

Course-Section: ECON 101 1  
 Title Prin Of Microeconomics  
 Instructor: Carroll,Kathlee  
 Enrollment: 78  
 Questionnaires: 41

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 442  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	4	9	6	21	4.02	1100/1509	4.03	4.21	4.31	4.18	4.02
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	6	9	15	11	3.76	1259/1509	3.98	4.21	4.26	4.25	3.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	11	8	18	3.93	1000/1287	4.15	4.28	4.30	4.24	3.93	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	2	4	8	7	10	3.61	1265/1459	4.00	4.07	4.22	4.11	3.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	1	2	9	14	10	3.83	986/1406	3.88	4.05	4.09	4.02	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	26	3	0	3	5	4	3.47	1209/1384	3.85	3.99	4.11	3.98	3.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	8	7	22	4.12	896/1489	4.14	4.31	4.17	4.20	4.12
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	2	6	31	4.74	858/1506	4.63	4.54	4.67	4.66	4.74
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	3	2	11	15	5	3.47	1257/1463	3.67	3.99	4.09	4.02	3.47
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	3	2	9	24	4.42	904/1438	4.44	4.53	4.46	4.44	4.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	3	6	29	4.68	991/1421	4.68	4.70	4.73	4.66	4.68
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	2	7	12	15	3.95	1107/1411	3.98	4.20	4.31	4.27	3.95
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	3	4	8	21	4.13	980/1405	4.19	4.29	4.32	4.27	4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	22	0	1	4	4	5	3.93	752/1236	3.78	3.77	4.00	3.87	3.93
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	2	4	3	7	8	3.63	1001/1260	3.49	3.77	4.14	3.95	3.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	2	4	6	4	8	3.50	1127/1255	3.37	3.89	4.33	4.15	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	2	2	5	7	8	3.71	1087/1258	3.69	4.05	4.38	4.18	3.71
4. Were special techniques successful	17	15	2	1	2	0	4	3.33	****/ 873	3.11	3.69	4.03	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	38	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	2.90	2.90	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	39	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.21	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 49	****	4.00	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	39	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	39	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	39	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	39	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: ECON 101 1  
 Title Prin Of Microeconomics  
 Instructor: Carroll, Kathlee  
 Enrollment: 78  
 Questionnaires: 41

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 442  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	2	A	11	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	13	General	14	Under-grad	41	Non-major	40
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	1	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 101 11  
 Title Prin Of Microeconomics  
 Instructor: Thomas,Mark  
 Enrollment: 42  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 443  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	7	10	4.35	778/1509	4.03	4.21	4.31	4.18	4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	6	11	4.30	807/1509	3.98	4.21	4.26	4.25	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	8	11	4.45	590/1287	4.15	4.28	4.30	4.24	4.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	346/1459	4.00	4.07	4.22	4.11	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	1	3	3	7	3.75	1045/1406	3.88	4.05	4.09	4.02	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	531/1384	3.85	3.99	4.11	3.98	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	399/1489	4.14	4.31	4.17	4.20	4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	19	0	3.95	1415/1506	4.63	4.54	4.67	4.66	3.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	4	6	7	4.18	714/1463	3.67	3.99	4.09	4.02	4.18
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	675/1438	4.44	4.53	4.46	4.44	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	665/1421	4.68	4.70	4.73	4.66	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	7	10	4.30	841/1411	3.98	4.20	4.31	4.27	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	7	10	4.32	848/1405	4.19	4.29	4.32	4.27	4.32
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	421/1236	3.78	3.77	4.00	3.87	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	621/1260	3.49	3.77	4.14	3.95	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	1	4	1	2	3.22	1184/1255	3.37	3.89	4.33	4.15	3.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	2	0	1	1	5	3.78	1063/1258	3.69	4.05	4.38	4.18	3.78
4. Were special techniques successful	11	7	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 873	3.11	3.69	4.03	3.89	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 2	General 5	Under-grad 20 Non-major 20
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 1	
			? 1		

Course-Section: ECON 101 13  
 Title Prin Of Microeconomics  
 Instructor: Mutter,Ryan  
 Enrollment: 39  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 444  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	4	7	9	4.10	1051/1509	4.03	4.21	4.31	4.18	4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	3	13	4.24	880/1509	3.98	4.21	4.26	4.25	4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	3	14	4.33	708/1287	4.15	4.28	4.30	4.24	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	2	1	4	7	3.93	1055/1459	4.00	4.07	4.22	4.11	3.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	2	4	2	1	7	3.44	1219/1406	3.88	4.05	4.09	4.02	3.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	1	2	4	7	4.00	807/1384	3.85	3.99	4.11	3.98	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	0	6	13	4.43	569/1489	4.14	4.31	4.17	4.20	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1506	4.63	4.54	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	1	1	7	4	3.86	1021/1463	3.67	3.99	4.09	4.02	3.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	480/1438	4.44	4.53	4.46	4.44	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	0	17	4.79	828/1421	4.68	4.70	4.73	4.66	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	1	4	12	4.32	830/1411	3.98	4.20	4.31	4.27	4.32
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	3	13	4.47	671/1405	4.19	4.29	4.32	4.27	4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	8	1	4	2	1	2	2.90	1164/1236	3.78	3.77	4.00	3.87	2.90
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	0	0	1	3	3.50	1045/1260	3.49	3.77	4.14	3.95	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	2	0	0	2	2	3.33	1167/1255	3.37	3.89	4.33	4.15	3.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	1	0	0	4	3.83	1041/1258	3.69	4.05	4.38	4.18	3.83
4. Were special techniques successful	15	4	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 873	3.11	3.69	4.03	3.89	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B 7			
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C 3	General 5	Under-grad 21	Non-major 21
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ECON 101 2  
 Title Prin Of Microeconomics  
 Instructor: Mitch,David F  
 Enrollment: 41  
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 445  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	3	10	10	6	3.66	1345/1509	4.03	4.21	4.31	4.18	3.66
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	9	7	8	3.59	1339/1509	3.98	4.21	4.26	4.25	3.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	3	12	11	4.07	898/1287	4.15	4.28	4.30	4.24	4.07
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	4	7	9	8	3.75	1192/1459	4.00	4.07	4.22	4.11	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	1	7	9	8	3.74	1052/1406	3.88	4.05	4.09	4.02	3.74
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	4	5	7	9	3.73	1063/1384	3.85	3.99	4.11	3.98	3.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	2	5	6	12	3.69	1227/1489	4.14	4.31	4.17	4.20	3.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	27	4.96	233/1506	4.63	4.54	4.67	4.66	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	1	4	9	5	1	3.05	1386/1463	3.67	3.99	4.09	4.02	3.05
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	2	4	13	8	3.89	1270/1438	4.44	4.53	4.46	4.44	3.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	7	19	4.57	1107/1421	4.68	4.70	4.73	4.66	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	6	10	9	2	3.18	1344/1411	3.98	4.20	4.31	4.27	3.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	4	6	5	10	3.54	1257/1405	4.19	4.29	4.32	4.27	3.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	14	2	0	6	4	2	3.29	1072/1236	3.78	3.77	4.00	3.87	3.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	3	3	4	4	3	3.06	1155/1260	3.49	3.77	4.14	3.95	3.06
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	7	4	3	3	3.12	1199/1255	3.37	3.89	4.33	4.15	3.12
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	3	2	6	4	3.56	1132/1258	3.69	4.05	4.38	4.18	3.56
4. Were special techniques successful	14	3	2	1	1	4	4	3.58	677/ 873	3.11	3.69	4.03	3.89	3.58

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A 7	Required for Majors 10	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 13			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C 4	General 9	Under-grad 29	Non-major 29
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 2		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ECON 101 3  
 Title Prin Of Microeconomics  
 Instructor: Mitch,David F  
 Enrollment: 47  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 446  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	4	11	10	3.96	1154/1509	4.03	4.21	4.31	4.18	3.96
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	0	7	8	10	3.79	1240/1509	3.98	4.21	4.26	4.25	3.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	0	6	7	11	3.85	1047/1287	4.15	4.28	4.30	4.24	3.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	3	1	5	10	8	3.70	1217/1459	4.00	4.07	4.22	4.11	3.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	2	5	6	12	3.89	949/1406	3.88	4.05	4.09	4.02	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	1	11	5	7	3.44	1217/1384	3.85	3.99	4.11	3.98	3.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	5	6	5	11	3.71	1214/1489	4.14	4.31	4.17	4.20	3.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/1506	4.63	4.54	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	2	1	9	8	2	3.32	1320/1463	3.67	3.99	4.09	4.02	3.32
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	2	4	4	13	4.08	1179/1438	4.44	4.53	4.46	4.44	4.08
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	2	8	13	4.38	1234/1421	4.68	4.70	4.73	4.66	4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	3	4	4	6	7	3.42	1305/1411	3.98	4.20	4.31	4.27	3.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	1	3	4	13	3.96	1089/1405	4.19	4.29	4.32	4.27	3.96
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	18	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	****/1236	3.78	3.77	4.00	3.87	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	2	4	4	1	3	2.93	1192/1260	3.49	3.77	4.14	3.95	2.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	2	1	6	3	2	3.14	1195/1255	3.37	3.89	4.33	4.15	3.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	2	5	4	2	3.29	1193/1258	3.69	4.05	4.38	4.18	3.29
4. Were special techniques successful	14	5	4	2	1	1	1	2.22	864/ 873	3.11	3.69	4.03	3.89	2.22
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	26	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 198	2.90	2.90	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 49	****	4.00	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: ECON 101 3  
 Title Prin Of Microeconomics  
 Instructor: Mitch,David F  
 Enrollment: 47  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 446  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	6	General	12	Under-grad	28	Non-major	28
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

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	2	7	8	12	10	3.54	1390/1509	4.03	4.21	4.31	4.18	3.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	8	10	11	8	3.38	1408/1509	3.98	4.21	4.26	4.25	3.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	8	6	10	12	3.58	1144/1287	4.15	4.28	4.30	4.24	3.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	4	4	8	7	10	3.45	1328/1459	4.00	4.07	4.22	4.11	3.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	5	8	8	13	3.77	1030/1406	3.88	4.05	4.09	4.02	3.77
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	20	3	0	6	4	4	3.35	1256/1384	3.85	3.99	4.11	3.98	3.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	2	1	8	10	14	3.94	1058/1489	4.14	4.31	4.17	4.20	3.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	1	36	4.97	175/1506	4.63	4.54	4.67	4.66	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	2	2	10	14	3	3.45	1268/1463	3.67	3.99	4.09	4.02	3.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	1	6	10	17	4.17	1128/1438	4.44	4.53	4.46	4.44	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	7	30	4.76	863/1421	4.68	4.70	4.73	4.66	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	5	3	13	8	7	3.25	1333/1411	3.98	4.20	4.31	4.27	3.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	4	6	5	5	15	3.60	1241/1405	4.19	4.29	4.32	4.27	3.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	18	2	2	5	3	5	3.41	1026/1236	3.78	3.77	4.00	3.87	3.41
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	6	8	6	4	7	2.94	1188/1260	3.49	3.77	4.14	3.95	2.94
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	7	6	6	5	6	2.90	1224/1255	3.37	3.89	4.33	4.15	2.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	3	3	8	5	11	3.60	1126/1258	3.69	4.05	4.38	4.18	3.60
4. Were special techniques successful	9	20	2	1	1	3	3	3.40	738/ 873	3.11	3.69	4.03	3.89	3.40
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	8	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	1	2	5	1	1	2.90	196/ 198	2.90	2.90	4.22	4.14	2.90
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	30	5	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	5	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	6	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	32	3	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	31	5	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	31	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	31	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	4	1	1	0	2	2.38	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	2	1	0	1	3	3.29	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	32	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	32	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	32	4	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	30	0	2	2	2	1	2	2.89	****/ 49	****	4.00	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	30	2	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	4	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	4	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	31	4	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****



