	5	7	4.13	394/ 948	3.79	3.94	3.95	3.75	4.13	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	26	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	26	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	26	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 555	****	4.38	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.31	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.73	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	3.86	3.86	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: ECON 121 0701
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I
 Instructor: MEDICUS, SUZANN
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 531
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	8	General	1	Under-grad	28	Non-major	25
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	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	22				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 121 0801
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I
 Instructor: MEDICUS, SUZANN
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 532
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	5	9	11	4.24	986/1649	4.18	4.23	4.28	4.11	4.24	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	8	13	4.32	811/1648	4.30	4.24	4.23	4.16	4.32	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	0	4	10	9	4.08	922/1375	4.17	4.32	4.27	4.10	4.08	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	5	0	3	1	6	8	4.06	1038/1595	4.04	4.06	4.20	4.03	4.06	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	2	0	0	3	7	11	4.38	495/1533	4.27	4.04	4.04	3.87	4.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	8	0	3	1	5	6	3.93	980/1512	4.06	3.93	4.10	3.86	3.93	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	0	2	8	13	4.33	720/1623	4.27	4.29	4.16	4.08	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	1	2	20	4.83	799/1646	4.85	4.57	4.69	4.67	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	2	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	709/1621	4.07	4.05	4.06	3.96	4.23	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	372/1568	4.64	4.53	4.43	4.39	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	2	20	4.83	790/1572	4.69	4.73	4.70	4.64	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	3	6	11	4.29	908/1564	4.32	4.28	4.28	4.20	4.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	6	15	4.64	549/1559	4.43	4.34	4.29	4.20	4.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	0	2	0	6	12	4.40	399/1352	3.83	3.57	3.98	3.86	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	1	5	10	4.41	530/1384	3.91	3.79	4.08	3.86	4.41	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	1	6	9	4.35	757/1382	3.82	3.91	4.29	4.03	4.35	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	1	2	2	11	4.24	855/1368	4.13	4.08	4.30	4.01	4.24	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	179/ 948	3.79	3.94	3.95	3.75	4.57	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.38	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.29	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 312	****	3.73	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 53	3.86	3.86	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: ECON 121 0801
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I
 Instructor: MEDICUS, SUZANN
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 532
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	26	Non-major	25
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	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	17				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 121 0901
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I
 Instructor: DAVIS, ALEXIS C
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 533
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	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	4	14	4.39	789/1649	4.18	4.23	4.28	4.11	4.39	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	9	13	4.52	533/1648	4.30	4.24	4.23	4.16	4.52	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	2	8	10	4.09	922/1375	4.17	4.32	4.27	4.10	4.09	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	1	1	6	9	4.17	930/1595	4.04	4.06	4.20	4.03	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	2	4	13	4.45	432/1533	4.27	4.04	4.04	3.87	4.45	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	1	2	4	10	4.35	574/1512	4.06	3.93	4.10	3.86	4.35	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	2	5	12	4.18	894/1623	4.27	4.29	4.16	4.08	4.18	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	0	21	4.91	664/1646	4.85	4.57	4.69	4.67	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	2	0	0	2	12	4	4.11	847/1621	4.07	4.05	4.06	3.96	4.11	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	3	18	4.70	588/1568	4.64	4.53	4.43	4.39	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	21	4.87	690/1572	4.69	4.73	4.70	4.64	4.87	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	5	15	4.48	689/1564	4.32	4.28	4.28	4.20	4.48	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	18	4.65	524/1559	4.43	4.34	4.29	4.20	4.65	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	14	0	1	3	2	3	3.78	900/1352	3.83	3.57	3.98	3.86	3.78	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	4	6	8	4.11	761/1384	3.91	3.79	4.08	3.86	4.11	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	1	3	6	8	4.00	946/1382	3.82	3.91	4.29	4.03	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	3	3	13	4.53	639/1368	4.13	4.08	4.30	4.01	4.53	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	10	1	0	4	2	2	3.44	727/ 948	3.79	3.94	3.95	3.75	3.44	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	1	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/ 555	****	4.38	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	****	3.29	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.73	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 53	3.86	3.86	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: ECON 121 0901
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I
 Instructor: DAVIS, ALEXIS C
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 533
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	22
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
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	14				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 122 0101
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING II
 Instructor: MCBRIDE, CHUCK
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 534
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	20	0	0	2	2	5	7	4.06	1142/1649	4.23	4.23	4.28	4.11	4.06	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	20	0	0	3	1	2	10	4.19	977/1648	4.40	4.24	4.23	4.16	4.19	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	20	0	1	1	0	3	11	4.38	694/1375	4.49	4.32	4.27	4.10	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	20	6	1	0	3	3	3	3.70	1311/1595	4.02	4.06	4.20	4.03	3.70	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	20	1	1	0	1	3	10	4.40	476/1533	4.19	4.04	4.04	3.87	4.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	20	9	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	****/1512	3.69	3.93	4.10	3.86	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	20	0	1	0	1	2	12	4.50	502/1623	4.49	4.29	4.16	4.08	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	19	0	1	0	0	8	8	4.29	1370/1646	4.58	4.57	4.69	4.67	4.29	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	21	1	0	1	3	6	4	3.93	1030/1621	3.98	4.05	4.06	3.96	3.93	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	20	0	0	1	2	4	9	4.31	1070/1568	4.35	4.53	4.43	4.39	4.31	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	20	0	0	1	0	2	13	4.69	1046/1572	4.76	4.73	4.70	4.64	4.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	20	0	0	4	2	4	6	3.75	1297/1564	4.18	4.28	4.28	4.20	3.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	20	0	3	1	1	1	10	3.88	1211/1559	4.14	4.34	4.29	4.20	3.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	20	13	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/1352	3.45	3.57	3.98	3.86	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	31	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	****/1384	4.07	3.79	4.08	3.86	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	31	0	0	2	0	2	1	3.40	****/1382	4.21	3.91	4.29	4.03	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	31	0	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	****/1368	4.08	4.08	4.30	4.01	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	31	3	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 948	3.92	3.94	3.95	3.75	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.38	4.29	4.14	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ECON 122 0201
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING II
 Instructor: MCBRIDE, CHUCK
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 535
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	10	10	4.16	1057/1649	4.23	4.23	4.28	4.11	4.16
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	10	10	4.20	966/1648	4.40	4.24	4.23	4.16	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	8	14	14	4.44	617/1375	4.49	4.32	4.27	4.10	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	1	1	3	4	7	3.94	1161/1595	4.02	4.06	4.20	4.03	3.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	7	14	4.40	476/1533	4.19	4.04	4.04	3.87	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	2	3	2	9	4.13	817/1512	3.69	3.93	4.10	3.86	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	4	5	15	4.46	568/1623	4.49	4.29	4.16	4.08	4.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	17	7	4.29	1370/1646	4.58	4.57	4.69	4.67	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	1	13	5	3	3.35	1426/1621	3.98	4.05	4.06	3.96	3.35
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	5	8	10	4.00	1279/1568	4.35	4.53	4.43	4.39	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	2	21	4.76	912/1572	4.76	4.73	4.70	4.64	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	2	5	8	8	3.72	1311/1564	4.18	4.28	4.28	4.20	3.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	5	5	4	10	3.68	1315/1559	4.14	4.34	4.29	4.20	3.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	17	2	4	2	0	0	2.00	1335/1352	3.45	3.57	3.98	3.86	2.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	4	1	3	3.88	901/1384	4.07	3.79	4.08	3.86	3.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	1	1	0	4	2	3.63	1165/1382	4.21	3.91	4.29	4.03	3.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	2	1	1	4	3.88	1043/1368	4.08	4.08	4.30	4.01	3.88
4. Were special techniques successful	17	5	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 948	3.92	3.94	3.95	3.75	****
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.29	3.68	3.54	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	25	Non-major	25
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 122 0401
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING II
 Instructor: MCBRIDE, CHUCK
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 536
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	776/1649	4.23	4.23	4.28	4.11	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	441/1648	4.40	4.24	4.23	4.16	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	665/1375	4.49	4.32	4.27	4.10	4.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	956/1595	4.02	4.06	4.20	4.03	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	476/1533	4.19	4.04	4.04	3.87	4.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	687/1512	3.69	3.93	4.10	3.86	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	635/1623	4.49	4.29	4.16	4.08	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	1287/1646	4.58	4.57	4.69	4.67	4.40	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	687/1621	3.98	4.05	4.06	3.96	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	731/1568	4.35	4.53	4.43	4.39	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	1034/1572	4.76	4.73	4.70	4.64	4.70	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	887/1564	4.18	4.28	4.28	4.20	4.30	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	832/1559	4.14	4.34	4.29	4.20	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	1219/1352	3.45	3.57	3.98	3.86	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	673/1384	4.07	3.79	4.08	3.86	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	616/1382	4.21	3.91	4.29	4.03	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	844/1368	4.08	4.08	4.30	4.01	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 948	3.92	3.94	3.95	3.75	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	9
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	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	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 122 0501
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING II
 Instructor: HARDY, TIMOTHY
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 537
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	933/1649	4.23	4.23	4.28	4.11	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	672/1648	4.40	4.24	4.23	4.16	4.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	488/1375	4.49	4.32	4.27	4.10	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	956/1595	4.02	4.06	4.20	4.03	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	966/1533	4.19	4.04	4.04	3.87	3.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	1	2	0	1	2.80	1476/1512	3.69	3.93	4.10	3.86	2.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	671/1623	4.49	4.29	4.16	4.08	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1646	4.58	4.57	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	812/1621	3.98	4.05	4.06	3.96	4.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	1279/1568	4.35	4.53	4.43	4.39	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	715/1572	4.76	4.73	4.70	4.64	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	754/1564	4.18	4.28	4.28	4.20	4.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	1045/1559	4.14	4.34	4.29	4.20	4.14	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	690/1352	3.45	3.57	3.98	3.86	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	937/1384	4.07	3.79	4.08	3.86	3.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	342/1382	4.21	3.91	4.29	4.03	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	948/1368	4.08	4.08	4.30	4.01	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	645/ 948	3.92	3.94	3.95	3.75	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 2		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 4	General	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 8
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	5
			? 0		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	13	8	4.26	954/1649	4.23	4.23	4.28	4.11	4.26	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	7	15	4.61	441/1648	4.40	4.24	4.23	4.16	4.61	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	16	4.65	412/1375	4.49	4.32	4.27	4.10	4.65	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	3	7	6	4.19	903/1595	4.02	4.06	4.20	4.03	4.19	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	3	3	9	7	3.91	915/1533	4.19	4.04	4.04	3.87	3.91	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	13	1	0	3	4	2	3.60	1202/1512	3.69	3.93	4.10	3.86	3.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	4	18	4.74	241/1623	4.49	4.29	4.16	4.08	4.74	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	1	0	21	4.91	664/1646	4.58	4.57	4.69	4.67	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	0	0	1	8	4	4.23	709/1621	3.98	4.05	4.06	3.96	4.23	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	372/1568	4.35	4.53	4.43	4.39	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	815/1572	4.76	4.73	4.70	4.64	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	7	15	4.68	447/1564	4.18	4.28	4.28	4.20	4.68	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	5	15	4.59	596/1559	4.14	4.34	4.29	4.20	4.59	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	129/1352	3.45	3.57	3.98	3.86	4.82	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	582/1384	4.07	3.79	4.08	3.86	4.36	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	1031/1382	4.21	3.91	4.29	4.03	3.91	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	881/1368	4.08	4.08	4.30	4.01	4.18	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	0	0	1	0	6	4	4.18	370/ 948	3.92	3.94	3.95	3.75	4.18	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 555	****	4.38	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 288	****	3.29	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 312	****	3.73	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****	

