

Course-Section: ECON 101 0101  
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS  
 Instructor: MCCONNELL, VIRG  
 Enrollment: 41  
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 448  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	9	9	13	4.06	1065/1504	4.11	4.21	4.27	4.13	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	7	12	11	4.00	1052/1503	4.18	4.26	4.20	4.16	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	12	15	4.25	783/1290	4.32	4.39	4.28	4.19	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	1	2	11	9	4.22	821/1453	4.13	4.16	4.21	4.11	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	4	15	12	4.26	548/1421	3.94	3.90	4.00	3.91	4.26
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	1	1	4	10	6	3.86	928/1365	4.04	4.06	4.08	3.96	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	6	13	11	4.03	974/1485	4.29	4.32	4.16	4.13	4.03
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	29	3	4.09	1386/1504	4.38	4.53	4.69	4.66	4.09
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	2	5	11	5	3.83	1072/1483	3.93	4.07	4.06	3.97	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	1	15	12	4.23	1050/1425	4.54	4.58	4.41	4.36	4.23
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	3	5	22	4.63	1008/1426	4.63	4.67	4.69	4.56	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	3	10	15	4.27	838/1418	4.36	4.30	4.25	4.20	4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	6	9	15	4.30	829/1416	4.35	4.37	4.26	4.21	4.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	17	1	1	3	1	6	3.83	780/1199	3.91	3.90	3.97	3.82	3.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	310/1312	3.90	3.83	4.00	3.69	4.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	737/1303	4.09	4.12	4.24	3.93	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	798/1299	4.17	4.22	4.25	3.94	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	20	1	1	1	3	2	4	3.64	546/ 758	3.43	3.71	4.01	3.80	3.64
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	30	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.07	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.01	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	30	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	30	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	30	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	30	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: ECON 101 0101  
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS  
 Instructor: MCCONNELL, VIRG  
 Enrollment: 41  
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 448  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	10	C	10	General	3	Under-grad	32	Non-major	26
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	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	21				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 101 0201  
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS  
 Instructor: Mahmud, Ahmed  
 Enrollment: 36  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 449  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	0	5	5	3	3.64	1309/1504	4.11	4.21	4.27	4.13	3.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	3	7	4.07	1008/1503	4.18	4.26	4.20	4.16	4.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	615/1290	4.32	4.39	4.28	4.19	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	1136/1453	4.13	4.16	4.21	4.11	3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	745/1421	3.94	3.90	4.00	3.91	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	10	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1153/1365	4.04	4.06	4.08	3.96	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	806/1485	4.29	4.32	4.16	4.13	4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	525/1504	4.38	4.53	4.69	4.66	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	3	6	2	3.67	1170/1483	3.93	4.07	4.06	3.97	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	1	3	8	4.31	1002/1425	4.54	4.58	4.41	4.36	4.31
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	1104/1426	4.63	4.67	4.69	4.56	4.54
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	1	4	6	4.00	1013/1418	4.36	4.30	4.25	4.20	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	3	3	5	3.77	1162/1416	4.35	4.37	4.26	4.21	3.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	12	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1199	3.91	3.90	3.97	3.82	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	4	1	1	1	3	2.80	1200/1312	3.90	3.83	4.00	3.69	2.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	1	2	4	3	3.64	1086/1303	4.09	4.12	4.24	3.93	3.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	1	5	3	3.90	996/1299	4.17	4.22	4.25	3.94	3.90
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.07	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.64	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****

5. Were there enough proctors for all the students

14 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 16 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.51 5.00 \*\*\*\*

Course-Section: ECON 101 0201  
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS  
 Instructor: Mahmud, Ahmed  
 Enrollment: 36  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 449  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ECON 101 0301  
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS  
 Instructor: DASGUPTA, NANDI  
 Enrollment: 50  