Course-Section: ECON 101 4  
 Title Prin Of Microeconomics  
 Instructor: Bradley, Michael  
 Enrollment: 76  
 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 447  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	5	General	14	Under-grad	39	Non-major	38
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 101 5  
 Title Prin Of Microeconomics  
 Instructor: Viauroux,Christ  
 Enrollment: 42  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 448  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	2	0	0	0	2	10	8	4.30	833/1509	4.03	4.21	4.31	4.18	4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	2	7	9	4.26	849/1509	3.98	4.21	4.26	4.25	4.26
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	1	1	3	14	4.58	453/1287	4.15	4.28	4.30	4.24	4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	7	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	367/1459	4.00	4.07	4.22	4.11	4.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	4	12	4.50	332/1406	3.88	4.05	4.09	4.02	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	7	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	531/1384	3.85	3.99	4.11	3.98	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	0	2	4	12	4.37	641/1489	4.14	4.31	4.17	4.20	4.37
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	981/1506	4.63	4.54	4.67	4.66	4.61
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	2	0	9	4	4.00	853/1463	3.67	3.99	4.09	4.02	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	396/1438	4.44	4.53	4.46	4.44	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	3	3	13	4.53	1146/1421	4.68	4.70	4.73	4.66	4.53
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	592/1411	3.98	4.20	4.31	4.27	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	4	12	4.47	671/1405	4.19	4.29	4.32	4.27	4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	4	2	12	4.32	441/1236	3.78	3.77	4.00	3.87	4.32
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	2	0	0	0	3	3.40	****/1260	3.49	3.77	4.14	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	2	0	0	1	2	3.20	****/1255	3.37	3.89	4.33	4.15	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	****/1258	3.69	4.05	4.38	4.18	****
4. Were special techniques successful	17	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 873	3.11	3.69	4.03	3.89	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	3	8	7	4.05	1079/1509	4.03	4.21	4.31	4.18	4.05
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	10	6	4.05	1049/1509	3.98	4.21	4.26	4.25	4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	7	9	4.21	811/1287	4.15	4.28	4.30	4.24	4.21
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	2	3	6	5	3.71	1217/1459	4.00	4.07	4.22	4.11	3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	4	5	8	4.00	813/1406	3.88	4.05	4.09	4.02	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	2	0	2	6	4	3.71	1076/1384	3.85	3.99	4.11	3.98	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	652/1489	4.14	4.31	4.17	4.20	4.35
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	820/1506	4.63	4.54	4.67	4.66	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	1	2	6	3	3.69	1148/1463	3.67	3.99	4.09	4.02	3.69
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	1	1	15	4.61	660/1438	4.44	4.53	4.46	4.44	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	0	16	4.78	846/1421	4.68	4.70	4.73	4.66	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	2	13	4.50	617/1411	3.98	4.20	4.31	4.27	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	3	2	12	4.53	615/1405	4.19	4.29	4.32	4.27	4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	1	2	2	11	4.24	504/1236	3.78	3.77	4.00	3.87	4.24
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	1	1	5	3	3.50	1045/1260	3.49	3.77	4.14	3.95	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	2	0	3	4	3	3.50	1127/1255	3.37	3.89	4.33	4.15	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	1	3	4	3	3.58	1129/1258	3.69	4.05	4.38	4.18	3.58
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	1	1	4	1	2	3.22	776/ 873	3.11	3.69	4.03	3.89	3.22
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 49	****	4.00	4.26	4.28	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	5	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	0	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	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	5	9	17	20	4.02	1107/1509	4.03	4.21	4.31	4.18	4.02
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	9	19	19	4.08	1027/1509	3.98	4.21	4.26	4.25	4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	4	7	14	23	3.98	943/1287	4.15	4.28	4.30	4.24	3.98
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	2	4	6	17	16	3.91	1077/1459	4.00	4.07	4.22	4.11	3.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	4	5	6	14	17	3.76	1038/1406	3.88	4.05	4.09	4.02	3.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	5	2	13	17	12	3.59	1149/1384	3.85	3.99	4.11	3.98	3.59
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	9	16	23	4.20	823/1489	4.14	4.31	4.17	4.20	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	3	40	7	4.08	1353/1506	4.63	4.54	4.67	4.66	4.08
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	1	1	2	9	15	5	3.66	1174/1463	3.67	3.99	4.09	4.02	3.66
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	3	17	28	4.47	852/1438	4.44	4.53	4.46	4.44	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	1	12	35	4.65	1026/1421	4.68	4.70	4.73	4.66	4.65
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	4	6	16	20	4.00	1051/1411	3.98	4.20	4.31	4.27	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	5	12	29	4.35	818/1405	4.19	4.29	4.32	4.27	4.35
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	23	2	7	6	9	2	3.08	1120/1236	3.78	3.77	4.00	3.87	3.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	3	3	1	5	15	3.96	795/1260	3.49	3.77	4.14	3.95	3.96
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	1	1	7	8	11	3.96	939/1255	3.37	3.89	4.33	4.15	3.96
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	2	0	3	6	17	4.29	802/1258	3.69	4.05	4.38	4.18	4.29
4. Were special techniques successful	23	16	0	1	6	4	1	3.42	****/ 873	3.11	3.69	4.03	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	48	1	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	48	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 198	2.90	2.90	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	48	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	48	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	48	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	48	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	48	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	48	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	48	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	48	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	48	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	48	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	49	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	48	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 49	****	4.00	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	48	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	49	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	48	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	48	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: ECON 101 7  
 Title Prin Of Microeconomics  
 Instructor: Dickson,Lisa M  
 Enrollment: 79  
 Questionnaires: 51

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 450  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	20						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C	8	General	12	Under-grad	51	Non-major	50
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	3						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	1	Electives	6	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ECON 101 8  
 Title Prin Of Microeconomics  
 Instructor: Thomas,Mark  
 Enrollment: 80  
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 451  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5							
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	4	9	15	4.31	822/1509	4.03	4.21	4.31	4.18	4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	0	8	18	4.38	731/1509	3.98	4.21	4.26	4.25	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	4	5	19	4.54	491/1287	4.15	4.28	4.30	4.24	4.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	12	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	182/1459	4.00	4.07	4.22	4.11	4.76
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	1	5	5	12	4.08	753/1406	3.88	4.05	4.09	4.02	4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	13	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	306/1384	3.85	3.99	4.11	3.98	4.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	5	5	15	4.03	965/1489	4.14	4.31	4.17	4.20	4.03
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	20	8	4.24	1265/1506	4.63	4.54	4.67	4.66	4.24
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	5	13	5	4.00	853/1463	3.67	3.99	4.09	4.02	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	9	18	4.61	675/1438	4.44	4.53	4.46	4.44	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	6	22	4.79	828/1421	4.68	4.70	4.73	4.66	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	4	7	16	4.32	820/1411	3.98	4.20	4.31	4.27	4.32
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	2	6	18	4.52	624/1405	4.19	4.29	4.32	4.27	4.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	0	1	3	2	17	4.52	261/1236	3.78	3.77	4.00	3.87	4.52
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	2	4	3	4	3.69	968/1260	3.49	3.77	4.14	3.95	3.69
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	2	4	3	4	3.69	1074/1255	3.37	3.89	4.33	4.15	3.69
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	1	6	3	3	3.62	1122/1258	3.69	4.05	4.38	4.18	3.62
4. Were special techniques successful	18	7	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/ 873	3.11	3.69	4.03	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 198	2.90	2.90	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	28	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	28	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	28	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 49	****	4.00	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	28	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	28	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	28	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: ECON 101 8  
 Title Prin Of Microeconomics  
 Instructor: Thomas,Mark  
 Enrollment: 80  
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 451  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	A	14	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	10	Under-grad	30	Non-major	30
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	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	1				
				?	3						

Course-Section: ECON 102 1  
 Title Prin Of Macroeconomics  
 Instructor: Cinyabuguma,Mat  
 Enrollment: 80  
 Questionnaires: 54

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 452  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	3	4	13	16	15	3.71	1321/1509	4.10	4.21	4.31	4.18	3.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	4	4	8	19	16	3.76	1252/1509	4.15	4.21	4.26	4.25	3.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	2	8	15	25	4.20	826/1287	4.29	4.28	4.30	4.24	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	11	5	3	3	14	15	3.78	1182/1459	4.09	4.07	4.22	4.11	3.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	10	3	4	3	16	14	3.85	971/1406	4.05	4.05	4.09	4.02	3.85
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	19	2	2	7	13	8	3.72	1076/1384	3.94	3.99	4.11	3.98	3.72
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	2	1	9	6	17	16	3.78	1188/1489	4.18	4.31	4.17	4.20	3.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	1	1	38	10	4.14	1325/1506	4.28	4.54	4.67	4.66	4.14
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	1	5	12	15	10	3.65	1174/1463	3.96	3.99	4.09	4.02	3.65
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	1	2	9	18	18	4.04	1191/1438	4.43	4.53	4.46	4.44	4.04
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	4	11	33	4.60	1084/1421	4.71	4.70	4.73	4.66	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	6	8	20	13	3.79	1190/1411	4.20	4.20	4.31	4.27	3.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	5	7	17	19	4.04	1028/1405	4.26	4.29	4.32	4.27	4.04
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	27	2	1	5	5	7	3.70	883/1236	3.72	3.77	4.00	3.87	3.70
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	3	5	9	7	3.83	896/1260	3.93	3.77	4.14	3.95	3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	29	0	1	3	3	7	11	3.96	939/1255	4.15	3.89	4.33	4.15	3.96
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	30	0	1	1	4	7	11	4.08	907/1258	4.37	4.05	4.38	4.18	4.08
4. Were special techniques successful	31	13	1	1	2	0	6	3.90	****/ 873	****	3.69	4.03	3.89	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	53	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 198	****	2.90	4.22	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	52	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	52	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.16	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	52	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	11	0.00-0.99 0	A 25	Required for Majors	15
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	B 14		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 1	C 2	General	16
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 7	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 1	Electives	9
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 2	Other	1

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



Course-Section: ECON 102 2  
 Title Prin Of Macroeconomics  
 Instructor: Dasgupta,Nandit  
 Enrollment: 40  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 453  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	6	11	4.65	434/1509	4.10	4.21	4.31	4.18	4.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	447/1509	4.15	4.21	4.26	4.25	4.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	261/1287	4.29	4.28	4.30	4.24	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	454/1459	4.09	4.07	4.22	4.11	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	575/1406	4.05	4.05	4.09	4.02	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	762/1384	3.94	3.99	4.11	3.98	4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	696/1489	4.18	4.31	4.17	4.20	4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	4	11	1	3.81	1463/1506	4.28	4.54	4.67	4.66	3.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	1	6	7	4.20	690/1463	3.96	3.99	4.09	4.02	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	0	2	11	4.57	712/1438	4.43	4.53	4.46	4.44	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	794/1421	4.71	4.70	4.73	4.66	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	6	9	4.44	701/1411	4.20	4.20	4.31	4.27	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	7	8	4.38	788/1405	4.26	4.29	4.32	4.27	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	383/1236	3.72	3.77	4.00	3.87	4.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	337/1260	3.93	3.77	4.14	3.95	4.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	723/1255	4.15	3.89	4.33	4.15	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	535/1258	4.37	4.05	4.38	4.18	4.63
4. Were special techniques successful	8	6	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 873	****	3.69	4.03	3.89	****

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	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	3	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	3	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	0				
				?	0						