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	5	1.00-1.99	B 9		Graduate 0
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	C 5	General	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 24
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	16
			? 1		

Course-Section: ECON 263 0101
 Title: SPORTS ECONOMICS
 Instructor: COATES, DENNIS
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 539
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	996/1649	4.22	4.23	4.28	4.29	4.22	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	1	3.89	1245/1648	3.89	4.24	4.23	4.25	3.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	1044/1375	3.89	4.32	4.27	4.37	3.89	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1067/1595	4.00	4.06	4.20	4.22	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	5	2	3.89	935/1533	3.89	4.04	4.04	4.04	3.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	883/1512	4.00	3.93	4.10	4.14	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	0	1	6	4.22	849/1623	4.22	4.29	4.16	4.21	4.22	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.57	4.69	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1123/1621	3.83	4.05	4.06	4.01	3.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	1121/1568	4.25	4.53	4.43	4.39	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	1	0	6	4.25	1400/1572	4.25	4.73	4.70	4.73	4.25	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1235/1564	3.88	4.28	4.28	4.27	3.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	1060/1559	4.13	4.34	4.29	4.33	4.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	1016/1352	3.57	3.57	3.98	4.07	3.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1192/1384	3.25	3.79	4.08	3.99	3.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	1275/1382	3.25	3.91	4.29	4.19	3.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	2	0	0	2	3.50	1181/1368	3.50	4.08	4.30	4.21	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 948	****	3.94	3.95	3.89	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.38	4.29	4.33	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 288	****	3.29	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 312	****	3.73	3.68	3.59	****	

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		0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 1		9
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	2
				#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	

Course-Section: ECON 280 0101
 Title INTERNATIONAL ECONOMY
 Instructor: TAKACS, WENDY E
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 540
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	1027/1649	4.20	4.23	4.28	4.29	4.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	441/1648	4.60	4.24	4.23	4.25	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	855/1375	4.20	4.32	4.27	4.37	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	2	3	3.70	1311/1595	3.70	4.06	4.20	4.22	3.70	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	945/1533	3.88	4.04	4.04	4.04	3.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	5	3	3.90	1022/1512	3.90	3.93	4.10	4.14	3.90	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	757/1623	4.30	4.29	4.16	4.21	4.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	1004/1646	4.70	4.57	4.69	4.63	4.70	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	687/1621	4.25	4.05	4.06	4.01	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	852/1568	4.50	4.53	4.43	4.39	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	931/1572	4.75	4.73	4.70	4.73	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	651/1564	4.50	4.28	4.28	4.27	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	861/1559	4.38	4.34	4.29	4.33	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	1219/1352	3.00	3.57	3.98	4.07	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1384	****	3.79	4.08	3.99	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	774/1382	4.33	3.91	4.29	4.19	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1368	****	4.08	4.30	4.21	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 948	****	3.94	3.95	3.89	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	10
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Major 7
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	6

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ECON 301 0101
 Title INTERMED ACCOUNTING I
 Instructor: ST MARTIN, JEAN
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 541
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	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	9	17	4.59	523/1649	4.61	4.23	4.28	4.27	4.59	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	18	4.59	452/1648	4.67	4.24	4.23	4.18	4.59	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	20	4.67	401/1375	4.74	4.32	4.27	4.22	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	3	6	15	4.36	685/1595	4.51	4.06	4.20	4.21	4.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	1	3	6	11	4.29	594/1533	4.21	4.04	4.04	4.05	4.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	2	1	5	2	13	4.00	883/1512	3.96	3.93	4.10	4.11	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	3	20	4.56	448/1623	4.65	4.29	4.16	4.08	4.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	21	4.81	833/1646	4.74	4.57	4.69	4.67	4.81	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	216/1621	4.84	4.05	4.06	4.02	4.68	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	7	16	4.56	779/1568	4.75	4.53	4.43	4.39	4.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	7	18	4.65	1084/1572	4.83	4.73	4.70	4.64	4.65	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	5	19	4.72	406/1564	4.73	4.28	4.28	4.25	4.72	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	4	19	4.62	573/1559	4.70	4.34	4.29	4.23	4.62	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	14	3	0	0	3	4	3.50	1049/1352	3.85	3.57	3.98	3.97	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/1384	3.20	3.79	4.08	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/1382	4.30	3.91	4.29	4.37	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/1368	4.10	4.08	4.30	4.39	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	22	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 948	****	3.94	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.07	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	3.89	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.21	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.12	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.38	4.29	4.22	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.55	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.30	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	4.46	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	****	3.29	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.21	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.43	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.32	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 312	****	3.73	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	3.86	4.30	4.32	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.44	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	4.05	****	

Course-Section: ECON 301 0101
 Title INTERMED ACCOUNTING I
 Instructor: ST MARTIN, JEAN
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 541
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	27	Non-major	27
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	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	19				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 301 0201
 Title INTERMED ACCOUNTING I
 Instructor: ST MARTIN, JEAN
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 542
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	484/1649	4.61	4.23	4.28	4.27	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	263/1648	4.67	4.24	4.23	4.18	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	226/1375	4.74	4.32	4.27	4.22	4.81	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	321/1595	4.51	4.06	4.20	4.21	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	2	4	7	4.14	718/1533	4.21	4.04	4.04	4.05	4.14	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	0	3	1	8	3.93	994/1512	3.96	3.93	4.10	4.11	3.93	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	220/1623	4.65	4.29	4.16	4.08	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	1037/1646	4.74	4.57	4.69	4.67	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1621	4.84	4.05	4.06	4.02	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	171/1568	4.75	4.53	4.43	4.39	4.93	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1572	4.83	4.73	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	374/1564	4.73	4.28	4.28	4.25	4.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	347/1559	4.70	4.34	4.29	4.23	4.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	10	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	556/1352	3.85	3.57	3.98	3.97	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	1	3	1	3	3.20	1209/1384	3.20	3.79	4.08	4.11	3.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	1	1	7	4.30	799/1382	4.30	3.91	4.29	4.37	4.30	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	2	1	6	4.10	920/1368	4.10	4.08	4.30	4.39	4.10	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	7	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 948	****	3.94	3.95	4.00	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.29	3.68	3.58	****	