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 450  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	3	3	9	20	4.22	927/1504	4.11	4.21	4.27	4.13	4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	12	20	4.42	633/1503	4.18	4.26	4.20	4.16	4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	26	4.61	400/1290	4.32	4.39	4.28	4.19	4.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	17	0	0	3	4	12	4.47	486/1453	4.13	4.16	4.21	4.11	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	14	1	4	4	3	10	3.77	957/1421	3.94	3.90	4.00	3.91	3.77
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	23	0	1	0	2	10	4.62	217/1365	4.04	4.06	4.08	3.96	4.62
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	5	6	25	4.56	402/1485	4.29	4.32	4.16	4.13	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	29	7	4.19	1314/1504	4.38	4.53	4.69	4.66	4.19
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	4	0	0	4	12	14	4.33	543/1483	3.93	4.07	4.06	3.97	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	8	26	4.71	492/1425	4.54	4.58	4.41	4.36	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	32	4.89	549/1426	4.63	4.67	4.69	4.56	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	10	22	4.50	578/1418	4.36	4.30	4.25	4.20	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	3	2	5	25	4.49	649/1416	4.35	4.37	4.26	4.21	4.49
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	22	2	0	2	2	8	4.00	636/1199	3.91	3.90	3.97	3.82	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	1	1	2	8	4.15	657/1312	3.90	3.83	4.00	3.69	4.15
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	1	0	1	2	8	4.33	737/1303	4.09	4.12	4.24	3.93	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	1	0	1	1	9	4.42	667/1299	4.17	4.22	4.25	3.94	4.42
4. Were special techniques successful	23	7	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	****/ 758	3.43	3.71	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.07	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.01	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: ECON 101 0301  
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS  
 Instructor: DASGUPTA, NANDI  
 Enrollment: 50  
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 450  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	5	C	4	General	4	Under-grad	36	Non-major	33
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	11	D	1						
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	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 101 0401  
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS  
 Instructor: DASGUPTA, NANDI  
 Enrollment: 43  
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 451  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	10	17	4.52	535/1504	4.11	4.21	4.27	4.13	4.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	22	4.72	248/1503	4.18	4.26	4.20	4.16	4.72
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	24	4.83	187/1290	4.32	4.39	4.28	4.19	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	16	1	0	1	4	7	4.23	798/1453	4.13	4.16	4.21	4.11	4.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	6	3	0	2	8	9	3.91	863/1421	3.94	3.90	4.00	3.91	3.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	19	1	0	0	4	4	4.11	717/1365	4.04	4.06	4.08	3.96	4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	3	4	21	4.64	309/1485	4.29	4.32	4.16	4.13	4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	20	8	4.29	1255/1504	4.38	4.53	4.69	4.66	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	195/1483	3.93	4.07	4.06	3.97	4.68
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	5	21	4.81	331/1425	4.54	4.58	4.41	4.36	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	2	23	4.85	643/1426	4.63	4.67	4.69	4.56	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	7	18	4.65	390/1418	4.36	4.30	4.25	4.20	4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	3	21	4.73	352/1416	4.35	4.37	4.26	4.21	4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	18	1	0	3	0	3	3.57	****/1199	3.91	3.90	3.97	3.82	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	814/1312	3.90	3.83	4.00	3.69	3.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	737/1303	4.09	4.12	4.24	3.93	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	0	1	3	1	4	3.89	1004/1299	4.17	4.22	4.25	3.94	3.89
4. Were special techniques successful	21	4	2	0	1	2	0	2.60	****/ 758	3.43	3.71	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.07	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.01	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	28	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	28	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	28	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	28	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: ECON 101 0401  
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS  
 Instructor: DASGUPTA, NANDI  
 Enrollment: 43  
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 451  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	5	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	30	Non-major	30
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	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	15				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 101 0501  
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS  
 Instructor: THOMAS, MARK S  