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	2	4	5	4	2	3.00	1473/1509	4.10	4.21	4.31	4.18	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	4	3	5	2	2.94	1475/1509	4.15	4.21	4.26	4.25	2.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	4	3	6	3	3.35	1200/1287	4.29	4.28	4.30	4.24	3.35
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	2	2	5	1	3.50	1314/1459	4.09	4.07	4.22	4.11	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	2	0	4	5	3	3.50	1178/1406	4.05	4.05	4.09	4.02	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	10	1	0	3	3	0	3.14	1306/1384	3.94	3.99	4.11	3.98	3.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	4	1	4	5	3	3.12	1396/1489	4.18	4.31	4.17	4.20	3.12
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	12	4	4.25	1258/1506	4.28	4.54	4.67	4.66	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	4	0	7	2	2	2.87	1415/1463	3.96	3.99	4.09	4.02	2.87
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	4	5	6	3.82	1291/1438	4.43	4.53	4.46	4.44	3.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	2	5	9	4.24	1299/1421	4.71	4.70	4.73	4.66	4.24
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	3	3	4	4	2	2.94	1373/1411	4.20	4.20	4.31	4.27	2.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	2	4	6	2	3.12	1339/1405	4.26	4.29	4.32	4.27	3.12
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	4	0	4	3	5	3.31	1064/1236	3.72	3.77	4.00	3.87	3.31
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	4	2	2	4	3	3.00	1162/1260	3.93	3.77	4.14	3.95	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	1	3	5	4	3.53	1120/1255	4.15	3.89	4.33	4.15	3.53
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	2	0	5	4	4	3.53	1137/1258	4.37	4.05	4.38	4.18	3.53
4. Were special techniques successful	3	14	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 873	****	3.69	4.03	3.89	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 198	****	2.90	4.22	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.31	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.21	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 49	****	4.00	4.26	4.28	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	6	5	18	4.23	911/1509	4.10	4.21	4.31	4.18	4.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	9	16	4.26	859/1509	4.15	4.21	4.26	4.25	4.26
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	8	17	4.23	803/1287	4.29	4.28	4.30	4.24	4.23
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	6	1	1	3	7	10	4.09	917/1459	4.09	4.07	4.22	4.11	4.09
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	8	19	4.45	389/1406	4.05	4.05	4.09	4.02	4.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	2	3	5	13	4.26	609/1384	3.94	3.99	4.11	3.98	4.26
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	5	22	4.55	411/1489	4.18	4.31	4.17	4.20	4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	29	4.94	408/1506	4.28	4.54	4.67	4.66	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	1	1	2	10	10	4.13	774/1463	3.96	3.99	4.09	4.02	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	3	1	5	21	4.47	852/1438	4.43	4.53	4.46	4.44	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	2	27	4.83	716/1421	4.71	4.70	4.73	4.66	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	1	2	7	18	4.27	876/1411	4.20	4.20	4.31	4.27	4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	0	4	23	4.53	605/1405	4.26	4.29	4.32	4.27	4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	12	2	0	3	6	7	3.89	784/1236	3.72	3.77	4.00	3.87	3.89
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	3	4	10	4.22	645/1260	3.93	3.77	4.14	3.95	4.22
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	681/1255	4.15	3.89	4.33	4.15	4.39
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	563/1258	4.37	4.05	4.38	4.18	4.59
4. Were special techniques successful	14	10	0	2	3	0	2	3.29	****/ 873	****	3.69	4.03	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 198	****	2.90	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	27	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	2	0	1	0	1	2.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	2	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	2	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 49	****	4.00	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	28	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	28	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: ECON 102 5  
 Title Prin Of Macroeconomics  
 Instructor: Falcon III,Haro  
 Enrollment: 40  
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 455  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	7	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	1	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	4	General	9	Under-grad	30	Non-major	30
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	2						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 102 6  
 Title Prin Of Macroeconomics  
 Instructor: Gindling JR,Tho  
 Enrollment: 78  
 Questionnaires: 45

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 456  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	4	0	0	0	4	15	22	4.44	686/1509	4.10	4.21	4.31	4.18	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	2	19	20	4.44	652/1509	4.15	4.21	4.26	4.25	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	3	12	26	4.56	463/1287	4.29	4.28	4.30	4.24	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	7	0	2	1	14	17	4.35	667/1459	4.09	4.07	4.22	4.11	4.35
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	2	8	11	19	4.18	674/1406	4.05	4.05	4.09	4.02	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	4	0	0	1	19	16	4.42	430/1384	3.94	3.99	4.11	3.98	4.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	1	0	6	9	23	4.36	652/1489	4.18	4.31	4.17	4.20	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	0	28	11	4.28	1236/1506	4.28	4.54	4.67	4.66	4.28
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	0	7	14	13	4.18	714/1463	3.96	3.99	4.09	4.02	4.18
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	5	34	4.82	334/1438	4.43	4.53	4.46	4.44	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	5	34	4.82	742/1421	4.71	4.70	4.73	4.66	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	2	7	31	4.72	339/1411	4.20	4.20	4.31	4.27	4.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	11	26	4.57	568/1405	4.26	4.29	4.32	4.27	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	19	2	2	6	5	5	3.45	1007/1236	3.72	3.77	4.00	3.87	3.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	1	5	5	8	4.05	729/1260	3.93	3.77	4.14	3.95	4.05
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	26	0	0	4	2	4	9	3.95	956/1255	4.15	3.89	4.33	4.15	3.95
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	27	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	542/1258	4.37	4.05	4.38	4.18	4.61
4. Were special techniques successful	27	10	1	1	2	1	3	3.50	****/ 873	****	3.69	4.03	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	41	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	42	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 198	****	2.90	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	41	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	42	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	42	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	42	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	43	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	43	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	44	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	43	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	44	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	44	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	44	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	44	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	43	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	44	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	4.00	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	44	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	44	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	44	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	43	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: ECON 102 6  
 Title Prin Of Macroeconomics  
 Instructor: Gindling JR,Tho  
 Enrollment: 78  
 Questionnaires: 45

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 456  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	2	A	4	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	17						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	6	C	7	General	8	Under-grad	45	Non-major	44
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	7	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 102 7  
 Title Prin Of Macroeconomics  
 Instructor: Kaikai,Alpha  
 Enrollment: 40  
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 457  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	3	13	11	4.03	1093/1509	4.10	4.21	4.31	4.18	4.03
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	8	16	4.23	880/1509	4.15	4.21	4.26	4.25	4.23
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	11	13	4.10	882/1287	4.29	4.28	4.30	4.24	4.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	1	1	1	12	3	3.83	1143/1459	4.09	4.07	4.22	4.11	3.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	3	2	2	11	9	3.78	1030/1406	4.05	4.05	4.09	4.02	3.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	17	0	1	4	5	3	3.77	1043/1384	3.94	3.99	4.11	3.98	3.77
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	4	22	4.50	458/1489	4.18	4.31	4.17	4.20	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	22	4.73	870/1506	4.28	4.54	4.67	4.66	4.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	1	0	3	11	9	4.13	774/1463	3.96	3.99	4.09	4.02	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	10	17	4.43	891/1438	4.43	4.53	4.46	4.44	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	5	24	4.77	863/1421	4.71	4.70	4.73	4.66	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	3	8	18	4.40	738/1411	4.20	4.20	4.31	4.27	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	9	17	4.40	758/1405	4.26	4.29	4.32	4.27	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	22	1	0	1	3	2	3.71	****/1236	3.72	3.77	4.00	3.87	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	2	1	2	4	8	3.88	876/1260	3.93	3.77	4.14	3.95	3.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	0	1	3	12	4.47	602/1255	4.15	3.89	4.33	4.15	4.47
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	2	1	14	4.71	480/1258	4.37	4.05	4.38	4.18	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	13	13	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/ 873	****	3.69	4.03	3.89	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 198	****	2.90	4.22	4.14	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
-----												
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	2	A	16	Required for Majors		17	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	6							
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General		6	Under-grad	30	Non-major	30
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives		2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		0				
				?	0							

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	5	16	4.68	386/1509	4.10	4.21	4.31	4.18	4.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	192/1509	4.15	4.21	4.26	4.25	4.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	159/1287	4.29	4.28	4.30	4.24	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	1	0	4	12	4.59	367/1459	4.09	4.07	4.22	4.11	4.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	1	2	2	13	4.32	518/1406	4.05	4.05	4.09	4.02	4.32
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	2	2	3	9	4.19	685/1384	3.94	3.99	4.11	3.98	4.19
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	1	18	4.68	254/1489	4.18	4.31	4.17	4.20	4.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	7	10	4	3.77	1467/1506	4.28	4.54	4.67	4.66	3.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	263/1463	3.96	3.99	4.09	4.02	4.59
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	348/1438	4.43	4.53	4.46	4.44	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	21	4.91	537/1421	4.71	4.70	4.73	4.66	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	232/1411	4.20	4.20	4.31	4.27	4.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	321/1405	4.26	4.29	4.32	4.27	4.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	10	2	0	4	1	5	3.58	945/1236	3.72	3.77	4.00	3.87	3.58
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	2	1	1	4	3.88	880/1260	3.93	3.77	4.14	3.95	3.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	629/1255	4.15	3.89	4.33	4.15	4.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	680/1258	4.37	4.05	4.38	4.18	4.44
4. Were special techniques successful	14	7	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 873	****	3.69	4.03	3.89	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	4.00	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 15	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 0	Major 2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 4	Under-grad 23	Non-major 21
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			



Course-Section: ECON 121 2  
 Title Prin Of Accounting I  
 Instructor: Cole, Richard M.  
 Enrollment: 38  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 459  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	6	6	10	4.04	1086/1509	4.16	4.21	4.31	4.18	4.04
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	16	4.61	424/1509	4.39	4.21	4.26	4.25	4.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	6	13	4.26	771/1287	4.30	4.28	4.30	4.24	4.26
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	2	4	3	7	3.76	1187/1459	4.06	4.07	4.22	4.11	3.76
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	3	4	14	4.52	319/1406	4.33	4.05	4.09	4.02	4.52
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	3	1	9	4.46	385/1384	4.17	3.99	4.11	3.98	4.46
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	19	4.74	208/1489	4.47	4.31	4.17	4.20	4.74
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1506	4.49	4.54	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	2	11	2	4.00	853/1463	3.89	3.99	4.09	4.02	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	18	4.74	480/1438	4.52	4.53	4.46	4.44	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	1	3	18	4.61	1084/1421	4.63	4.70	4.73	4.66	4.61
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	4	15	4.43	701/1411	4.05	4.20	4.31	4.27	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	4	15	4.50	634/1405	4.05	4.29	4.32	4.27	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	12	1	1	4	1	4	3.55	964/1236	3.85	3.77	4.00	3.87	3.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	2	4	3	6	3.69	973/1260	3.81	3.77	4.14	3.95	3.69
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	1	5	3	6	3.75	1054/1255	3.97	3.89	4.33	4.15	3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	2	0	1	5	8	4.06	913/1258	4.18	4.05	4.38	4.18	4.06
4. Were special techniques successful	7	11	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/ 873	3.77	3.69	4.03	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.29	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	7	General	1	Under-grad	23	Non-major	23
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ECON 121 3  
 Title Prin Of Accounting I  
 Instructor: Medicus,Suzann  
 Enrollment: 47  
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 460  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	2	1	7	9	11	3.87	1243/1509	4.16	4.21	4.31	4.18	3.87
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	14	12	4.23	880/1509	4.39	4.21	4.26	4.25	4.23
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	12	15	4.37	678/1287	4.30	4.28	4.30	4.24	4.37
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	1	1	6	3	8	3.84	1135/1459	4.06	4.07	4.22	4.11	3.84
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	7	8	11	3.90	941/1406	4.33	4.05	4.09	4.02	3.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	16	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	677/1384	4.17	3.99	4.11	3.98	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	9	19	4.52	446/1489	4.47	4.31	4.17	4.20	4.52
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	1	0	21	8	4.20	1300/1506	4.49	4.54	4.67	4.66	4.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	13	5	5	3.65	1174/1463	3.89	3.99	4.09	4.02	3.65
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	3	8	18	4.43	891/1438	4.52	4.53	4.46	4.44	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	2	6	21	4.57	1115/1421	4.63	4.70	4.73	4.66	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	2	9	8	9	3.67	1235/1411	4.05	4.20	4.31	4.27	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	7	9	10	3.80	1177/1405	4.05	4.29	4.32	4.27	3.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	3	1	5	7	9	3.72	871/1236	3.85	3.77	4.00	3.87	3.72
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	2	6	5	4.00	746/1260	3.81	3.77	4.14	3.95	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	575/1255	3.97	3.89	4.33	4.15	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	700/1258	4.18	4.05	4.38	4.18	4.43
4. Were special techniques successful	17	0	1	2	1	4	6	3.86	560/ 873	3.77	3.69	4.03	3.89	3.86

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 7	Required for Majors 23	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B 12					
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	7	C 3	General	0	Under-grad	31	Non-major 29
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D 0					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		
				P 0					
				I 0	Other	1			
				? 1					