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	6	2.00-2.99	C 5	General	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	9
			? 0		

Course-Section: ECON 302 0101
 Title INTERMED ACCOUNTING II
 Instructor: CROTEAU, MARCIA
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 543
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	186/1649	4.90	4.23	4.28	4.27	4.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	216/1648	4.80	4.24	4.23	4.18	4.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	233/1375	4.80	4.32	4.27	4.22	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	218/1595	4.78	4.06	4.20	4.21	4.78	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	327/1533	4.56	4.04	4.04	4.05	4.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	263/1512	4.67	3.93	4.10	4.11	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	130/1623	4.89	4.29	4.16	4.08	4.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.57	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	374/1621	4.50	4.05	4.06	4.02	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	245/1568	4.90	4.53	4.43	4.39	4.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.73	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	263/1564	4.80	4.28	4.28	4.25	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	475/1559	4.70	4.34	4.29	4.23	4.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	1	1	1	6	4.00	690/1352	4.00	3.57	3.98	3.97	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	201/1384	4.80	3.79	4.08	4.11	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	342/1382	4.80	3.91	4.29	4.37	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	369/1368	4.80	4.08	4.30	4.39	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 948	****	3.94	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.38	4.29	4.22	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.21	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.32	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	3.86	4.30	4.32	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.44	****	

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	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	10
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	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	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 311 0101
 Title INTERM MICROECON ANALY
 Instructor: COATES, DENNIS
 Enrollment: 79
 Questionnaires: 53

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 544
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	8	19	24	4.21	1018/1649	3.66	4.23	4.28	4.27	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	11	19	20	4.10	1070/1648	3.63	4.24	4.23	4.18	4.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	4	17	29	4.36	714/1375	3.75	4.32	4.27	4.22	4.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	34	1	4	5	5	4	3.37	1459/1595	3.26	4.06	4.20	4.21	3.37
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	22	3	7	8	7	4	3.07	1430/1533	3.14	4.04	4.04	4.05	3.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	44	2	2	1	1	0	2.17	****/1512	2.76	3.93	4.10	4.11	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	4	9	11	27	4.20	883/1623	4.06	4.29	4.16	4.08	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	51	5.00	1/1646	4.90	4.57	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	2	1	1	4	23	12	4.07	875/1621	3.77	4.05	4.06	4.02	4.07
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	6	11	33	4.44	930/1568	4.15	4.53	4.43	4.39	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	6	14	31	4.49	1249/1572	4.50	4.73	4.70	4.64	4.49
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	3	5	18	25	4.27	918/1564	3.72	4.28	4.28	4.25	4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	5	9	35	4.46	749/1559	3.87	4.34	4.29	4.23	4.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	35	2	2	2	4	4	3.43	1090/1352	3.33	3.57	3.98	3.97	3.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	28	0	7	2	4	9	3	2.96	1272/1384	2.73	3.79	4.08	4.11	2.96
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	29	0	5	3	7	3	6	3.08	1311/1382	3.40	3.91	4.29	4.37	3.08
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	29	0	4	2	7	6	5	3.25	1252/1368	3.39	4.08	4.30	4.39	3.25
4. Were special techniques successful	28	22	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 948	3.13	3.94	3.95	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	4	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	18						
56-83	11	2.00-2.99	4	C	12	General	2	Under-grad	53	Non-major	50
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	36				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 311 0201
 Title INTERM MICROECON ANALY
 Instructor: BRADLEY, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 545
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	3	3	5	6	3.82	1335/1649	3.66	4.23	4.28	4.27	3.82	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	5	6	3.88	1245/1648	3.63	4.24	4.23	4.18	3.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	4	8	4.06	932/1375	3.75	4.32	4.27	4.22	4.06	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	****/1595	3.26	4.06	4.20	4.21	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	6	6	4.00	815/1533	3.14	4.04	4.04	4.05	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	13	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	****/1512	2.76	3.93	4.10	4.11	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	541/1623	4.06	4.29	4.16	4.08	4.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	799/1646	4.90	4.57	4.69	4.67	4.82	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	2	2	4	5	3.92	1030/1621	3.77	4.05	4.06	4.02	3.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	969/1568	4.15	4.53	4.43	4.39	4.41	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	790/1572	4.50	4.73	4.70	4.64	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	4	2	4	7	3.82	1262/1564	3.72	4.28	4.28	4.25	3.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	0	4	9	3.94	1166/1559	3.87	4.34	4.29	4.23	3.94	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	10	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	1177/1352	3.33	3.57	3.98	3.97	3.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	3	2	1	0	2	2.50	1346/1384	2.73	3.79	4.08	4.11	2.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	2	1	1	3	3.38	1240/1382	3.40	3.91	4.29	4.37	3.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	2	1	1	3	3.38	1215/1368	3.39	4.08	4.30	4.39	3.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	5	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 948	3.13	3.94	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	3.89	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.63	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.21	****	