 Enrollment: 32  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 452  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	5	6	5	3.72	1280/1504	4.11	4.21	4.27	4.13	3.72
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	6	7	4.11	981/1503	4.18	4.26	4.20	4.16	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	3	10	4.28	766/1290	4.32	4.39	4.28	4.19	4.28
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	2	0	2	2	3.67	1229/1453	4.13	4.16	4.21	4.11	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	9	1	0	1	4	2	3.75	967/1421	3.94	3.90	4.00	3.91	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	10	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	1032/1365	4.04	4.06	4.08	3.96	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	4	4	8	4.00	990/1485	4.29	4.32	4.16	4.13	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1504	4.38	4.53	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	0	1	6	2	4.11	782/1483	3.93	4.07	4.06	3.97	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	420/1425	4.54	4.58	4.41	4.36	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	1155/1426	4.63	4.67	4.69	4.56	4.47
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	426/1418	4.36	4.30	4.25	4.20	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	675/1416	4.35	4.37	4.26	4.21	4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	10	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1199	3.91	3.90	3.97	3.82	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	845/1312	3.90	3.83	4.00	3.69	3.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	910/1303	4.09	4.12	4.24	3.93	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	869/1299	4.17	4.22	4.25	3.94	4.14
4. Were special techniques successful	11	4	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 758	3.43	3.71	4.01	3.80	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0	Major 2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B 8			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C 5	General 0	Under-grad 18	Non-major 16
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 10		
				? 1			

Course-Section: ECON 101 0601  
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS  
 Instructor: KAIKAI, ALPHA  
 Enrollment: 32  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 453  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	1	4	6	9	3.86	1214/1504	4.11	4.21	4.27	4.13	3.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	8	11	4.23	880/1503	4.18	4.26	4.20	4.16	4.23
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	5	4	10	3.91	1022/1290	4.32	4.39	4.28	4.19	3.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	1	1	4	2	6	3.79	1177/1453	4.13	4.16	4.21	4.11	3.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	8	2	10	3.91	863/1421	3.94	3.90	4.00	3.91	3.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	2	0	3	0	7	3.83	947/1365	4.04	4.06	4.08	3.96	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	3	15	4.41	591/1485	4.29	4.32	4.16	4.13	4.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	21	1	4.05	1400/1504	4.38	4.53	4.69	4.66	4.05
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	2	2	1	1	6	5	3.73	1135/1483	3.93	4.07	4.06	3.97	3.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	0	2	9	9	4.05	1150/1425	4.54	4.58	4.41	4.36	4.05
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	1	1	8	11	4.23	1280/1426	4.63	4.67	4.69	4.56	4.23
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	2	7	10	4.14	947/1418	4.36	4.30	4.25	4.20	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	2	5	13	4.23	896/1416	4.35	4.37	4.26	4.21	4.23
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	13	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	587/1199	3.91	3.90	3.97	3.82	4.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	290/1312	3.90	3.83	4.00	3.69	4.62
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	0	2	10	4.62	497/1303	4.09	4.12	4.24	3.93	4.62
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	263/1299	4.17	4.22	4.25	3.94	4.85
4. Were special techniques successful	11	7	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 758	3.43	3.71	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.07	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.01	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: ECON 101 0601  
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS  
 Instructor: KAIKAI, ALPHA  
 Enrollment: 32  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 453  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ECON 101 0701  
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS  
 Instructor: KAIKAI, ALPHA  
 Enrollment: 42  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 454  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	4	9	11	4.12	1038/1504	4.11	4.21	4.27	4.13	4.12
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	3	8	12	4.29	805/1503	4.18	4.26	4.20	4.16	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	1	8	14	4.32	721/1290	4.32	4.39	4.28	4.19	4.32
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	4	6	6	4.13	924/1453	4.13	4.16	4.21	4.11	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	3	10	10	4.21	587/1421	3.94	3.90	4.00	3.91	4.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	9	0	0	4	3	7	4.21	625/1365	4.04	4.06	4.08	3.96	4.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	3	7	13	4.33	670/1485	4.29	4.32	4.16	4.13	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	18	5	4.17	1337/1504	4.38	4.53	4.69	4.66	4.17