Course-Section: ECON 121 4  
 Title Prin Of Accounting I  
 Instructor: Medicus,Suzann  
 Enrollment: 46  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 461  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	6	14	4.48	635/1509	4.16	4.21	4.31	4.18	4.48
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	14	4.43	652/1509	4.39	4.21	4.26	4.25	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	14	4.48	554/1287	4.30	4.28	4.30	4.24	4.48
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	4	6	7	4.18	851/1459	4.06	4.07	4.22	4.11	4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	7	12	4.48	366/1406	4.33	4.05	4.09	4.02	4.48
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	4	5	8	4.11	742/1384	4.17	3.99	4.11	3.98	4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	4	14	4.35	663/1489	4.47	4.31	4.17	4.20	4.35
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	18	3	4.14	1325/1506	4.49	4.54	4.67	4.66	4.14
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	2	9	4	4.13	762/1463	3.89	3.99	4.09	4.02	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	2	19	4.74	480/1438	4.52	4.53	4.46	4.44	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	20	4.83	742/1421	4.63	4.70	4.73	4.66	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3	2	5	13	4.22	920/1411	4.05	4.20	4.31	4.27	4.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	3	3	14	4.13	980/1405	4.05	4.29	4.32	4.27	4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	5	8	8	4.14	580/1236	3.85	3.77	4.00	3.87	4.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	4	5	2	3.58	1017/1260	3.81	3.77	4.14	3.95	3.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	1	2	4	4	3.75	1054/1255	3.97	3.89	4.33	4.15	3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	867/1258	4.18	4.05	4.38	4.18	4.17
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	0	1	4	5	2	3.67	650/ 873	3.77	3.69	4.03	3.89	3.67

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 7	Required for Majors 14	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	B 9					
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 1	General	1	Under-grad	23	Non-major 23
84-150	0	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	1			
				? 0					

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	3	4	7	12	3.96	1154/1509	4.16	4.21	4.31	4.18	3.96
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	3	9	11	3.93	1148/1509	4.39	4.21	4.26	4.25	3.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	6	5	12	3.85	1047/1287	4.30	4.28	4.30	4.24	3.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	3	3	5	8	3.80	1167/1459	4.06	4.07	4.22	4.11	3.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	5	6	13	4.15	693/1406	4.33	4.05	4.09	4.02	4.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	1	2	2	5	5	3.73	1063/1384	4.17	3.99	4.11	3.98	3.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	2	5	7	12	4.12	906/1489	4.47	4.31	4.17	4.20	4.12
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	1	25	4.81	762/1506	4.49	4.54	4.67	4.66	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	3	1	6	6	6	3.50	1241/1463	3.89	3.99	4.09	4.02	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	4	2	5	13	3.88	1273/1438	4.52	4.53	4.46	4.44	3.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	2	0	2	9	13	4.19	1312/1421	4.63	4.70	4.73	4.66	4.19
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	4	1	6	6	9	3.58	1262/1411	4.05	4.20	4.31	4.27	3.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	5	4	3	10	3.38	1297/1405	4.05	4.29	4.32	4.27	3.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	17	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	799/1236	3.85	3.77	4.00	3.87	3.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	3	1	1	4	5	3.50	1045/1260	3.81	3.77	4.14	3.95	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	3	1	3	1	6	3.43	1148/1255	3.97	3.89	4.33	4.15	3.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	3	2	2	6	3.64	1110/1258	4.18	4.05	4.38	4.18	3.64
4. Were special techniques successful	13	3	1	1	1	2	6	4.00	442/ 873	3.77	3.69	4.03	3.89	4.00
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	****/ 198	****	2.90	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	1	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	1	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	1	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	2	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	2	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	2	0	1	1	0	2.25	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	3	0	0	1	0	1.75	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/ 49	****	4.00	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: ECON 121 5  
 Title Prin Of Accounting I  
 Instructor: Davis,Alexis C.  
 Enrollment: 40  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 462  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	8	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	5	General	1	Under-grad	27	Non-major	27
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 121 6  
 Title Prin Of Accounting I  
 Instructor: McBride,Charles  
 Enrollment: 37  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 463  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	2	6	16	4.44	673/1509	4.16	4.21	4.31	4.18	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	21	4.77	245/1509	4.39	4.21	4.26	4.25	4.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	4	19	4.54	491/1287	4.30	4.28	4.30	4.24	4.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	5	17	4.70	247/1459	4.06	4.07	4.22	4.11	4.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	20	4.62	261/1406	4.33	4.05	4.09	4.02	4.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	1	2	2	14	4.35	505/1384	4.17	3.99	4.11	3.98	4.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	3	21	4.65	287/1489	4.47	4.31	4.17	4.20	4.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	16	9	4.31	1222/1506	4.49	4.54	4.67	4.66	4.31
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	1	2	8	7	4.17	726/1463	3.89	3.99	4.09	4.02	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	396/1438	4.52	4.53	4.46	4.44	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	269/1421	4.63	4.70	4.73	4.66	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	4	4	14	4.35	799/1411	4.05	4.20	4.31	4.27	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	3	3	16	4.43	720/1405	4.05	4.29	4.32	4.27	4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	2	0	5	3	11	4.00	664/1236	3.85	3.77	4.00	3.87	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	613/1260	3.81	3.77	4.14	3.95	4.27
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	0	6	8	4.40	665/1255	3.97	3.89	4.33	4.15	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	549/1258	4.18	4.05	4.38	4.18	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	11	8	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	681/ 873	3.77	3.69	4.03	3.89	3.57
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 198	****	2.90	4.22	4.14	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
-----												
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	11	Required for Majors		16	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	8							
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General		1	Under-grad	26	Non-major	26
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives		4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		0				
				?	1							

Course-Section: ECON 122 1  
 Title Prin Of Accounting II  
 Instructor: McBride, Charles  
 Enrollment: 38  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 464  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	5	12	4.71	363/1509	4.24	4.21	4.31	4.18	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	245/1509	4.34	4.21	4.26	4.25	4.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	76/1287	4.54	4.28	4.30	4.24	4.94
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	116/1459	4.42	4.07	4.22	4.11	4.87
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	135/1406	4.65	4.05	4.09	4.02	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	225/1384	4.07	3.99	4.11	3.98	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	233/1489	4.44	4.31	4.17	4.20	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	622/1506	4.85	4.54	4.67	4.66	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	325/1463	4.28	3.99	4.09	4.02	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	276/1438	4.48	4.53	4.46	4.44	4.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	376/1421	4.79	4.70	4.73	4.66	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	416/1411	4.14	4.20	4.31	4.27	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	459/1405	4.11	4.29	4.32	4.27	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	306/1236	3.75	3.77	4.00	3.87	4.46
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	172/1260	3.49	3.77	4.14	3.95	4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	647/1255	4.27	3.89	4.33	4.15	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1258	4.42	4.05	4.38	4.18	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	10	3	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/ 873	4.25	3.69	4.03	3.89	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0	Major 2
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 2	General 1	Under-grad 17	Non-major 15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 1			

Course-Section: ECON 122 2  
 Title Prin Of Accounting II  
 Instructor: McBride, Charles  
 Enrollment: 38  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 465  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	3	4	3	2	3.33	1435/1509	4.24	4.21	4.31	4.18	3.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	6	2	3.75	1259/1509	4.34	4.21	4.26	4.25	3.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	924/1287	4.54	4.28	4.30	4.24	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1238/1459	4.42	4.07	4.22	4.11	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	300/1406	4.65	4.05	4.09	4.02	4.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	0	2	3	0	3.17	1302/1384	4.07	3.99	4.11	3.98	3.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	1	7	4.25	760/1489	4.44	4.31	4.17	4.20	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	941/1506	4.85	4.54	4.67	4.66	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	1006/1463	4.28	3.99	4.09	4.02	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	1055/1438	4.48	4.53	4.46	4.44	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	1049/1421	4.79	4.70	4.73	4.66	4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	6	2	1	3.18	1343/1411	4.14	4.20	4.31	4.27	3.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	5	3	1	3.40	1294/1405	4.11	4.29	4.32	4.27	3.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	2	3	0	1	3.00	1131/1236	3.75	3.77	4.00	3.87	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	1	2	0	0	2.25	1251/1260	3.49	3.77	4.14	3.95	2.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	783/1255	4.27	3.89	4.33	4.15	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	620/1258	4.42	4.05	4.38	4.18	4.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
-----											
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	11
84-150	1	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	0				
				?	0						



Course-Section: ECON 122 3  
 Title Prin Of Accounting II  
 Instructor: Hardy,Timothy W  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 466  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	5	11	4.69	386/1509	4.24	4.21	4.31	4.18	4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	11	4.50	543/1509	4.34	4.21	4.26	4.25	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	337/1287	4.54	4.28	4.30	4.24	4.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	218/1459	4.42	4.07	4.22	4.11	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	0	2	12	4.60	269/1406	4.65	4.05	4.09	4.02	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	466/1384	4.07	3.99	4.11	3.98	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	1	12	4.38	630/1489	4.44	4.31	4.17	4.20	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1506	4.85	4.54	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	381/1463	4.28	3.99	4.09	4.02	4.46
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	4	9	4.31	1021/1438	4.48	4.53	4.46	4.44	4.31
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	768/1421	4.79	4.70	4.73	4.66	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	544/1411	4.14	4.20	4.31	4.27	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	4	8	4.25	896/1405	4.11	4.29	4.32	4.27	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	1	1	2	1	5	3.80	824/1236	3.75	3.77	4.00	3.87	3.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	2	1	1	3	3.38	1096/1260	3.49	3.77	4.14	3.95	3.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	862/1255	4.27	3.89	4.33	4.15	4.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	2	2	0	4	3.75	1070/1258	4.42	4.05	4.38	4.18	3.75
4. Were special techniques successful	8	4	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	333/ 873	4.25	3.69	4.03	3.89	4.25
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	2.90	4.22	4.14	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	4	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	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 301 1  
 Title Intermed Accounting I  
 Instructor: Stmartin,Jeanne  
 Enrollment: 32  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 467  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	1	0	9	11	4.43	698/1509	4.49	4.21	4.31	4.32	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	7	13	4.52	519/1509	4.50	4.21	4.26	4.25	4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	0	6	14	4.52	500/1287	4.47	4.28	4.30	4.33	4.52
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	0	3	3	13	4.19	834/1459	4.22	4.07	4.22	4.26	4.19
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	1	3	5	9	4.05	776/1406	4.14	4.05	4.09	4.12	4.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	1	5	4	8	3.89	946/1384	4.01	3.99	4.11	4.15	3.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	0	3	16	4.57	376/1489	4.59	4.31	4.17	4.14	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	7	13	4.65	949/1506	4.63	4.54	4.67	4.67	4.65
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	0	0	6	9	4.38	500/1463	4.45	3.99	4.09	4.08	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	5	14	4.52	775/1438	4.57	4.53	4.46	4.43	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	19	4.86	665/1421	4.82	4.70	4.73	4.73	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	2	5	12	4.35	789/1411	4.52	4.20	4.31	4.29	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	4	15	4.52	615/1405	4.55	4.29	4.32	4.32	4.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	10	1	0	1	2	6	4.20	536/1236	3.90	3.77	4.00	4.07	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	645/1260	4.22	3.77	4.14	4.22	4.22
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	0	2	3	3	3.78	1047/1255	3.78	3.89	4.33	4.37	3.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	1070/1258	3.75	4.05	4.38	4.42	3.75
4. Were special techniques successful	14	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 873	****	3.69	4.03	4.08	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 198	****	2.90	4.22	4.17	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.52	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.11	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	3.94	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.40	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	4.00	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****