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	0	Major	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	5	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	17	Non-major	15
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	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	12				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 311 0301
 Title INTERM MICROECON ANALY
 Instructor: VIAUROUX, CHRIS
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 546
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	7	0	7	5	4	2.96	1611/1649	3.66	4.23	4.28	4.27	2.96	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	5	5	7	2	2.91	1604/1648	3.63	4.24	4.23	4.18	2.91	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	8	2	2	8	3	2.83	1349/1375	3.75	4.32	4.27	4.22	2.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	3	5	2	6	4	3.15	1513/1595	3.26	4.06	4.20	4.21	3.15	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	9	3	2	4	2	2.35	1520/1533	3.14	4.04	4.04	4.05	2.35	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	5	2	4	4	2	2.76	1479/1512	2.76	3.93	4.10	4.11	2.76	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	3	5	7	6	3.52	1379/1623	4.06	4.29	4.16	4.08	3.52	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	731/1646	4.90	4.57	4.69	4.67	4.87	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	3	1	5	7	3	3.32	1436/1621	3.77	4.05	4.06	4.02	3.32	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	2	1	5	7	5	3.60	1440/1568	4.15	4.53	4.43	4.39	3.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	2	9	8	4.20	1419/1572	4.50	4.73	4.70	4.64	4.20	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	5	0	7	5	3	3.05	1492/1564	3.72	4.28	4.28	4.25	3.05	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	4	2	3	6	4	3.21	1446/1559	3.87	4.34	4.29	4.23	3.21	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	2	2	6	7	3	3.35	1122/1352	3.33	3.57	3.98	3.97	3.35	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	3	3	2	1	2.73	1327/1384	2.73	3.79	4.08	4.11	2.73	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	1	4	3	3	3.73	1116/1382	3.40	3.91	4.29	4.37	3.73	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	2	1	4	3	3.55	1165/1368	3.39	4.08	4.30	4.39	3.55	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	3	2	0	2	3	1	3.13	831/ 948	3.13	3.94	3.95	4.00	3.13	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.63	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	4.46	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 288	****	3.29	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.73	3.68	3.60	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ECON 312 0101
 Title INTERM MACROECON ANALY
 Instructor: CINYABUGUMA, MA
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 547
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	0	2	3.43	1518/1649	3.95	4.23	4.28	4.27	3.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	1	2	2	3.29	1558/1648	3.97	4.24	4.23	4.18	3.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	641/1375	4.46	4.32	4.27	4.22	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1231/1595	4.27	4.06	4.20	4.21	3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	3	2	3.71	1103/1533	3.98	4.04	4.04	4.05	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	1	1	3.29	1363/1512	3.89	3.93	4.10	4.11	3.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	0	0	4	3.57	1359/1623	4.07	4.29	4.16	4.08	3.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1130/1646	4.51	4.57	4.69	4.67	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	914/1621	3.98	4.05	4.06	4.02	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	1096/1568	4.56	4.53	4.43	4.39	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	1003/1572	4.58	4.73	4.70	4.64	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1127/1564	4.23	4.28	4.28	4.25	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	1	1	2	3.00	1479/1559	3.94	4.34	4.29	4.23	3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1049/1352	4.14	3.57	3.98	3.97	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1254/1384	3.68	3.79	4.08	4.11	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1316/1382	3.65	3.91	4.29	4.37	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1181/1368	3.88	4.08	4.30	4.39	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 948	4.00	3.94	3.95	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.07	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	7
			P 0		Non-major
			I 0		
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ECON 312 0301
 Title INTERM MACROECON ANALY
 Instructor: LI, VICTOR
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 548
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	350/1649	3.95	4.23	4.28	4.27	4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	362/1648	3.97	4.24	4.23	4.18	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	321/1375	4.46	4.32	4.27	4.22	4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	162/1595	4.27	4.06	4.20	4.21	4.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	137/1533	3.98	4.04	4.04	4.05	4.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	286/1512	3.89	3.93	4.10	4.11	4.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	261/1623	4.07	4.29	4.16	4.08	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	531/1646	4.51	4.57	4.69	4.67	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	339/1621	3.98	4.05	4.06	4.02	4.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1568	4.56	4.53	4.43	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1572	4.58	4.73	4.70	4.64	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	216/1564	4.23	4.28	4.28	4.25	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1559	3.94	4.34	4.29	4.23	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	188/1352	4.14	3.57	3.98	3.97	4.69
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	284/1384	3.68	3.79	4.08	4.11	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	435/1382	3.65	3.91	4.29	4.37	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	601/1368	3.88	4.08	4.30	4.39	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	431/ 948	4.00	3.94	3.95	4.00	4.00
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.29	3.68	3.58	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	12
84-150	0	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	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 312 0401
 Title INTERM MACROECON ANALY
 Instructor: THOMAS, MARK S
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 549
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	3	9	10	8	3.68	1422/1649	3.95	4.23	4.28	4.27	3.68	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	10	9	11	3.97	1166/1648	3.97	4.24	4.23	4.18	3.97	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	7	16	4.23	831/1375	4.46	4.32	4.27	4.22	4.23	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	18	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	1021/1595	4.27	4.06	4.20	4.21	4.08	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	13	2	2	7	1	6	3.39	1323/1533	3.98	4.04	4.04	4.05	3.39	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	22	1	1	1	1	4	3.75	1119/1512	3.89	3.93	4.10	4.11	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	3	8	6	12	3.93	1134/1623	4.07	4.29	4.16	4.08	3.93	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	1	26	2	4.03	1532/1646	4.51	4.57	4.69	4.67	4.03	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	15	9	1	3.38	1412/1621	3.98	4.05	4.06	4.02	3.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	5	9	17	4.39	1002/1568	4.56	4.53	4.43	4.39	4.39	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	1	9	5	15	4.03	1458/1572	4.58	4.73	4.70	4.64	4.03	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	3	0	6	12	10	3.84	1256/1564	4.23	4.28	4.28	4.25	3.84	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	5	0	4	9	13	3.81	1246/1559	3.94	4.34	4.29	4.23	3.81	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	2	2	8	16	4.24	521/1352	4.14	3.57	3.98	3.97	4.24	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	2	1	1	2	3	3.33	1159/1384	3.68	3.79	4.08	4.11	3.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	2	0	4	0	3	3.22	1284/1382	3.65	3.91	4.29	4.37	3.22	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	0	1	5	0	3	3.56	1162/1368	3.88	4.08	4.30	4.39	3.56	
4. Were special techniques successful	22	4	2	0	1	0	2	3.00	****/ 948	4.00	3.94	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.38	4.29	4.22	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	28	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 312	****	3.73	3.68	3.60	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	3	C	6	General	3	Under-grad	31	Non-major	29
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	22				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 320 0101
 Title QUANT MTHDS:MANAGEMENT
 Instructor: PALMATEER, JASO
 Enrollment: 55
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 550
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	3	14	15	4.27	943/1649	4.27	4.23	4.28	4.27	4.27	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	15	14	4.27	873/1648	4.27	4.24	4.23	4.18	4.27	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	16	13	4.24	814/1375	4.24	4.32	4.27	4.22	4.24	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	2	3	16	9	4.07	1032/1595	4.07	4.06	4.20	4.21	4.07	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	3	8	7	7	3.72	1093/1533	3.72	4.04	4.04	4.05	3.72	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	3	2	11	10	4.08	849/1512	4.08	3.93	4.10	4.11	4.08	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	13	15	4.24	826/1623	4.24	4.29	4.16	4.08	4.24	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	2	8	11	11	3.88	1608/1646	3.88	4.57	4.69	4.67	3.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	1	4	12	8	4.08	870/1621	4.08	4.05	4.06	4.02	4.08	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	6	23	4.59	743/1568	4.59	4.53	4.43	4.39	4.59	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	2	0	10	19	4.38	1339/1572	4.38	4.73	4.70	4.64	4.38	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	5	8	18	4.34	844/1564	4.34	4.28	4.28	4.25	4.34	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	5	7	20	4.47	749/1559	4.47	4.34	4.29	4.23	4.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	2	4	9	13	4.07	655/1352	4.07	3.57	3.98	3.97	4.07	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	3	2	8	4.14	737/1384	4.14	3.79	4.08	4.11	4.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	1	5	3	5	3.86	1050/1382	3.86	3.91	4.29	4.37	3.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	1	3	4	6	4.07	928/1368	4.07	4.08	4.30	4.39	4.07	
4. Were special techniques successful	19	1	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	323/ 948	4.31	3.94	3.95	4.00	4.31	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.29	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	31	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 312	****	3.73	3.68	3.60	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	6	C	4	General	3	Under-grad	33	Non-major	23
84-150	7	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	22				
				?	1						

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	5	11	4.50	644/1649	4.48	4.23	4.28	4.27	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	362/1648	4.60	4.24	4.23	4.18	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	488/1375	4.46	4.32	4.27	4.22	4.58	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	1	2	6	7	4.19	903/1595	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.21	4.19	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	8	2	1	1	2	4	3.50	1249/1533	3.75	4.04	4.04	4.05	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	1	0	5	4	4	3.71	1143/1512	3.71	3.93	4.10	4.11	3.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	251/1623	4.43	4.29	4.16	4.08	4.72	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	9	7	4.44	1258/1646	4.36	4.57	4.69	4.67	4.44	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	632/1621	4.43	4.05	4.06	4.02	4.31	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	147/1568	4.65	4.53	4.43	4.39	4.94	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	640/1572	4.73	4.73	4.70	4.64	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	570/1564	4.29	4.28	4.28	4.25	4.59	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	1	13	4.33	901/1559	4.24	4.34	4.29	4.23	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	1	1	3	3	5	3.77	907/1352	3.77	3.57	3.98	3.97	3.77	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	2	0	0	6	1	3.44	1105/1384	3.47	3.79	4.08	4.11	3.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	1	2	5	0	3.22	1284/1382	3.86	3.91	4.29	4.37	3.22	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	3	3	2	3.56	1162/1368	4.15	4.08	4.30	4.39	3.56	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	5	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 948	****	3.94	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.38	4.29	4.22	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.29	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 312	****	3.73	3.68	3.60	****	

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	1	1.00-1.99	B 10		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	1
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 19
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0		Non-major 18
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
				Electives	0
				Other	15