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	4	13	1	3.83	1061/1483	3.93	4.07	4.06	3.97	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	6	15	4.57	712/1425	4.54	4.58	4.41	4.36	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	1	5	16	4.57	1081/1426	4.63	4.67	4.69	4.56	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	4	6	12	4.26	838/1418	4.36	4.30	4.25	4.20	4.26
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	4	5	14	4.43	714/1416	4.35	4.37	4.26	4.21	4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	8	0	0	4	4	5	4.08	610/1199	3.91	3.90	3.97	3.82	4.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	483/1312	3.90	3.83	4.00	3.69	4.39
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	3	3	11	4.33	737/1303	4.09	4.12	4.24	3.93	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	537/1299	4.17	4.22	4.25	3.94	4.56
4. Were special techniques successful	9	9	0	1	3	0	4	3.88	478/ 758	3.43	3.71	4.01	3.80	3.88

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	1	B	9						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	26	Non-major	25
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	8	D	1						
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	9				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 101 0801  
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS  
 Instructor: CARROLL, KATHLE  
 Enrollment: 38  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 455  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	5	10	8	4.04	1074/1504	4.11	4.21	4.27	4.13	4.04
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	8	10	4.04	1027/1503	4.18	4.26	4.20	4.16	4.04
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	4	16	4.33	711/1290	4.32	4.39	4.28	4.19	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	0	2	6	8	4.18	867/1453	4.13	4.16	4.21	4.11	4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	7	12	4.21	587/1421	3.94	3.90	4.00	3.91	4.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	1	3	2	9	4.27	569/1365	4.04	4.06	4.08	3.96	4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	5	6	10	3.96	1038/1485	4.29	4.32	4.16	4.13	3.96
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	329/1504	4.38	4.53	4.69	4.66	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	1	5	9	5	3.76	1117/1483	3.93	4.07	4.06	3.97	3.76
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	2	19	4.77	384/1425	4.54	4.58	4.41	4.36	4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	596/1426	4.63	4.67	4.69	4.56	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	2	8	10	4.14	955/1418	4.36	4.30	4.25	4.20	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	1	1	1	16	4.18	929/1416	4.35	4.37	4.26	4.21	4.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	15	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	771/1199	3.91	3.90	3.97	3.82	3.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	3	1	3	5	3	3.27	1090/1312	3.90	3.83	4.00	3.69	3.27
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	2	1	3	5	3	3.43	1135/1303	4.09	4.12	4.24	3.93	3.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	2	2	2	4	4	3.43	1133/1299	4.17	4.22	4.25	3.94	3.43
4. Were special techniques successful	10	5	2	0	5	2	0	2.78	721/ 758	3.43	3.71	4.01	3.80	2.78
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.07	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	General	1	Under-grad	24	Non-major	22
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	2						
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	10
?	1		

Course-Section: ECON 101 0901  
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS  
 Instructor: Francis, Johann  
 Enrollment: 40  
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 456  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	6	14	9	4.03	1078/1504	4.11	4.21	4.27	4.13	4.03
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	15	7	3.93	1110/1503	4.18	4.26	4.20	4.16	3.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	12	10	4.03	924/1290	4.32	4.39	4.28	4.19	4.03
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	3	5	4	4	3.56	1264/1453	4.13	4.16	4.21	4.11	3.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	4	6	9	10	3.86	895/1421	3.94	3.90	4.00	3.91	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	13	2	0	5	7	3	3.53	1143/1365	4.04	4.06	4.08	3.96	3.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	7	8	14	4.17	866/1485	4.29	4.32	4.16	4.13	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	5	22	3	3.93	1441/1504	4.38	4.53	4.69	4.66	3.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	1	12	9	1	3.43	1263/1483	3.93	4.07	4.06	3.97	3.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	3	12	13	4.28	1022/1425	4.54	4.58	4.41	4.36	4.28
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	4	13	12	4.28	1260/1426	4.63	4.67	4.69	4.56	4.28
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	5	9	14	4.24	857/1418	4.36	4.30	4.25	4.20	4.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	11	14	4.34	799/1416	4.35	4.37	4.26	4.21	4.34
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	20	3	0	2	0	2	2.71	****/1199	3.91	3.90	3.97	3.82	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	3	9	2	2	3.19	1112/1312	3.90	3.83	4.00	3.69	3.19
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	1	11	1	2	3.13	1188/1303	4.09	4.12	4.24	3.93	3.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	1	10	2	3	3.44	1129/1299	4.17	4.22	4.25	3.94	3.44