Course-Section: ECON 301 1  
 Title Intermed Accounting I  
 Instructor: Stmartin,Jeanne  
 Enrollment: 32  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 467  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	8	C	11	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	5	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	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 301 2  
 Title Intermed Accounting I  
 Instructor: Stmartin,Jeanne  
 Enrollment: 35  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 468  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	4	20	4.56	540/1509	4.49	4.21	4.31	4.32	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	2	1	21	4.48	574/1509	4.50	4.21	4.26	4.25	4.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	1	5	18	4.41	638/1287	4.47	4.28	4.30	4.33	4.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	1	4	4	15	4.24	792/1459	4.22	4.07	4.22	4.26	4.24
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	3	9	10	4.22	635/1406	4.14	4.05	4.09	4.12	4.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	3	3	8	12	4.12	742/1384	4.01	3.99	4.11	4.15	4.12
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	1	1	22	4.62	330/1489	4.59	4.31	4.17	4.14	4.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	10	16	4.62	981/1506	4.63	4.54	4.67	4.67	4.62
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	2	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	309/1463	4.45	3.99	4.09	4.08	4.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	1	4	18	4.63	646/1438	4.57	4.53	4.46	4.43	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	1	21	4.79	811/1421	4.82	4.70	4.73	4.73	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	1	2	19	4.70	376/1411	4.52	4.20	4.31	4.29	4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	2	2	19	4.58	558/1405	4.55	4.29	4.32	4.32	4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	14	2	0	2	2	4	3.60	936/1236	3.90	3.77	4.00	4.07	3.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	****/1260	4.22	3.77	4.14	4.22	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	0	3	1	0	1	2.80	****/1255	3.78	3.89	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	0	2	1	0	2	3.40	****/1258	3.75	4.05	4.38	4.42	****
4. Were special techniques successful	22	2	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/ 873	****	3.69	4.03	4.08	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	2.90	4.22	4.17	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 11		Graduate 0
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	C 4	General	0
84-150	5	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	0
			? 1		

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	2	1	7	7	4.12	1032/1509	4.01	4.21	4.31	4.32	4.12
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	6	7	4.06	1049/1509	4.01	4.21	4.26	4.25	4.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	4	11	4.41	626/1287	4.23	4.28	4.30	4.33	4.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	1	2	1	2	3	3.44	1330/1459	3.83	4.07	4.22	4.26	3.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	5	4	6	3.88	956/1406	3.83	4.05	4.09	4.12	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	13	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/1384	4.08	3.99	4.11	4.15	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	109/1489	4.51	4.31	4.17	4.14	4.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	1006/1506	4.47	4.54	4.67	4.67	4.59
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	2	8	3	3.93	957/1463	3.88	3.99	4.09	4.08	3.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	131/1438	4.53	4.53	4.46	4.43	4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	742/1421	4.59	4.70	4.73	4.73	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	363/1411	4.24	4.20	4.31	4.29	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	406/1405	4.25	4.29	4.32	4.32	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	1	0	0	4	5	4.20	536/1236	3.79	3.77	4.00	4.07	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	0	1	1	7	4.00	746/1260	3.83	3.77	4.14	4.22	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	3	2	5	3.91	992/1255	4.01	3.89	4.33	4.37	3.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	932/1258	4.13	4.05	4.38	4.42	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	9	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 873	4.00	3.69	4.03	4.08	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	2.90	4.22	4.17	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 49	****	4.00	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 2	Required for Majors 15	Graduate 0	Major 3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B 13			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5	C 2	General 0	Under-grad 17	Non-major 14
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 1		
				? 0			

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	1	1	6	16	4.54	551/1509	4.01	4.21	4.31	4.32	4.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	1	3	18	4.50	543/1509	4.01	4.21	4.26	4.25	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	19	4.75	261/1287	4.23	4.28	4.30	4.33	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	569/1459	3.83	4.07	4.22	4.26	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	2	3	1	4	9	3.79	1023/1406	3.83	4.05	4.09	4.12	3.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	10	0	1	3	2	7	4.15	710/1384	4.08	3.99	4.11	4.15	4.15
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	3	3	17	4.61	341/1489	4.51	4.31	4.17	4.14	4.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	16	7	4.30	1222/1506	4.47	4.54	4.67	4.67	4.30
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	2	9	6	4.24	648/1463	3.88	3.99	4.09	4.08	4.24
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	319/1438	4.53	4.53	4.46	4.43	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	21	4.88	614/1421	4.59	4.70	4.73	4.73	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	5	17	4.63	469/1411	4.24	4.20	4.31	4.29	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	20	4.79	297/1405	4.25	4.29	4.32	4.32	4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	8	1	0	0	4	10	4.47	306/1236	3.79	3.77	4.00	4.07	4.47
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	605/1260	3.83	3.77	4.14	4.22	4.27
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	474/1255	4.01	3.89	4.33	4.37	4.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	670/1258	4.13	4.05	4.38	4.42	4.45
4. Were special techniques successful	14	1	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	442/ 873	4.00	3.69	4.03	4.08	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 198	****	2.90	4.22	4.17	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.52	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.11	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	3.94	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.40	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 49	****	4.00	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****

Course-Section: ECON 311 2  
 Title Interm Microecon Analy  
 Instructor: Ma,Bing  
 Enrollment: 39  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 470  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	8	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	6	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	25	Non-major	25
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	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	1				
				?	0						

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	3	3	3	8	14	3.87	1236/1509	4.01	4.21	4.31	4.32	3.87
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	1	10	18	4.34	763/1509	4.01	4.21	4.26	4.25	4.34
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	10	15	4.22	811/1287	4.23	4.28	4.30	4.33	4.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	17	0	2	4	3	6	3.87	1119/1459	3.83	4.07	4.22	4.26	3.87
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	1	1	5	8	9	3.96	873/1406	3.83	4.05	4.09	4.12	3.96
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	18	1	1	0	4	6	4.08	762/1384	4.08	3.99	4.11	4.15	4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	0	9	20	4.48	485/1489	4.51	4.31	4.17	4.14	4.48
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	3	0	0	0	18	10	4.36	1194/1506	4.47	4.54	4.67	4.67	4.36
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	3	0	0	4	10	5	4.05	826/1463	3.88	3.99	4.09	4.08	4.05
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	5	23	4.76	447/1438	4.53	4.53	4.46	4.43	4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	6	22	4.72	933/1421	4.59	4.70	4.73	4.73	4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	2	2	7	18	4.41	725/1411	4.24	4.20	4.31	4.29	4.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	2	0	3	2	5	16	4.31	859/1405	4.25	4.29	4.32	4.32	4.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	13	4	2	2	3	3	2.93	1157/1236	3.79	3.77	4.00	4.07	2.93
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	1	2	0	5	3.78	924/1260	3.83	3.77	4.14	4.22	3.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	1	1	1	1	5	3.89	1001/1255	4.01	3.89	4.33	4.37	3.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	770/1258	4.13	4.05	4.38	4.42	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	23	7	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 873	4.00	3.69	4.03	4.08	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	2.90	4.22	4.17	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.52	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.11	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	3.94	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.40	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	4.00	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****



Course-Section: ECON 311 3  
 Title Interm Microecon Analy  
 Instructor: Takacs, Wendy E  
 Enrollment: 39  
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 471  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	32	Non-major	31
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	2	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 311 4  
 Title Interm Microecon Analy  
 Instructor: Lord,William A  
 Enrollment: 41  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 472  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	5	8	2	3.53	1393/1509	4.01	4.21	4.31	4.32	3.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	5	5	3	3	3.12	1455/1509	4.01	4.21	4.26	4.25	3.12
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	1	6	5	3.53	1161/1287	4.23	4.28	4.30	4.33	3.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	2	1	2	2	3.57	1283/1459	3.83	4.07	4.22	4.26	3.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	4	5	3	3.69	1087/1406	3.83	4.05	4.09	4.12	3.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	807/1384	4.08	3.99	4.11	4.15	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	2	3	9	4.06	951/1489	4.51	4.31	4.17	4.14	4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	973/1506	4.47	4.54	4.67	4.67	4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	1	4	2	2	3.30	1323/1463	3.88	3.99	4.09	4.08	3.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	1	4	5	5	3.59	1360/1438	4.53	4.53	4.46	4.43	3.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	2	2	4	8	3.94	1358/1421	4.59	4.70	4.73	4.73	3.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	3	3	7	2	3.24	1336/1411	4.24	4.20	4.31	4.29	3.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	5	3	4	3	3.19	1332/1405	4.25	4.29	4.32	4.32	3.19
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	2	1	1	3	4	3.55	964/1236	3.79	3.77	4.00	4.07	3.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	0	2	2	2	3.25	1120/1260	3.83	3.77	4.14	4.22	3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	1	2	0	4	3.63	1097/1255	4.01	3.89	4.33	4.37	3.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	2	2	0	4	3.75	1070/1258	4.13	4.05	4.38	4.42	3.75
4. Were special techniques successful	9	5	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 873	4.00	3.69	4.03	4.08	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 14	Graduate 0	Major 7
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B 8			
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C 2	General 0	Under-grad 17	Non-major 10
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	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 0		
				? 2			

Course-Section: ECON 312 1  
 Title Interm Macroecon Analy  
 Instructor: Carpenter, Rober  
 Enrollment: 44  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 473  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	7	11	4.33	800/1509	4.10	4.21	4.31	4.32	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	5	10	4.25	859/1509	4.13	4.21	4.26	4.25	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	8	8	4.10	886/1287	4.21	4.28	4.30	4.33	4.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	1	4	1	0	3.00	1422/1459	3.45	4.07	4.22	4.26	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	10	6	4.05	783/1406	3.93	4.05	4.09	4.12	4.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	12	2	2	1	2	1	2.75	1359/1384	3.56	3.99	4.11	4.15	2.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	10	8	4.24	781/1489	4.18	4.31	4.17	4.14	4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	2	10	7	4.26	1251/1506	4.11	4.54	4.67	4.67	4.26
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	0	1	5	8	4.27	618/1463	3.74	3.99	4.09	4.08	4.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	3	6	9	4.21	1102/1438	4.25	4.53	4.46	4.43	4.21
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	933/1421	4.38	4.70	4.73	4.73	4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	4	6	8	4.11	1000/1411	4.10	4.20	4.31	4.29	4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	9	8	4.32	848/1405	4.23	4.29	4.32	4.32	4.32
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	0	3	5	8	4.12	607/1236	3.98	3.77	4.00	4.07	4.12
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	876/1260	3.58	3.77	4.14	4.22	3.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	0	3	0	4	3.75	1054/1255	3.58	3.89	4.33	4.37	3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	2	0	4	3	3.89	1021/1258	3.54	4.05	4.38	4.42	3.89
4. Were special techniques successful	12	7	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 873	****	3.69	4.03	4.08	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	5	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	18
84-150	3	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	0				
				?	3						

Course-Section: ECON 312 2  
 Title Interm Macroecon Analy  
 Instructor: Thomas,Mark  
 Enrollment: 41  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 474  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	1	6	8	8	3.88	1236/1509	4.10	4.21	4.31	4.32	3.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	7	7	9	4.00	1086/1509	4.13	4.21	4.26	4.25	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	10	11	4.33	708/1287	4.21	4.28	4.30	4.33	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	12	1	1	1	3	5	3.91	1088/1459	3.45	4.07	4.22	4.26	3.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	12	1	1	1	4	4	3.82	1001/1406	3.93	4.05	4.09	4.12	3.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	15	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	479/1384	3.56	3.99	4.11	4.15	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	1	1	11	9	4.13	885/1489	4.18	4.31	4.17	4.14	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	22	0	3.96	1415/1506	4.11	4.54	4.67	4.67	3.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	0	13	4	1	3.21	1350/1463	3.74	3.99	4.09	4.08	3.21
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	3	6	11	4.29	1047/1438	4.25	4.53	4.46	4.43	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	2	4	7	9	4.05	1339/1421	4.38	4.70	4.73	4.73	4.05
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	4	9	8	4.09	1005/1411	4.10	4.20	4.31	4.29	4.09
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	5	6	10	4.14	980/1405	4.23	4.29	4.32	4.32	4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	2	0	4	5	7	3.83	809/1236	3.98	3.77	4.00	4.07	3.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	3	1	1	2	4	3.27	1115/1260	3.58	3.77	4.14	4.22	3.27
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	2	0	3	2	3	3.40	1154/1255	3.58	3.89	4.33	4.37	3.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	2	1	3	1	3	3.20	1209/1258	3.54	4.05	4.38	4.42	3.20
4. Were special techniques successful	15	6	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/ 873	****	3.69	4.03	4.08	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	2.90	4.22	4.17	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.52	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.11	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	3.94	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.40	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	4.00	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****