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ECON 374 0201
 Title FUND FINANCIAL MGMT
 Instructor: ROSE, MORGAN
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 552
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	5	9	4.47	696/1649	4.48	4.23	4.28	4.27	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	521/1648	4.60	4.24	4.23	4.18	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	8	4.33	733/1375	4.46	4.32	4.27	4.22	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	930/1595	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.21	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	6	6	4.00	815/1533	3.75	4.04	4.04	4.05	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1512	3.71	3.93	4.10	4.11	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	4	8	4.13	947/1623	4.43	4.29	4.16	4.08	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	10	4	4.29	1377/1646	4.36	4.57	4.69	4.67	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	331/1621	4.43	4.05	4.06	4.02	4.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	0	5	8	4.36	1031/1568	4.65	4.53	4.43	4.39	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	3	10	4.57	1174/1572	4.73	4.73	4.70	4.64	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	3	4	6	4.00	1127/1564	4.29	4.28	4.28	4.25	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	0	4	8	4.14	1045/1559	4.24	4.34	4.29	4.23	4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	13	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1352	3.77	3.57	3.98	3.97	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1081/1384	3.47	3.79	4.08	4.11	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	616/1382	3.86	3.91	4.29	4.37	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	426/1368	4.15	4.08	4.30	4.39	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	****	3.94	3.95	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 4	C 3	General 0	Under-grad 15 Non-major 14
84-150	5	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 14	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ECON 408 0101
 Title: MANAGERIAL ECONOMICS
 Instructor: DASGUPTA, NANDI
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 553
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	1	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	274/1649	4.80	4.23	4.28	4.50	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	0	18	4.70	323/1648	4.70	4.24	4.23	4.36	4.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	172/1375	4.89	4.32	4.27	4.48	4.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	1	0	1	3	10	4.40	636/1595	4.40	4.06	4.20	4.36	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	198/1533	4.72	4.04	4.04	4.14	4.72
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	0	3	3	10	4.24	711/1512	4.24	3.93	4.10	4.26	4.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	125/1623	4.89	4.29	4.16	4.27	4.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	1	14	4	4.16	1469/1646	4.16	4.57	4.69	4.71	4.16
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	75/1621	4.93	4.05	4.06	4.24	4.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.53	4.43	4.54	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	355/1572	4.95	4.73	4.70	4.79	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	101/1564	4.95	4.28	4.28	4.40	4.95
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	216/1559	4.89	4.34	4.29	4.41	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	9	2	0	1	0	5	3.75	914/1352	3.75	3.57	3.98	4.07	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	394/1384	4.57	3.79	4.08	4.35	4.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	812/1382	4.29	3.91	4.29	4.56	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	316/1368	4.86	4.08	4.30	4.58	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	14	3	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 948	****	3.94	3.95	4.31	****
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.38	4.29	4.41	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 13	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	4
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 21
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 410A 0101
 Title RISK MNGMT FINANCIAL I
 Instructor: CARPENTER, ROBE
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 554
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	1	0	1	0	0	3	5	4.22	996/1649	4.22	4.23	4.28	4.50	4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	3	1	1	3	3.50	1481/1648	3.50	4.24	4.23	4.36	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1375	****	4.32	4.27	4.48	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	2	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1260/1595	3.80	4.06	4.20	4.36	3.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	740/1533	4.11	4.04	4.04	4.14	4.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	595/1512	4.33	3.93	4.10	4.26	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	7	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	1615/1623	2.00	4.29	4.16	4.27	2.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	3	5	1	3.78	1619/1646	3.78	4.57	4.69	4.71	3.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	595/1621	4.33	4.05	4.06	4.24	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	2	1	6	4.10	1235/1568	4.10	4.53	4.43	4.54	4.10
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.73	4.70	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	780/1564	4.40	4.28	4.28	4.40	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	1075/1559	4.10	4.34	4.29	4.41	4.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	1090/1352	3.43	3.57	3.98	4.07	3.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	613/1384	4.33	3.79	4.08	4.35	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1382	5.00	3.91	4.29	4.56	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	337/1368	4.83	4.08	4.30	4.58	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	4	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	****	3.94	3.95	4.31	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.66	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	4.44	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 288	****	3.29	3.68	3.71	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ECON 410B 0101
 Title VENTURE CAPT MARKET IM
 Instructor: ROSE, MORGAN
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 555
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	372/1649	4.71	4.23	4.28	4.50	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	300/1648	4.71	4.24	4.23	4.36	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	199/1375	4.86	4.32	4.27	4.48	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.06	4.20	4.36	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	454/1533	4.43	4.04	4.04	4.14	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	427/1623	4.57	4.29	4.16	4.27	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	1377/1646	4.29	4.57	4.69	4.71	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	754/1621	4.20	4.05	4.06	4.24	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	316/1568	4.86	4.53	4.43	4.54	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	715/1572	4.86	4.73	4.70	4.79	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	580/1564	4.57	4.28	4.28	4.40	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	448/1559	4.71	4.34	4.29	4.41	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1301/1352	2.50	3.57	3.98	4.07	2.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	1039/1384	3.60	3.79	4.08	4.35	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	2	2	0	1	3.00	1316/1382	3.00	3.91	4.29	4.56	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1071/1368	3.80	4.08	4.30	4.58	3.80

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	0 Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 2		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	1 Under-grad 7 Non-major 6
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	5

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ECON 411 0101
 Title TOPICS IN MICROECONOMI
 Instructor: MITCH, DAVID F
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 556
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	2	4	9	6	3.77	1366/1649	3.77	4.23	4.28	4.50	3.77	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	5	7	7	3.77	1333/1648	3.77	4.24	4.23	4.36	3.77	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	0	4	5	11	4.05	936/1375	4.05	4.32	4.27	4.48	4.05	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	1	9	2	8	3.71	1305/1595	3.71	4.06	4.20	4.36	3.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	3	7	3	7	3.45	1283/1533	3.45	4.04	4.04	4.14	3.45	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	3	3	7	7	3.76	1113/1512	3.76	3.93	4.10	4.26	3.76	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	4	3	7	7	3.68	1308/1623	3.68	4.29	4.16	4.27	3.68	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	0	9	12	4.41	1287/1646	4.41	4.57	4.69	4.71	4.41	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	0	8	8	2	3.53	1336/1621	3.53	4.05	4.06	4.24	3.53	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	4	8	8	3.95	1313/1568	3.95	4.53	4.43	4.54	3.95	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	2	5	14	4.41	1321/1572	4.41	4.73	4.70	4.79	4.41	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	5	5	5	7	3.64	1348/1564	3.64	4.28	4.28	4.40	3.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	5	6	8	3.77	1264/1559	3.77	4.34	4.29	4.41	3.77	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	12	2	3	1	0	4	3.10	1207/1352	3.10	3.57	3.98	4.07	3.10	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	3	1	3	3	3	3.15	1228/1384	3.15	3.79	4.08	4.35	3.15	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	3	2	3	5	3.57	1187/1382	3.57	3.91	4.29	4.56	3.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	3	3	7	4.14	900/1368	4.14	4.08	4.30	4.58	4.14	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	6	0	2	1	0	5	4.00	431/ 948	4.00	3.94	3.95	4.31	4.00	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.61	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.38	4.29	4.41	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.66	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.54	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.57	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	4.44	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 288	****	3.29	3.68	3.71	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	4.86	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.52	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.59	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 312	****	3.73	3.68	3.95	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 53	****	3.86	4.30	4.64	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.24	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.84	****	

Course-Section: ECON 411 0101
 Title TOPICS IN MICROECONOMI
 Instructor: MITCH, DAVID F
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 556
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	5	Under-grad	23	Non-major	9
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 413 0101
 Title INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIO
 Instructor: CARROLL, KATHLE
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 557
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	6	4	4.08	1129/1649	4.08	4.23	4.28	4.50	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	3	5	4.00	1124/1648	4.00	4.24	4.23	4.36	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	3	5	4.00	950/1375	4.00	4.32	4.27	4.48	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1372/1595	3.60	4.06	4.20	4.36	3.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	5	3	3.67	1139/1533	3.67	4.04	4.04	4.14	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	1	0	2	1	3.20	1395/1512	3.20	3.93	4.10	4.26	3.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	6	4	4.08	989/1623	4.08	4.29	4.16	4.27	4.08	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	3	4.25	1398/1646	4.25	4.57	4.69	4.71	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1087/1621	3.88	4.05	4.06	4.24	3.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	969/1568	4.42	4.53	4.43	4.54	4.42	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	765/1572	4.83	4.73	4.70	4.79	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	939/1564	4.25	4.28	4.28	4.40	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	0	9	4.42	818/1559	4.42	4.34	4.29	4.41	4.42	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1287/1352	2.67	3.57	3.98	4.07	2.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	911/1384	3.86	3.79	4.08	4.35	3.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	292/1382	4.86	3.91	4.29	4.56	4.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	2	0	1	4	4.00	948/1368	4.00	4.08	4.30	4.58	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	431/ 948	4.00	3.94	3.95	4.31	4.00	

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 5		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 5	General	3
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 12
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	1	0	0	2	1	5	7	4.13	1086/1649	4.13	4.23	4.28	4.50	4.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	966/1648	4.20	4.24	4.23	4.36	4.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	797/1375	4.27	4.32	4.27	4.48	4.27		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	608/1595	4.43	4.06	4.20	4.36	4.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	594/1533	4.29	4.04	4.04	4.14	4.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	687/1512	4.25	3.93	4.10	4.26	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	7	5	4.21	861/1623	4.21	4.29	4.16	4.27	4.21	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	465/1646	4.93	4.57	4.69	4.71	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	4	3	4	4.00	914/1621	4.00	4.05	4.06	4.24	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	904/1568	4.47	4.53	4.43	4.54	4.47	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	840/1572	4.80	4.73	4.70	4.79	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	5	7	4.27	929/1564	4.27	4.28	4.28	4.40	4.27	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	4	9	4.33	901/1559	4.33	4.34	4.29	4.41	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	1	2	3	7	4.00	690/1352	4.00	3.57	3.98	4.07	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	795/1384	4.00	3.79	4.08	4.35	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1069/1382	3.80	3.91	4.29	4.56	3.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	752/1368	4.40	4.08	4.30	4.58	4.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	104/ 948	4.80	3.94	3.95	4.31	4.80	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.73	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.61	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.57	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.63	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.38	4.29	4.41	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.66	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.54	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.57	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	4.44	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 288	****	3.29	3.68	3.71	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	4.86	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.42	****	