4. Were special techniques successful	14	13	0	2	1	0	0	2.33	****/ 758	3.43	3.71	4.01	3.80	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	2	B	14						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	9	General	0	Under-grad	30	Non-major	29
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	7	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	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 101 1001  
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS  
 Instructor: Francis, Johann  
 Enrollment: 32  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 457  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	7	15	4.42	669/1504	4.11	4.21	4.27	4.13	4.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	8	14	4.38	678/1503	4.18	4.26	4.20	4.16	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	7	15	4.38	661/1290	4.32	4.39	4.28	4.19	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	1	2	5	11	4.37	643/1453	4.13	4.16	4.21	4.11	4.37
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	3	1	3	5	11	3.87	895/1421	3.94	3.90	4.00	3.91	3.87
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	1	2	4	3	8	3.83	947/1365	4.04	4.06	4.08	3.96	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	5	7	14	4.35	659/1485	4.29	4.32	4.16	4.13	4.35
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	21	4	4.12	1376/1504	4.38	4.53	4.69	4.66	4.12
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	5	10	7	3.96	919/1483	3.93	4.07	4.06	3.97	3.96
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	9	17	4.65	587/1425	4.54	4.58	4.41	4.36	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	5	21	4.81	738/1426	4.63	4.67	4.69	4.56	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	8	16	4.54	539/1418	4.36	4.30	4.25	4.20	4.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	20	4.65	459/1416	4.35	4.37	4.26	4.21	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	14	2	1	2	1	5	3.55	905/1199	3.91	3.90	3.97	3.82	3.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	5	3	10	4.11	689/1312	3.90	3.83	4.00	3.69	4.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	2	6	11	4.47	596/1303	4.09	4.12	4.24	3.93	4.47
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	474/1299	4.17	4.22	4.25	3.94	4.63
4. Were special techniques successful	7	13	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	****/ 758	3.43	3.71	4.01	3.80	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1	B	13						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General	6	Under-grad	26	Non-major	26
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	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	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 101 1101  
 Title PRIN OF MICROECONOMICS  
 Instructor: Mahmud, Ahmed  
 Enrollment: 38  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 458  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	495/1504	4.11	4.21	4.27	4.13	4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	2	3.82	1178/1503	4.18	4.26	4.20	4.16	3.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	4	4.09	898/1290	4.32	4.39	4.28	4.19	4.09
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1453	4.13	4.16	4.21	4.11	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	3	2	2	3.63	1043/1421	3.94	3.90	4.00	3.91	3.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1365	4.04	4.06	4.08	3.96	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	412/1485	4.29	4.32	4.16	4.13	4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	1130/1504	4.38	4.53	4.69	4.66	4.45
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1041/1483	3.93	4.07	4.06	3.97	3.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	384/1425	4.54	4.58	4.41	4.36	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	790/1426	4.63	4.67	4.69	4.56	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	514/1418	4.36	4.30	4.25	4.20	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	3	5	4.22	896/1416	4.35	4.37	4.26	4.21	4.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1199	3.91	3.90	3.97	3.82	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	716/1312	3.90	3.83	4.00	3.69	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	675/1303	4.09	4.12	4.24	3.93	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	678/1299	4.17	4.22	4.25	3.94	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 758	3.43	3.71	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.07	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ECON 102 0101  
 Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS  
 Instructor: THOMAS, MARK S  
 Enrollment: 36  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 459  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	1	0	1	1	4	6	3	3.60	1322/1504	4.17	4.21	4.27	4.13	3.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	8	3	3.87	1154/1503	4.35	4.26	4.20	4.16	3.87
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	8	4	4.00	937/1290	4.46	4.39	4.28	4.19	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	2	1	3	4	2	3.25	1366/1453	4.06	4.16	4.21	4.11	3.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	2	1	3	1	1	2.75	1368/1421	3.61	3.90	4.00	3.91	2.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	3	2	3	3	1	2.75	1329/1365	3.79	4.06	4.08	3.96	2.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	8	3	3.93	1057/1485	4.27	4.32	4.16	4.13	3.93