Course-Section: ECON 312 2  
 Title Interm Macroecon Analy  
 Instructor: Thomas,Mark  
 Enrollment: 41  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 474  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	8	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	25	Non-major	25
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 320 1  
 Title Quant Mthds:Management  
 Instructor: Palmateer,Jason  
 Enrollment: 58  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 475  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	7	4	9	3.95	1164/1509	3.95	4.21	4.31	4.32	3.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	5	7	6	3.85	1196/1509	3.85	4.21	4.26	4.25	3.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	7	7	3.95	972/1287	3.95	4.28	4.30	4.33	3.95
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	3	2	4	6	3.87	1119/1459	3.87	4.07	4.22	4.26	3.87
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	1	2	3	5	2	3.38	1243/1406	3.38	4.05	4.09	4.12	3.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	2	6	3	3	3.33	1264/1384	3.33	3.99	4.11	4.15	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	6	6	7	3.86	1141/1489	3.86	4.31	4.17	4.14	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	4	8	7	4.05	1364/1506	4.05	4.54	4.67	4.67	4.05
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	2	1	3	9	2	3.47	1257/1463	3.47	3.99	4.09	4.08	3.47
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	5	6	6	3.79	1304/1438	3.79	4.53	4.46	4.43	3.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	9	8	4.32	1269/1421	4.32	4.70	4.73	4.73	4.32
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	2	4	6	6	3.74	1211/1411	3.74	4.20	4.31	4.29	3.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	3	2	6	8	4.00	1047/1405	4.00	4.29	4.32	4.32	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	5	1	1	0	6	3	3.82	819/1236	3.82	3.77	4.00	4.07	3.82
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	597/1260	4.29	3.77	4.14	4.22	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	1110/1255	3.57	3.89	4.33	4.37	3.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	932/1258	4.00	4.05	4.38	4.42	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	15	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 873	****	3.69	4.03	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	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1		
					0
					21
					21

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

Course-Section: ECON 374 1  
 Title Fund Financial Mgmt  
 Instructor: Lamdin,Douglas  
 Enrollment: 39  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 476  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	3	8	12	4.39	734/1509	4.54	4.21	4.31	4.32	4.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	7	14	4.52	519/1509	4.58	4.21	4.26	4.25	4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	5	15	4.52	500/1287	4.65	4.28	4.30	4.33	4.52
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	3	8	10	4.23	803/1459	4.26	4.07	4.22	4.26	4.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	6	1	2	1	7	5	3.81	1001/1406	4.14	4.05	4.09	4.12	3.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	3	8	9	4.30	570/1384	4.09	3.99	4.11	4.15	4.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	2	9	10	4.38	619/1489	4.62	4.31	4.17	4.14	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	0	5	16	4.64	965/1506	4.46	4.54	4.67	4.67	4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	1	0	3	5	7	4.06	820/1463	4.16	3.99	4.09	4.08	4.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	660/1438	4.68	4.53	4.46	4.43	4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	950/1421	4.73	4.70	4.73	4.73	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	9	9	4.35	789/1411	4.54	4.20	4.31	4.29	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	526/1405	4.70	4.29	4.32	4.32	4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	354/1236	4.40	3.77	4.00	4.07	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	2	3	3	3.78	924/1260	3.54	3.77	4.14	4.22	3.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	4	1	4	4.00	904/1255	3.80	3.89	4.33	4.37	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	895/1258	3.96	4.05	4.38	4.42	4.11
4. Were special techniques successful	15	2	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	560/ 873	3.86	3.69	4.03	4.08	3.86

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	23
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 374 2  
 Title Fund Financial Mgmt  
 Instructor: Rose, Morgan J  
 Enrollment: 38  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 477  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	1	5	16	4.68	386/1509	4.54	4.21	4.31	4.32	4.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	17	4.64	390/1509	4.58	4.21	4.26	4.25	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	240/1287	4.65	4.28	4.30	4.33	4.77
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	3	0	1	10	4.29	737/1459	4.26	4.07	4.22	4.26	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	1	1	4	11	4.47	366/1406	4.14	4.05	4.09	4.12	4.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	13	2	0	0	1	5	3.88	962/1384	4.09	3.99	4.11	4.15	3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	121/1489	4.62	4.31	4.17	4.14	4.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	13	7	4.29	1236/1506	4.46	4.54	4.67	4.67	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	8	6	4.25	628/1463	4.16	3.99	4.09	4.08	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	0	1	18	4.75	447/1438	4.68	4.53	4.46	4.43	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	915/1421	4.73	4.70	4.73	4.73	4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	1	16	4.74	327/1411	4.54	4.20	4.31	4.29	4.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	321/1405	4.70	4.29	4.32	4.32	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	14	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/1236	4.40	3.77	4.00	4.07	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	2	0	3	3	3.30	1108/1260	3.54	3.77	4.14	4.22	3.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	2	1	0	3	4	3.60	1104/1255	3.80	3.89	4.33	4.37	3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	1	2	1	5	3.80	1054/1258	3.96	4.05	4.38	4.42	3.80
4. Were special techniques successful	12	8	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 873	3.86	3.69	4.03	4.08	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required for Majors 20	Graduate 0	Major 3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 8			
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C 5	General 0	Under-grad 22	Non-major 19
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			



Course-Section: ECON 408 1  
 Title Managerial Economics  
 Instructor: Dasgupta,Nandit  
 Enrollment: 44  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 478  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	446/1509	4.63	4.21	4.31	4.39	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	390/1509	4.63	4.21	4.26	4.26	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	392/1287	4.63	4.28	4.30	4.38	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	569/1459	4.44	4.07	4.22	4.32	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	238/1406	4.65	4.05	4.09	4.11	4.65
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	0	1	2	11	4.47	385/1384	4.47	3.99	4.11	4.23	4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	2	14	4.47	499/1489	4.47	4.31	4.17	4.18	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	6	10	3	3.84	1458/1506	3.84	4.54	4.67	4.67	3.84
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	4	1	11	4.44	424/1463	4.44	3.99	4.09	4.18	4.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	559/1438	4.68	4.53	4.46	4.50	4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	828/1421	4.79	4.70	4.73	4.76	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	532/1411	4.58	4.20	4.31	4.35	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	568/1405	4.58	4.29	4.32	4.34	4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	8	1	2	0	2	4	3.67	904/1236	3.67	3.77	4.00	4.03	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	415/1260	4.50	3.77	4.14	4.25	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	484/1255	4.63	3.89	4.33	4.46	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	535/1258	4.63	4.05	4.38	4.51	4.63
4. Were special techniques successful	11	5	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 873	****	3.69	4.03	4.26	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 9	Required for Majors 11	Graduate 0	Major 2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 6			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1	General 1	Under-grad 19	Non-major 17
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	5	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ECON 410 1  
 Title Topics In Fin Econ  
 Instructor: Rose,Morgan J  
 Enrollment: 40  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 479  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR NA		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	4	4	8	4.12	1032/1509	4.12	4.21	4.31	4.39	4.12
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	3	8	4.06	1049/1509	4.06	4.21	4.26	4.26	4.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	688/1287	4.35	4.28	4.30	4.38	4.35
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	553/1459	4.44	4.07	4.22	4.32	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	6	2	8	4.00	813/1406	4.00	4.05	4.09	4.11	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	225/1384	4.67	3.99	4.11	4.23	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	6	4	6	3.88	1120/1489	3.88	4.31	4.17	4.18	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	12	4	4.25	1258/1506	4.25	4.54	4.67	4.67	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	8	2	4.09	804/1463	4.09	3.99	4.09	4.18	4.09
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	348/1438	4.81	4.53	4.46	4.50	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	2	12	4.56	1115/1421	4.56	4.70	4.73	4.76	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	6	7	4.19	943/1411	4.19	4.20	4.31	4.35	4.19
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	0	4	10	4.38	788/1405	4.38	4.29	4.32	4.34	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	13	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1236	****	3.77	4.00	4.03	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/1260	****	3.77	4.14	4.25	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/1255	****	3.89	4.33	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/1258	****	4.05	4.38	4.51	****
4. Were special techniques successful	12	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 873	****	3.69	4.03	4.26	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	2.90	4.22	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.66	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.47	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.83	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.69	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	4.32	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.54	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.51	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.19	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.07	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	4.00	4.26	4.67	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.14	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.31	4.67	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.33	****

Course-Section: ECON 410 1  
 Title Topics In Fin Econ  
 Instructor: Rose, Morgan J  
 Enrollment: 40  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 479  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	3	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	16
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 415 1  
 Title Orgs,Incentives,Behavi  
 Instructor: Carroll,Kathlee  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 480  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	882/1509	4.25	4.21	4.31	4.39	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	3	5	3.92	1156/1509	3.92	4.21	4.26	4.26	3.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	2	5	3.92	1010/1287	3.92	4.28	4.30	4.38	3.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	1088/1459	3.91	4.07	4.22	4.32	3.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	502/1406	4.33	4.05	4.09	4.11	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	3	5	3.92	925/1384	3.92	3.99	4.11	4.23	3.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	3	7	4.25	760/1489	4.25	4.31	4.17	4.18	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	524/1506	4.92	4.54	4.67	4.67	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	0	3	2	3	3.67	1168/1463	3.67	3.99	4.09	4.18	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	588/1438	4.67	4.53	4.46	4.50	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	768/1421	4.82	4.70	4.73	4.76	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	1	5	5	4.08	1010/1411	4.08	4.20	4.31	4.35	4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	828/1405	4.33	4.29	4.32	4.34	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	1	1	3	0	1	2.83	1171/1236	2.83	3.77	4.00	4.03	2.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	908/1260	3.80	3.77	4.14	4.25	3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	904/1255	4.00	3.89	4.33	4.46	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	1054/1258	3.80	4.05	4.38	4.51	3.80
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 873	****	3.69	4.03	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.71	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	4.32	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ECON 421 1  
 Title Intro To Econometrics  
 Instructor: Ma,Bing  
 Enrollment: 39  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 481  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	3	8	10	4.33	800/1509	4.33	4.21	4.31	4.39	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	2	15	4.52	519/1509	4.52	4.21	4.26	4.26	4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	6	12	4.43	614/1287	4.43	4.28	4.30	4.38	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	2	1	6	11	4.30	715/1459	4.30	4.07	4.22	4.32	4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	5	0	0	5	3	7	4.13	711/1406	4.13	4.05	4.09	4.11	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	1	9	9	4.42	421/1384	4.42	3.99	4.11	4.23	4.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	1	3	6	9	4.21	802/1489	4.21	4.31	4.17	4.18	4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	11	8	4.42	1146/1506	4.42	4.54	4.67	4.67	4.42
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	500/1463	4.38	3.99	4.09	4.18	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	131/1438	4.95	4.53	4.46	4.50	4.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	322/1421	4.95	4.70	4.73	4.76	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	3	5	11	4.42	713/1411	4.42	4.20	4.31	4.35	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	7	11	4.53	615/1405	4.53	4.29	4.32	4.34	4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	11	2	1	3	0	2	2.88	1167/1236	2.88	3.77	4.00	4.03	2.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	272/1260	4.71	3.77	4.14	4.25	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	246/1255	4.86	3.89	4.33	4.46	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	468/1258	4.71	4.05	4.38	4.51	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	15	5	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 873	****	3.69	4.03	4.26	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	19
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	6	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR NA		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean		
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	4	7	12	4.25	882/1509	4.25	4.21	4.31	4.39	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	4	9	9	3.96	1117/1509	3.96	4.21	4.26	4.26	3.96
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	5	14	4.20	826/1287	4.20	4.28	4.30	4.38	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	8	11	4.04	951/1459	4.04	4.07	4.22	4.32	4.04
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	6	5	11	3.92	909/1406	3.92	4.05	4.09	4.11	3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	6	7	9	3.88	962/1384	3.88	3.99	4.11	4.23	3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	16	9	4.36	641/1489	4.36	4.31	4.17	4.18	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	466/1506	4.92	4.54	4.67	4.67	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	5	7	8	4.15	738/1463	4.15	3.99	4.09	4.18	4.15
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	11	13	4.48	826/1438	4.48	4.53	4.46	4.50	4.48
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	429/1421	4.92	4.70	4.73	4.76	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	4	8	10	4.08	1010/1411	4.08	4.20	4.31	4.35	4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	1	9	12	4.20	940/1405	4.20	4.29	4.32	4.34	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	2	2	6	10	4	3.50	984/1236	3.50	3.77	4.00	4.03	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	2	5	1	3	3.45	1068/1260	3.45	3.77	4.14	4.25	3.45
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	2	2	1	6	4.00	904/1255	4.00	3.89	4.33	4.46	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	749/1258	4.36	4.05	4.38	4.51	4.36
4. Were special techniques successful	14	3	1	1	1	1	4	3.75	610/ 873	3.75	3.69	4.03	4.26	3.75
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 198	****	2.90	4.22	4.37	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.83	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	4.32	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.54	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.51	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.19	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	4.00	4.26	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.31	4.67	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 11	Graduate 3	Major 11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 9			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C 8	General 1	Under-grad 22	Non-major 14
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 11	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 1			
				I 0	Other 1		