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	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	4	Under-grad	16	Non-major	9
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	1	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	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 421 0101
 Title INTRO TO ECONOMETRICS
 Instructor: YUAN, CHUNMING
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 559
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	3	7	5	4.00	1183/1649	4.00	4.23	4.28	4.50	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	897/1648	4.25	4.24	4.23	4.36	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	753/1375	4.31	4.32	4.27	4.48	4.31	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	722/1595	4.33	4.06	4.20	4.36	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	1	4	2	4	3.82	1006/1533	3.82	4.04	4.04	4.14	3.82	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	883/1512	4.00	3.93	4.10	4.26	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	437/1623	4.56	4.29	4.16	4.27	4.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.57	4.69	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	4	6	2	3.69	1240/1621	3.69	4.05	4.06	4.24	3.69	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	699/1568	4.63	4.53	4.43	4.54	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.73	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	4	6	5	3.94	1191/1564	3.94	4.28	4.28	4.40	3.94	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	4	7	4.06	1093/1559	4.06	4.34	4.29	4.41	4.06	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	3	0	2	1	3	3.11	1204/1352	3.11	3.57	3.98	4.07	3.11	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	795/1384	4.00	3.79	4.08	4.35	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	946/1382	4.00	3.91	4.29	4.56	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	1	0	5	4.29	827/1368	4.29	4.08	4.30	4.58	4.29	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	4	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 948	****	3.94	3.95	4.31	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.73	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.61	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.57	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.63	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	17	Non-major	12
84-150	6	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	10				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 443 0101
 Title HIST OF ECON THOUGHT I
 Instructor: BRADLEY, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 560
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	395/1649	4.69	4.23	4.28	4.50	4.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	7	5	4.15	1010/1648	4.15	4.24	4.23	4.36	4.15	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	206/1375	4.85	4.32	4.27	4.48	4.85	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	660/1595	4.38	4.06	4.20	4.36	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	4	7	4.23	643/1533	4.23	4.04	4.04	4.14	4.23	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	627/1512	4.31	3.93	4.10	4.26	4.31	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	838/1623	4.23	4.29	4.16	4.27	4.23	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	531/1646	4.92	4.57	4.69	4.71	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	0	6	5	4.25	687/1621	4.25	4.05	4.06	4.24	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	344/1568	4.83	4.53	4.43	4.54	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	532/1572	4.92	4.73	4.70	4.79	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	767/1564	4.42	4.28	4.28	4.40	4.42	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	184/1559	4.92	4.34	4.29	4.41	4.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1160/1352	3.25	3.57	3.98	4.07	3.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	795/1384	4.00	3.79	4.08	4.35	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	292/1382	4.86	3.91	4.29	4.56	4.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	316/1368	4.86	4.08	4.30	4.58	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 948	****	3.94	3.95	4.31	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.38	4.29	4.41	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.73	3.68	3.95	4.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	4.22	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ECON 453 0101
 Title HOUSEHOLD ECONOMICS
 Instructor: LORD, WILLIAM
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 561
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	3	6	9	4.10	1116/1649	3.70	4.23	4.28	4.50	4.10	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	5	11	4.30	839/1648	4.00	4.24	4.23	4.36	4.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	4	12	4.35	714/1375	3.95	4.32	4.27	4.48	4.35	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	853/1595	3.40	4.06	4.20	4.36	4.22	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	545/1533	3.86	4.04	4.04	4.14	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	13	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	799/1512	3.64	3.93	4.10	4.26	4.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	502/1623	4.25	4.29	4.16	4.27	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	1015/1646	4.61	4.57	4.69	4.71	4.68	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	870/1621	3.66	4.05	4.06	4.24	4.08	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	731/1568	4.38	4.53	4.43	4.54	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	18	4.85	715/1572	4.61	4.73	4.70	4.79	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	651/1564	3.99	4.28	4.28	4.40	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	15	4.60	586/1559	3.93	4.34	4.29	4.41	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	0	1	3	5	5	4.00	690/1352	3.50	3.57	3.98	4.07	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	437/1384	3.85	3.79	4.08	4.35	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	394/1382	4.32	3.91	4.29	4.56	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	771/1368	4.09	4.08	4.30	4.58	4.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	4	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 948	****	3.94	3.95	4.31	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.73	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.61	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.57	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.63	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.38	4.29	4.41	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.66	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.54	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.57	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	4.44	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	****	3.29	3.68	3.71	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	4.86	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.52	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.59	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 312	****	3.73	3.68	3.95	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	3.86	4.30	4.64	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.24	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.84	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.85	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	4.22	****	

Course-Section: ECON 453 0101
 Title HOUSEHOLD ECONOMICS
 Instructor: LORD, WILLIAM
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 561
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	2	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	3	Under-grad	20	Non-major	16
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	5	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	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 453 0201
 Title HOUSEHOLD ECONOMICS
 Instructor: LORD, WILLIAM
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 562
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	5	4	7	3	3.30	1548/1649	3.70	4.23	4.28	4.50	3.30	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	5	6	6	3.70	1382/1648	4.00	4.24	4.23	4.36	3.70	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	8	3	6	3.55	1188/1375	3.95	4.32	4.27	4.48	3.55	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	12	1	2	3	1	0	2.57	1581/1595	3.40	4.06	4.20	4.36	2.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	3	5	6	3	3.39	1323/1533	3.86	4.04	4.04	4.14	3.39	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	12	0	3	1	2	1	3.14	1408/1512	3.64	3.93	4.10	4.26	3.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	4	4	9	4.00	1029/1623	4.25	4.29	4.16	4.27	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	9	10	4.53	1175/1646	4.61	4.57	4.69	4.71	4.53	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	2	2	6	4	3	3.24	1456/1621	3.66	4.05	4.06	4.24	3.24	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	4	5	9	4.16	1198/1568	4.38	4.53	4.43	4.54	4.16	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	2	2	2	13	4.37	1346/1572	4.61	4.73	4.70	4.79	4.37	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	4	5	3	6	3.47	1399/1564	3.99	4.28	4.28	4.40	3.47	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	3	5	2	6	3.26	1438/1559	3.93	4.34	4.29	4.41	3.26	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	3	2	6	0	4	3.00	1219/1352	3.50	3.57	3.98	4.07	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	2	0	4	2	2	3.20	1209/1384	3.85	3.79	4.08	4.35	3.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	5	1	4	3.90	1031/1382	4.32	3.91	4.29	4.56	3.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	6	0	4	3.80	1071/1368	4.09	4.08	4.30	4.58	3.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	6	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/ 948	****	3.94	3.95	4.31	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 312	****	3.73	3.68	3.95	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 7	General	1
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 20
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	14
			? 1		

Course-Section: ECON 454 0101
 Title ECON:EDUC/HUMAN CAPITA
 Instructor: DICKSON, LISA
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 563
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	17	4.65	446/1649	4.65	4.23	4.28	4.50	4.65	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	15	4.61	441/1648	4.61	4.24	4.23	4.36	4.61	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	18	4.70	370/1375	4.70	4.32	4.27	4.48	4.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	8	9	4.14	970/1595	4.14	4.06	4.20	4.36	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	4	4	13	4.27	604/1533	4.27	4.04	4.04	4.14	4.27	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	9	11	4.36	564/1512	4.36	3.93	4.10	4.26	4.36	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	4	16	4.64	358/1623	4.64	4.29	4.16	4.27	4.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	18	4	4.18	1447/1646	4.18	4.57	4.69	4.71	4.18	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	1	0	2	6	8	4.18	777/1621	4.18	4.05	4.06	4.24	4.18	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	461/1568	4.76	4.53	4.43	4.54	4.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	715/1572	4.86	4.73	4.70	4.79	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	326/1564	4.76	4.28	4.28	4.40	4.76	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	2	18	4.71	448/1559	4.71	4.34	4.29	4.41	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	11	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	690/1352	4.00	3.57	3.98	4.07	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	1	2	9	4.38	561/1384	4.38	3.79	4.08	4.35	4.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	1	5	6	4.23	844/1382	4.23	3.91	4.29	4.56	4.23	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	569/1368	4.62	4.08	4.30	4.58	4.62	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	4	1	1	0	3	4	3.89	542/ 948	3.89	3.94	3.95	4.31	3.89	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.61	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	4.86	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.42	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	3.86	4.30	4.64	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.24	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.84	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.85	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 1	Major 7
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 6			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	6	C 2	General 5	Under-grad 22	Non-major 16
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	5	D 0			
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 13		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ECON 467 0101
 Title HEALTH ECONOMICS
 Instructor: GOLDFARB, MARSH
 Enrollment: 44
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 564
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	6	17	4.60	510/1649	4.47	4.23	4.28	4.50	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	2	19	4.60	441/1648	4.63	4.24	4.23	4.36	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	2	19	4.60	464/1375	4.80	4.32	4.27	4.48	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	17	1	0	1	0	6	4.25	818/1595	4.13	4.06	4.20	4.36	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	2	3	3	13	4.14	725/1533	4.32	4.04	4.04	4.14	4.14	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	17	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	799/1512	4.14	3.93	4.10	4.26	4.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	0	4	2	17	4.42	621/1623	4.46	4.29	4.16	4.27	4.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	12	11	4.42	1277/1646	4.33	4.57	4.69	4.71	4.42	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	3	8	10	4.33	595/1621	4.04	4.05	4.06	4.24	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	21	4.80	387/1568	4.90	4.53	4.43	4.54	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	3	20	4.72	1003/1572	4.69	4.73	4.70	4.79	4.72	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	5	19	4.72	406/1564	4.36	4.28	4.28	4.40	4.72	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	2	22	4.80	318/1559	4.90	4.34	4.29	4.41	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	18	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	****/1352	2.00	3.57	3.98	4.07	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	2	3	0	6	3.91	886/1384	2.95	3.79	4.08	4.35	3.91	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	1	2	1	6	3.91	1031/1382	3.20	3.91	4.29	4.56	3.91	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	1	1	0	8	4.18	881/1368	3.59	4.08	4.30	4.58	4.18	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	7	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 948	****	3.94	3.95	4.31	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 555	****	4.38	4.29	4.41	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	B	11						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	5	General	3	Under-grad	26	Non-major	18
84-150	11	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	19				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 467 0201
 Title HEALTH ECONOMICS
 Instructor: GOLDFARB, MARSH
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 565
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	871/1649	4.47	4.23	4.28	4.50	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	362/1648	4.63	4.24	4.23	4.36	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1375	4.80	4.32	4.27	4.48	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1067/1595	4.13	4.06	4.20	4.36	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	366/1533	4.32	4.04	4.04	4.14	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	502/1623	4.46	4.29	4.16	4.27	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1398/1646	4.33	4.57	4.69	4.71	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1192/1621	4.04	4.05	4.06	4.24	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1568	4.90	4.53	4.43	4.54	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1071/1572	4.69	4.73	4.70	4.79	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1127/1564	4.36	4.28	4.28	4.40	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1559	4.90	4.34	4.29	4.41	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1335/1352	2.00	3.57	3.98	4.07	2.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	1366/1384	2.95	3.79	4.08	4.35	2.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1363/1382	3.20	3.91	4.29	4.56	2.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1286/1368	3.59	4.08	4.30	4.58	3.00
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.73	3.68	3.95	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ECON 475 0101
 Title FINANCIAL INVSTMNT ANA
 Instructor: LAMDIN, DOUGLAS
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 566
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	4	5	16	4.48	670/1649	4.48	4.23	4.28	4.50	4.48	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	8	16	4.60	441/1648	4.60	4.24	4.23	4.36	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	22	4.84	206/1375	4.84	4.32	4.27	4.48	4.84	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	2	1	4	16	4.33	722/1595	4.33	4.06	4.20	4.36	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	1	2	2	16	4.41	476/1533	4.41	4.04	4.04	4.14	4.41	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	6	1	1	2	2	12	4.28	663/1512	4.28	3.93	4.10	4.26	4.28	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	4	19	4.75	220/1623	4.75	4.29	4.16	4.27	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	7	17	4.71	993/1646	4.71	4.57	4.69	4.71	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	13	11	4.40	511/1621	4.40	4.05	4.06	4.24	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	273/1568	4.88	4.53	4.43	4.54	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	22	4.84	740/1572	4.84	4.73	4.70	4.79	4.84	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	5	18	4.64	498/1564	4.64	4.28	4.28	4.40	4.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	2	19	4.56	629/1559	4.56	4.34	4.29	4.41	4.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	2	0	3	1	10	4.06	655/1352	4.06	3.57	3.98	4.07	4.06	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	2	1	2	0	4	3.33	1159/1384	3.33	3.79	4.08	4.35	3.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	1	1	2	1	4	3.67	1146/1382	3.67	3.91	4.29	4.56	3.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	1	4	0	4	3.78	1085/1368	3.78	4.08	4.30	4.58	3.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	4	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	****/ 948	****	3.94	3.95	4.31	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 288	****	3.29	3.68	3.71	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	2	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	24	Non-major	26
84-150	14	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	21				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 477 0101
 Title DERIVATIVE SECURITIES
 Instructor: GETTER, DARYL
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 567
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	2	1	22	4.46	696/1649	4.46	4.23	4.28	4.50	4.46	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	4	18	4.32	811/1648	4.32	4.24	4.23	4.36	4.32	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	4	5	16	4.18	868/1375	4.18	4.32	4.27	4.48	4.18	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	2	8	3	11	3.84	1236/1595	3.84	4.06	4.20	4.36	3.84	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	13	3	3	3	1	5	3.13	1411/1533	3.13	4.04	4.04	4.14	3.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	1	2	4	3	8	3.83	1068/1512	3.83	3.93	4.10	4.26	3.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	5	20	4.61	395/1623	4.61	4.29	4.16	4.27	4.61	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.57	4.69	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	3	5	15	4.42	497/1621	4.42	4.05	4.06	4.24	4.42	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	2	3	21	4.59	743/1568	4.59	4.53	4.43	4.54	4.59	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	23	4.81	815/1572	4.81	4.73	4.70	4.79	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	4	3	18	4.37	812/1564	4.37	4.28	4.28	4.40	4.37	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	3	21	4.59	596/1559	4.59	4.34	4.29	4.41	4.59	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	21	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	****/1352	****	3.57	3.98	4.07	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	3	0	2	3.33	****/1384	****	3.79	4.08	4.35	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	****/1382	****	3.91	4.29	4.56	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	****/1368	****	4.08	4.30	4.58	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	22	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	****	3.94	3.95	4.31	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.73	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.61	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.57	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.63	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.38	4.29	4.41	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.66	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.54	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.57	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	4.44	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	****	3.29	3.68	3.71	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	4.86	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.52	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.59	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 312	****	3.73	3.68	3.95	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	3.86	4.30	4.64	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.24	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.84	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.85	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	4.22	****	

Course-Section: ECON 477 0101
 Title DERIVATIVE SECURITIES
 Instructor: GETTER, DARYL
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 567
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	6	C	5	General	4	Under-grad	27	Non-major	28
84-150	15	3.00-3.49	6	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	20				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 481 0101
 Title INTERNATIONAL TRADE TH
 Instructor: TAKACS, WENDY E
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 568
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	8	17	4.41	762/1649	4.41	4.23	4.28	4.50	4.41	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	7	17	4.46	614/1648	4.46	4.24	4.23	4.36	4.46	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	5	8	14	4.25	806/1375	4.25	4.32	4.27	4.48	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	13	1	1	1	5	8	4.13	983/1595	4.13	4.06	4.20	4.36	4.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	1	5	8	10	3.78	1045/1533	3.78	4.04	4.04	4.14	3.78	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	16	0	1	0	4	7	4.42	507/1512	4.42	3.93	4.10	4.26	4.42	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	3	22	4.64	345/1623	4.64	4.29	4.16	4.27	4.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	13	14	4.52	1184/1646	4.52	4.57	4.69	4.71	4.52	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	3	10	8	4.24	709/1621	4.24	4.05	4.06	4.24	4.24	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	4	22	4.78	442/1568	4.78	4.53	4.43	4.54	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	4	23	4.85	715/1572	4.85	4.73	4.70	4.79	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	3	3	18	4.52	630/1564	4.52	4.28	4.28	4.40	4.52	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	2	4	18	4.42	804/1559	4.42	4.34	4.29	4.41	4.42	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	16	1	0	2	3	3	3.78	900/1352	3.78	3.57	3.98	4.07	3.78	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	673/1384	4.25	3.79	4.08	4.35	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	925/1382	4.09	3.91	4.29	4.56	4.09	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	1	0	1	2	8	4.33	796/1368	4.33	4.08	4.30	4.58	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	11	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	****	3.94	3.95	4.31	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.38	4.29	4.41	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.73	3.68	3.95	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	1	Major	10
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	6	C	6	General	4	Under-grad	28	Non-major	19
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	21				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ECON 482 0101
 Title INTERNATIONAL FINANCE
 Instructor: YUAN, CHUNMING
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 569
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	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	8	13	4.23	986/1649	4.23	4.23	4.28	4.50	4.23	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	10	10	4.04	1106/1648	4.04	4.24	4.23	4.36	4.04	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	4	8	12	4.24	823/1375	4.24	4.32	4.27	4.48	4.24	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	3	1	0	7	8	3.84	1236/1595	3.84	4.06	4.20	4.36	3.84	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	3	1	2	5	8	3.74	1084/1533	3.74	4.04	4.04	4.14	3.74	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	13	1	1	3	4	4	3.69	1154/1512	3.69	3.93	4.10	4.26	3.69	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	4	5	14	4.12	968/1623	4.12	4.29	4.16	4.27	4.12	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	1	0	0	8	16	4.52	1175/1646	4.52	4.57	4.69	4.71	4.52	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	2	0	4	8	8	3.91	1060/1621	3.91	4.05	4.06	4.24	3.91	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	9	14	4.38	1002/1568	4.38	4.53	4.43	4.54	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	2	22	4.80	840/1572	4.80	4.73	4.70	4.79	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	2	2	7	13	4.16	1028/1564	4.16	4.28	4.28	4.40	4.16	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	8	14	4.32	911/1559	4.32	4.34	4.29	4.41	4.32	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	18	1	0	2	0	3	3.67	****/1352	****	3.57	3.98	4.07	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	571/1384	4.38	3.79	4.08	4.35	4.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	790/1382	4.31	3.91	4.29	4.56	4.31	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	722/1368	4.44	4.08	4.30	4.58	4.44	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	10	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	****/ 948	****	3.94	3.95	4.31	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.73	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.61	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.57	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.63	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.38	4.29	4.41	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.66	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.54	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.57	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	4.44	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	****	3.29	3.68	3.71	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	4.86	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.52	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.59	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 312	****	3.73	3.68	3.95	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	3.86	4.30	4.64	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.24	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.84	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.85	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	4.22	****	