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	4	6	6	4.13	1021/1509	4.13	4.21	4.31	4.39	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	4	8	4.19	932/1509	4.19	4.21	4.26	4.26	4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	5	9	4.31	728/1287	4.31	4.28	4.30	4.38	4.31
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	6	7	4.13	894/1459	4.13	4.07	4.22	4.32	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	3	9	4.13	720/1406	4.13	4.05	4.09	4.11	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	5	7	4.13	734/1384	4.13	3.99	4.11	4.23	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	5	8	4.25	760/1489	4.25	4.31	4.17	4.18	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	1	14	4.75	845/1506	4.75	4.54	4.67	4.67	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	1	6	3	4.00	853/1463	4.00	3.99	4.09	4.18	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	852/1438	4.47	4.53	4.46	4.50	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	1	13	4.73	915/1421	4.73	4.70	4.73	4.76	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	3	2	2	8	4.00	1051/1411	4.00	4.20	4.31	4.35	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	4	8	4.13	980/1405	4.13	4.29	4.32	4.34	4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	3	1	3	2	5	3.36	1049/1236	3.36	3.77	4.00	4.03	3.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	415/1260	4.50	3.77	4.14	4.25	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	2	0	7	4.30	749/1255	4.30	3.89	4.33	4.46	4.30
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	620/1258	4.50	4.05	4.38	4.51	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	442/ 873	4.00	3.69	4.03	4.26	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.62	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	2.90	4.22	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.66	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.47	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.83	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.69	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	4.32	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.54	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.51	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.19	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.07	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 49	****	4.00	4.26	4.67	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.14	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.31	4.67	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.33	****



Course-Section: ECON 442 1  
 Title European Economic Hist  
 Instructor: Mitch,David F  
 Enrollment: 36  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 483  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	4	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	9
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 454 1  
 Title Econ:Educ/Human Capita  
 Instructor: Dickson,Lisa M  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 484  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	1	8	13	4.29	842/1509	4.29	4.21	4.31	4.39	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	6	11	4.08	1027/1509	4.08	4.21	4.26	4.26	4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	5	16	4.46	578/1287	4.46	4.28	4.30	4.38	4.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	1	4	5	11	4.24	792/1459	4.24	4.07	4.22	4.32	4.24
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	7	12	4.22	635/1406	4.22	4.05	4.09	4.11	4.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	4	15	4.25	619/1384	4.25	3.99	4.11	4.23	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	4	5	13	4.26	749/1489	4.26	4.31	4.17	4.18	4.26
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	21	2	4.09	1353/1506	4.09	4.54	4.67	4.67	4.09
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	3	7	5	4.13	762/1463	4.13	3.99	4.09	4.18	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	1	4	16	4.55	750/1438	4.55	4.53	4.46	4.50	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	1	4	17	4.57	1115/1421	4.57	4.70	4.73	4.76	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	4	16	4.64	456/1411	4.64	4.20	4.31	4.35	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	7	14	4.50	634/1405	4.50	4.29	4.32	4.34	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	11	3	1	2	2	3	3.09	1117/1236	3.09	3.77	4.00	4.03	3.09
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	2	3	1	7	4.00	746/1260	4.00	3.77	4.14	4.25	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	333/1255	4.77	3.89	4.33	4.46	4.77
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	189/1258	4.92	4.05	4.38	4.51	4.92
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	366/ 873	4.20	3.69	4.03	4.26	4.20
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.83	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.69	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	4.32	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ECON 467 1  
 Title Health Economics  
 Instructor: Goldfarb, M G  
 Enrollment: 45  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 485  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	2	3	10	13	4.21	921/1509	4.33	4.21	4.31	4.39	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	7	14	4.21	901/1509	4.43	4.21	4.26	4.26	4.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	9	13	4.21	811/1287	4.31	4.28	4.30	4.38	4.21
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	586/1459	4.25	4.07	4.22	4.32	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	9	7	9	3.92	909/1406	3.92	4.05	4.09	4.11	3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	17	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	599/1384	4.02	3.99	4.11	4.23	4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	6	18	4.43	569/1489	4.57	4.31	4.17	4.18	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	25	4.89	602/1506	4.95	4.54	4.67	4.67	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	0	6	10	5	3.82	1052/1463	3.83	3.99	4.09	4.18	3.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	3	3	19	4.64	617/1438	4.78	4.53	4.46	4.50	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	0	6	18	4.64	1037/1421	4.66	4.70	4.73	4.76	4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	0	2	6	15	4.42	725/1411	4.49	4.20	4.31	4.35	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	4	18	4.56	577/1405	4.64	4.29	4.32	4.34	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	18	2	0	0	1	3	3.50	****/1236	****	3.77	4.00	4.03	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	2	2	4	3	3.73	952/1260	3.39	3.77	4.14	4.25	3.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	2	0	5	1	3	3.27	1177/1255	2.96	3.89	4.33	4.46	3.27
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	2	0	2	2	4	3.60	1126/1258	3.39	4.05	4.38	4.51	3.60
4. Were special techniques successful	17	7	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 873	****	3.69	4.03	4.26	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 18	Graduate 0	Major 7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 14			
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C 4	General 2	Under-grad 28	Non-major 21
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	8	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 1			

Course-Section: ECON 467 2  
 Title Health Economics  
 Instructor: Goldfarb,M G  
 Enrollment: 33  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 486  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	3	0	5	17	4.44	673/1509	4.33	4.21	4.31	4.39	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	6	18	4.64	378/1509	4.43	4.21	4.26	4.26	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	7	14	4.40	638/1287	4.31	4.28	4.30	4.38	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	1	3	5	6	4.07	938/1459	4.25	4.07	4.22	4.32	4.07
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	2	8	11	3.92	909/1406	3.92	4.05	4.09	4.11	3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	2	2	2	3	8	3.76	1043/1384	4.02	3.99	4.11	4.23	3.76
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	7	18	4.72	224/1489	4.57	4.31	4.17	4.18	4.72
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1506	4.95	4.54	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	1	0	5	9	5	3.85	1021/1463	3.83	3.99	4.09	4.18	3.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	175/1438	4.78	4.53	4.46	4.50	4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	2	20	4.68	1002/1421	4.66	4.70	4.73	4.76	4.68
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	2	19	4.56	544/1411	4.49	4.20	4.31	4.35	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	20	4.72	393/1405	4.64	4.29	4.32	4.34	4.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	18	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	****/1236	****	3.77	4.00	4.03	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	4	3	3	2	5	3.06	1155/1260	3.39	3.77	4.14	4.25	3.06
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	8	1	2	1	5	2.65	1235/1255	2.96	3.89	4.33	4.46	2.65
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	5	1	2	2	6	3.19	1210/1258	3.39	4.05	4.38	4.51	3.19
4. Were special techniques successful	8	14	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 873	****	3.69	4.03	4.26	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	4.00	4.26	4.67	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.14	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.31	4.67	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	2	A 12	Required for Majors 11	Graduate 8	Major 4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 9			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 17	Non-major 21
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D 0			
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives 9	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 2		
				? 2			

Course-Section: ECON 472 1  
 Title Monetary Theory & Poli  
 Instructor: Carpenter, Rober  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 487  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	2	11	4.38	756/1509	4.38	4.21	4.31	4.39	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	2	9	4.27	849/1509	4.27	4.21	4.26	4.26	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	10	4.38	668/1287	4.38	4.28	4.30	4.38	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	454/1459	4.50	4.07	4.22	4.32	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	502/1406	4.33	4.05	4.09	4.11	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	677/1384	4.20	3.99	4.11	4.23	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	276/1489	4.67	4.31	4.17	4.18	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	11	4	4.19	1305/1506	4.19	4.54	4.67	4.67	4.19
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	648/1463	4.23	3.99	4.09	4.18	4.23
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	348/1438	4.81	4.53	4.46	4.50	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	376/1421	4.94	4.70	4.73	4.76	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	389/1411	4.69	4.20	4.31	4.35	4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	5	9	4.31	848/1405	4.31	4.29	4.32	4.34	4.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	193/1236	4.64	3.77	4.00	4.03	4.64
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	746/1260	4.00	3.77	4.14	4.25	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	575/1255	4.50	3.89	4.33	4.46	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	878/1258	4.14	4.05	4.38	4.51	4.14
4. Were special techniques successful	9	5	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 873	****	3.69	4.03	4.26	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 5	Graduate 1	Major 4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 5			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 2	General 1	Under-grad 15	Non-major 12
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D 0			
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 2			

Course-Section: ECON 475 1  
 Title Financial Invstmnt Ana  
 Instructor: Lamdin,Douglas  
 Enrollment: 39  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 488  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	8	15	4.46	648/1509	4.46	4.21	4.31	4.39	4.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	17	4.58	459/1509	4.58	4.21	4.26	4.26	4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	6	19	4.65	370/1287	4.65	4.28	4.30	4.38	4.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	6	16	4.52	432/1459	4.52	4.07	4.22	4.32	4.52
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	2	7	2	8	3.84	979/1406	3.84	4.05	4.09	4.11	3.84
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	1	7	6	6	3.71	1076/1384	3.71	3.99	4.11	4.23	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	8	16	4.54	422/1489	4.54	4.31	4.17	4.18	4.54
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	8	17	4.68	933/1506	4.68	4.54	4.67	4.67	4.68
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	3	9	10	4.32	567/1463	4.32	3.99	4.09	4.18	4.32
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	247/1438	4.88	4.53	4.46	4.50	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	22	4.84	691/1421	4.84	4.70	4.73	4.76	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	9	14	4.48	641/1411	4.48	4.20	4.31	4.35	4.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	1	4	17	4.50	634/1405	4.50	4.29	4.32	4.34	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	1	0	2	7	10	4.25	489/1236	4.25	3.77	4.00	4.03	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	1021/1260	3.57	3.77	4.14	4.25	3.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	1	0	1	4	0	3.33	****/1255	****	3.89	4.33	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	1	2	3	0	3.33	****/1258	****	4.05	4.38	4.51	****
4. Were special techniques successful	20	4	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 873	****	3.69	4.03	4.26	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 13	Required for Majors 21	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 12		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 5	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 26 Non-major 25
84-150	13	3.00-3.49 10	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 0	
			? 0		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank						
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	6	8	4.11	1044/1509	4.11	4.21	4.31	4.39	4.11	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	2	4	10	4.22	891/1509	4.22	4.21	4.26	4.26	4.22	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	658/1287	4.39	4.28	4.30	4.38	4.39	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	5	8	4	3.83	1143/1459	3.83	4.07	4.22	4.32	3.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	1	1	3	3	3	3.55	1162/1406	3.55	4.05	4.09	4.11	3.55	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	1	5	3	4	3.57	1159/1384	3.57	3.99	4.11	4.23	3.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	458/1489	4.50	4.31	4.17	4.18	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	820/1506	4.78	4.54	4.67	4.67	4.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	4	9	3	3.94	944/1463	3.94	3.99	4.09	4.18	3.94	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	588/1438	4.67	4.53	4.46	4.50	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	846/1421	4.78	4.70	4.73	4.76	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	7	4	8	4.05	1025/1411	4.05	4.20	4.31	4.35	4.05	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	6	10	4.32	848/1405	4.32	4.29	4.32	4.34	4.32	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	4	1	1	2	1	2.44	1203/1236	2.44	3.77	4.00	4.03	2.44	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	880/1260	3.88	3.77	4.14	4.25	3.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	1001/1255	3.89	3.89	4.33	4.46	3.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	932/1258	4.00	4.05	4.38	4.51	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	7	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 873	****	3.69	4.03	4.26	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.75	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	4.00	4.26	4.67	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	19	Non-major	18
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	7	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	0				
				?	1						

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	3	3	11	4.47	635/1509	4.47	4.21	4.31	4.39	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	1	4	10	4.29	817/1509	4.29	4.21	4.26	4.26	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	602/1287	4.44	4.28	4.30	4.38	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	454/1459	4.50	4.07	4.22	4.32	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	2	0	4	2	4	3.50	1178/1406	3.50	4.05	4.09	4.11	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	1	4	3	5	3.92	912/1384	3.92	3.99	4.11	4.23	3.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	0	3	12	4.47	499/1489	4.47	4.31	4.17	4.18	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	622/1506	4.88	4.54	4.67	4.67	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	0	6	7	4.36	523/1463	4.36	3.99	4.09	4.18	4.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	430/1438	4.76	4.53	4.46	4.50	4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	322/1421	4.94	4.70	4.73	4.76	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	442/1411	4.65	4.20	4.31	4.35	4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	432/1405	4.69	4.29	4.32	4.34	4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	11	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	984/1236	3.50	3.77	4.00	4.03	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	671/1260	4.18	3.77	4.14	4.25	4.18
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	278/1255	4.82	3.89	4.33	4.46	4.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	1	0	9	4.45	670/1258	4.45	4.05	4.38	4.51	4.45
4. Were special techniques successful	7	7	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	****/ 873	****	3.69	4.03	4.26	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.62	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	2.90	4.22	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.66	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.47	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.83	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.69	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	4.32	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.54	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.51	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.19	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.07	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	4.00	4.26	4.67	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.14	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.31	4.67	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.33	****



Course-Section: ECON 477 1  
 Title Derivative Securities  
 Instructor: Getter, Darryl E  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 490  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	16
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 481 1  
 Title International Trade Th  
 Instructor: Takacs,Wendy E  
 Enrollment: 40  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 491  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	7	5	6	3.94	1174/1509	3.94	4.21	4.31	4.39	3.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	6	6	4.00	1086/1509	4.00	4.21	4.26	4.26	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	8	3	7	3.94	981/1287	3.94	4.28	4.30	4.38	3.94
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	2	1	4	0	2	2.89	1443/1459	2.89	4.07	4.22	4.32	2.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	2	5	3	5	3.56	1155/1406	3.56	4.05	4.09	4.11	3.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	1	3	1	2	2	3.11	1311/1384	3.11	3.99	4.11	4.23	3.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	3	2	9	3.94	1058/1489	3.94	4.31	4.17	4.18	3.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	957/1506	4.65	4.54	4.67	4.67	4.65
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	690/1463	4.20	3.99	4.09	4.18	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	1001/1438	4.33	4.53	4.46	4.50	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	3	2	11	4.50	1162/1421	4.50	4.70	4.73	4.76	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	3	5	7	4.06	1020/1411	4.06	4.20	4.31	4.35	4.06
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	5	2	7	4.00	1047/1405	4.00	4.29	4.32	4.34	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	6	0	1	3	2	2	3.63	925/1236	3.63	3.77	4.00	4.03	3.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	908/1260	3.80	3.77	4.14	4.25	3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1104/1255	3.60	3.89	4.33	4.46	3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	1170/1258	3.40	4.05	4.38	4.51	3.40
4. Were special techniques successful	13	2	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 873	****	3.69	4.03	4.26	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 10	Graduate 0	Major 3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 6			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 4	General 1	Under-grad 18	Non-major 15
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 2			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR NA		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	9	8	4.20	942/1509	4.20	4.21	4.31	4.39	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	9	9	4.35	753/1509	4.35	4.21	4.26	4.26	4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	10	4.35	688/1287	4.35	4.28	4.30	4.38	4.35
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	3	5	7	4.27	759/1459	4.27	4.07	4.22	4.32	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	2	6	8	4.24	611/1406	4.24	4.05	4.09	4.11	4.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	479/1384	4.38	3.99	4.11	4.23	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	243/1489	4.70	4.31	4.17	4.18	4.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	925/1506	4.68	4.54	4.67	4.67	4.68
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	8	6	4.18	714/1463	4.18	3.99	4.09	4.18	4.18
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	603/1438	4.65	4.53	4.46	4.50	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	1049/1421	4.63	4.70	4.73	4.76	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	5	11	4.35	789/1411	4.35	4.20	4.31	4.35	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	615/1405	4.53	4.29	4.32	4.34	4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	545/1236	4.18	3.77	4.00	4.03	4.18
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	469/1260	4.44	3.77	4.14	4.25	4.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	868/1255	4.11	3.89	4.33	4.46	4.11
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	932/1258	4.00	4.05	4.38	4.51	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	152/ 873	4.67	3.69	4.03	4.26	4.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.62	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	2.90	4.22	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.66	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.47	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.83	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.69	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	4.32	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.54	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.51	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.19	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.07	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	4.00	4.26	4.67	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.14	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.31	4.67	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.33	****

Course-Section: ECON 482 1  
 Title International Finance  
 Instructor: Yuan, Chunming  
 Enrollment: 41  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 492  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	18
84-150	7	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	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 490 1  
 Title Analytic Methods In Ec  
 Instructor: Cinyabuguma,Mat  
 Enrollment: 41  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 493  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	5	6	9	3.95	1164/1509	3.95	4.21	4.31	4.39	3.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	7	9	4.09	1020/1509	4.09	4.21	4.26	4.26	4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	7	10	4.09	886/1287	4.09	4.28	4.30	4.38	4.09
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	3	2	2	7	3.73	1202/1459	3.73	4.07	4.22	4.32	3.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	1	4	2	7	4.07	761/1406	4.07	4.05	4.09	4.11	4.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	2	1	1	6	4.10	751/1384	4.10	3.99	4.11	4.23	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	6	3	9	3.73	1210/1489	3.73	4.31	4.17	4.18	3.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	15	7	4.32	1216/1506	4.32	4.54	4.67	4.67	4.32
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	6	7	2	3.63	1194/1463	3.63	3.99	4.09	4.18	3.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	1	7	11	4.29	1047/1438	4.29	4.53	4.46	4.50	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	2	1	5	13	4.38	1228/1421	4.38	4.70	4.73	4.76	4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	4	5	9	4.00	1051/1411	4.00	4.20	4.31	4.35	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	4	12	4.29	874/1405	4.29	4.29	4.32	4.34	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	12	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	274/1236	4.50	3.77	4.00	4.03	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	2	0	3	0	1	2.67	1226/1260	2.67	3.77	4.14	4.25	2.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	2	1	1	1	1	2.67	1235/1255	2.67	3.89	4.33	4.46	2.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	1	2	2	0	1	2.67	1246/1258	2.67	4.05	4.38	4.51	2.67
4. Were special techniques successful	17	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 873	****	3.69	4.03	4.26	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 12	Required for Majors 12	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3					
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	5	C 2	General	1	Under-grad	22	Non-major 20
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D 0					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		
				P 1					
				I 0	Other	2			
				? 0					

Course-Section: ECON 600 1  
 Title Policy Consq:Econ Anal  
 Instructor: Brennan,Timothy  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 494  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	8	12	4.39	734/1509	4.39	4.21	4.31	4.39	4.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	9	6	3.87	1189/1509	3.87	4.21	4.26	4.25	3.87
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	6	11	3	3.61	1134/1287	3.61	4.28	4.30	4.22	3.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	1	6	9	4	3.67	1238/1459	3.67	4.07	4.22	4.16	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	4	8	9	4.00	813/1406	4.00	4.05	4.09	4.12	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	0	6	3	7	3.88	954/1384	3.88	3.99	4.11	4.16	3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	3	4	6	8	3.65	1241/1489	3.65	4.31	4.17	4.14	3.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.54	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	3	10	4	3.94	931/1463	3.94	3.99	4.09	4.15	3.94
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	5	16	4.61	675/1438	4.61	4.53	4.46	4.49	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	269/1421	4.96	4.70	4.73	4.78	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	2	10	9	4.09	1010/1411	4.09	4.20	4.31	4.33	4.09
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	7	11	4.13	980/1405	4.13	4.29	4.32	4.33	4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	13	1	0	4	2	3	3.60	936/1236	3.60	3.77	4.00	3.98	3.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	4	1	4	5	6	3.40	1091/1260	3.40	3.77	4.14	4.21	3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	3	5	2	9	3.75	1054/1255	3.75	3.89	4.33	4.43	3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	2	5	3	9	3.85	1033/1258	3.85	4.05	4.38	4.50	3.85
4. Were special techniques successful	3	16	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 873	****	3.69	4.03	4.01	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	2	A 10	Required for Majors 18	Graduate 16	Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 12			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 7	Non-major 23
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	16	3.50-4.00	9	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 3		
				? 1			

Course-Section: ECON 601 1  
 Title Microeconomic Analysis  
 Instructor: Farrow, Robert S  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 495  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	4	12	4.75	303/1509	4.75	4.21	4.31	4.39	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	796/1509	4.31	4.21	4.26	4.25	4.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	5	6	4.00	924/1287	4.00	4.28	4.30	4.22	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	421/1459	4.53	4.07	4.22	4.16	4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	3	11	4.44	411/1406	4.44	4.05	4.09	4.12	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	5	9	4.38	479/1384	4.38	3.99	4.11	4.16	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	555/1489	4.44	4.31	4.17	4.14	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	642/1506	4.88	4.54	4.67	4.71	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	325/1463	4.50	3.99	4.09	4.15	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	153/1438	4.94	4.53	4.46	4.49	4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.70	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	701/1411	4.44	4.20	4.31	4.33	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	513/1405	4.63	4.29	4.32	4.33	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	199/1236	4.63	3.77	4.00	3.98	4.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	5	6	4.07	722/1260	4.07	3.77	4.14	4.21	4.07
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	2	5	6	4.14	851/1255	4.14	3.89	4.33	4.43	4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	521/1258	4.64	4.05	4.38	4.50	4.64
4. Were special techniques successful	2	10	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	845/ 873	2.75	3.69	4.03	4.01	2.75

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 3	A 4	Required for Majors 14	Graduate 6 Major 5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 11		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 10 Non-major 11
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 1		

Course-Section: ECON 611 1  
 Title Econometrics I  
 Instructor: Gindling JR,Tho  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 496  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	8	4.80	244/1509	4.80	4.21	4.31	4.39	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	699/1509	4.40	4.21	4.26	4.25	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	359/1287	4.67	4.28	4.30	4.22	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	454/1459	4.50	4.07	4.22	4.16	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	527/1406	4.30	4.05	4.09	4.12	4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	313/1384	4.56	3.99	4.11	4.16	4.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	341/1489	4.60	4.31	4.17	4.14	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	1070/1506	4.50	4.54	4.67	4.71	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	500/1463	4.38	3.99	4.09	4.15	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	363/1438	4.80	4.53	4.46	4.49	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	537/1421	4.90	4.70	4.73	4.78	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	738/1411	4.40	4.20	4.31	4.33	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	419/1405	4.70	4.29	4.32	4.33	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	512/1236	4.22	3.77	4.00	3.98	4.22
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	746/1260	4.00	3.77	4.14	4.21	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	647/1255	4.43	3.89	4.33	4.43	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	570/1258	4.57	4.05	4.38	4.50	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	4	5	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 873	****	3.69	4.03	4.01	****

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: ECON 801 15  
 Title Individual Study In Ec  
 Instructor: Ma,Bing  
 Enrollment: 1  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 497  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	0	1	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.21	4.31	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.21	4.26	4.25	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	979/1459	4.00	4.07	4.22	4.16	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	813/1406	4.00	4.05	4.09	4.12	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	986/1489	4.00	4.31	4.17	4.14	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.54	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1463	5.00	3.99	4.09	4.15	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	28/ 49	4.00	4.00	4.26	4.16	4.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 41	5.00	5.00	4.14	4.08	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 46	5.00	5.00	4.31	4.11	5.00

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