Course-Section: ECON 482 0101
 Title INTERNATIONAL FINANCE
 Instructor: YUAN, CHUNMING
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 569
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General	3	Under-grad	26	Non-major	19
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ECON 490 0101
 Title ANALYTIC METHODS IN EC
 Instructor: CINYABUGUMA, MA
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 570
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	696/1649	4.46	4.23	4.28	4.50	4.46	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	672/1648	4.43	4.24	4.23	4.36	4.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	521/1375	4.54	4.32	4.27	4.48	4.54	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	1067/1595	4.00	4.06	4.20	4.36	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	4	6	2	3.83	986/1533	3.83	4.04	4.04	4.14	3.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	1042/1512	3.88	3.93	4.10	4.26	3.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	2	8	4.29	780/1623	4.29	4.29	4.16	4.27	4.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	977/1646	4.71	4.57	4.69	4.71	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	7	3	4.18	766/1621	4.18	4.05	4.06	4.24	4.18	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	956/1568	4.43	4.53	4.43	4.54	4.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	1003/1572	4.71	4.73	4.70	4.79	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	754/1564	4.43	4.28	4.28	4.40	4.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	618/1559	4.57	4.34	4.29	4.41	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	0	1	3	2	0	3.17	1189/1352	3.17	3.57	3.98	4.07	3.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	247/1384	4.75	3.79	4.08	4.35	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	394/1382	4.75	3.91	4.29	4.56	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	654/1368	4.50	4.08	4.30	4.58	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 948	****	3.94	3.95	4.31	****	

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 1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 0		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 1	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 14 Non-major 13
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 3	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 7	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ECON 600 0101
 Title POLICY CONSQ:ECON ANAL
 Instructor: BRENNAN, TIMOTH
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 571
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	8	8	5	3.86	1311/1649	3.86	4.23	4.28	4.46	3.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	10	3	3.71	1375/1648	3.71	4.24	4.23	4.34	3.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	3	7	5	5	3.60	1169/1375	3.60	4.32	4.27	4.44	3.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	1	2	9	5	3.89	1213/1595	3.89	4.06	4.20	4.35	3.89	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	5	8	3	3.40	1317/1533	3.40	4.04	4.04	4.28	3.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	0	3	8	5	4.13	817/1512	4.13	3.93	4.10	4.35	4.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	3	4	4	8	3.89	1186/1623	3.89	4.29	4.16	4.29	3.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.57	4.69	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	8	7	2	3.56	1323/1621	3.56	4.05	4.06	4.20	3.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	6	12	4.38	1002/1568	4.38	4.53	4.43	4.52	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	19	4.86	715/1572	4.86	4.73	4.70	4.83	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	10	6	4	3.62	1356/1564	3.62	4.28	4.28	4.41	3.62	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	6	6	8	3.95	1159/1559	3.95	4.34	4.29	4.41	3.95	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	15	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	****/1352	****	3.57	3.98	4.10	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	4	8	4	1	2.71	1329/1384	2.71	3.79	4.08	4.30	2.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	3	2	4	5	7	3.52	1207/1382	3.52	3.91	4.29	4.52	3.52	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	2	0	4	6	9	3.95	990/1368	3.95	4.08	4.30	4.56	3.95	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	20	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 948	****	3.94	3.95	4.03	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.61	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.63	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 288	****	3.29	3.68	3.87	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	4.51	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.47	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.58	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.44	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.73	3.68	3.83	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	3.86	4.30	4.37	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.49	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.43	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	2	A	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	18	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	3	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	18	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	19				

Course-Section: ECON 601 0101
 Title MICROECONOMIC ANALYSIS
 Instructor: FARROW, ROBERT
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 572
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.23	4.28	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	756/1648	4.36	4.24	4.23	4.34	4.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	788/1375	4.27	4.32	4.27	4.44	4.27	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	685/1595	4.36	4.06	4.20	4.35	4.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	0	9	4.55	334/1533	4.55	4.04	4.04	4.28	4.55	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	352/1512	4.55	3.93	4.10	4.35	4.55	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	121/1623	4.91	4.29	4.16	4.29	4.91	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.57	4.69	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	654/1621	4.29	4.05	4.06	4.20	4.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	372/1568	4.82	4.53	4.43	4.52	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.73	4.70	4.83	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	390/1564	4.73	4.28	4.28	4.41	4.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	184/1559	4.92	4.34	4.29	4.41	4.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	914/1352	3.75	3.57	3.98	4.10	3.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	613/1384	4.33	3.79	4.08	4.30	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1382	5.00	3.91	4.29	4.52	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.08	4.30	4.56	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	****	3.94	3.95	4.03	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.38	4.29	4.66	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.29	3.68	3.87	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.73	3.68	3.83	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 12
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	9
			? 0		

Course-Section: ECON 611 0101
 Title ECONOMETRICS I
 Instructor: GINDLING, THOMA
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 573
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	256/1649	4.82	4.23	4.28	4.46	4.82	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	161/1648	4.88	4.24	4.23	4.34	4.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	100/1375	4.94	4.32	4.27	4.44	4.94	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.06	4.20	4.35	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	1	13	4.47	399/1533	4.47	4.04	4.04	4.28	4.47	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	194/1512	4.75	3.93	4.10	4.35	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	85/1623	4.94	4.29	4.16	4.29	4.94	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	697/1646	4.88	4.57	4.69	4.81	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1621	5.00	4.05	4.06	4.20	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.53	4.43	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.73	4.70	4.83	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	118/1564	4.94	4.28	4.28	4.41	4.94	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	15	4.88	238/1559	4.88	4.34	4.29	4.41	4.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	188/1352	4.70	3.57	3.98	4.10	4.70	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	571/1384	4.38	3.79	4.08	4.30	4.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	394/1382	4.75	3.91	4.29	4.52	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	426/1368	4.75	4.08	4.30	4.56	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	4	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 948	****	3.94	3.95	4.03	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.38	4.29	4.66	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.73	3.68	3.83	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.92	****	

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 5		Graduate 6
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	1
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 11
Grad.	6	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 652 0101
 Title ECONOMICS OF HEALTH
 Instructor: GOLDFARB, MARSH
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 574
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	372/1649	4.71	4.23	4.28	4.46	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.24	4.23	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.32	4.27	4.44	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	162/1595	4.86	4.06	4.20	4.35	4.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	311/1533	4.57	4.04	4.04	4.28	4.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	133/1512	4.86	3.93	4.10	4.35	4.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	145/1623	4.86	4.29	4.16	4.29	4.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1130/1646	4.57	4.57	4.69	4.81	4.57	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	313/1621	4.57	4.05	4.06	4.20	4.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.53	4.43	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.73	4.70	4.83	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.28	4.28	4.41	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.34	4.29	4.41	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	690/1352	4.00	3.57	3.98	4.10	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	437/1384	4.50	3.79	4.08	4.30	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	616/1382	4.50	3.91	4.29	4.52	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	654/1368	4.50	4.08	4.30	4.56	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	3.94	3.95	4.03	5.00	

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