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	12	3	4.20	1314/1504	4.35	4.53	4.69	4.66	4.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	4	7	2	3.71	1147/1483	3.93	4.07	4.06	3.97	3.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	5	8	4.33	971/1425	4.67	4.58	4.41	4.36	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	1232/1426	4.55	4.67	4.69	4.56	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	4	6	4	3.87	1115/1418	4.39	4.30	4.25	4.20	3.87
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	5	3	7	4.13	969/1416	4.44	4.37	4.26	4.21	4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	1	1	5	2	1	3.10	1042/1199	3.90	3.90	3.97	3.82	3.10
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	1	1	2	0	2.80	1200/1312	3.69	3.83	4.00	3.69	2.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	2	0	1	1	1	2.80	1228/1303	3.86	4.12	4.24	3.93	2.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1092/1299	4.19	4.22	4.25	3.94	3.60
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 758	3.73	3.71	4.01	3.80	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	3	Under-grad	16	Non-major	15
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 102 0201  
 Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS  
 Instructor: THOMAS, MARK S  
 Enrollment: 41  
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 460  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean					
	NR	NA	1	2						3	4	5	Mean	Rank
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	2	6	11	9	3.96	1132/1504	4.17	4.21	4.27	4.13	3.96
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	12	11	4.21	891/1503	4.35	4.26	4.20	4.16	4.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	8	16	4.43	615/1290	4.46	4.39	4.28	4.19	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	2	1	6	13	4	3.62	1249/1453	4.06	4.16	4.21	4.11	3.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	9	5	3	4	2	4	2.83	1353/1421	3.61	3.90	4.00	3.91	2.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	0	7	13	4	3.65	1072/1365	3.79	4.06	4.08	3.96	3.65
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	7	7	12	4.00	990/1485	4.27	4.32	4.16	4.13	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	17	9	4.35	1214/1504	4.35	4.53	4.69	4.66	4.35
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	6	14	2	3.74	1135/1483	3.93	4.07	4.06	3.97	3.74
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	5	21	4.74	438/1425	4.67	4.58	4.41	4.36	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	7	18	4.59	1057/1426	4.55	4.67	4.69	4.56	4.59
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	15	9	4.22	877/1418	4.39	4.30	4.25	4.20	4.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	11	13	4.33	806/1416	4.44	4.37	4.26	4.21	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	9	2	3	5	6	2	3.17	1027/1199	3.90	3.90	3.97	3.82	3.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	3	4	2	2	3.27	1087/1312	3.69	3.83	4.00	3.69	3.27
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	6	3	2	3.64	1086/1303	3.86	4.12	4.24	3.93	3.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	4	3	4	4.00	922/1299	4.19	4.22	4.25	3.94	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	18	8	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 758	3.73	3.71	4.01	3.80	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.88	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	B	9						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	29	Non-major	25
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	7	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	19				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 102 0301  
 Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS  
 Instructor: THOMAS, MARK S  
 Enrollment: 33  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 461  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	6	4	7	3.79	1253/1504	4.17	4.21	4.27	4.13	3.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	8	5	3.89	1140/1503	4.35	4.26	4.20	4.16	3.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	3	3	10	4.11	887/1290	4.46	4.39	4.28	4.19	4.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	1	4	5	6	3.82	1155/1453	4.06	4.16	4.21	4.11	3.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	3	2	2	1	6	3.36	1198/1421	3.61	3.90	4.00	3.91	3.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	7	3	5	3.44	1181/1365	3.79	4.06	4.08	3.96	3.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	6	2	7	3.53	1276/1485	4.27	4.32	4.16	4.13	3.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	18	0	4.00	1411/1504	4.35	4.53	4.69	4.66	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	2	1	2	2	6	1	3.33	1302/1483	3.93	4.07	4.06	3.97	3.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	3	12	4.42	876/1425	4.67	4.58	4.41	4.36	4.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	2	5	11	4.37	1217/1426	4.55	4.67	4.69	4.56	4.37
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	4	5	8	3.95	1064/1418	4.39	4.30	4.25	4.20	3.95
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	8	8	4.16	953/1416	4.44	4.37	4.26	4.21	4.16
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	1	0	4	2	4	3.73	835/1199	3.90	3.90	3.97	3.82	3.73
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	3	3	2	4	0	2.58	1235/1312	3.69	3.83	4.00	3.69	2.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	6	1	3	0	2	2.25	1262/1303	3.86	4.12	4.24	3.93	2.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	2	1	3	0	5	3.45	1123/1299	4.19	4.22	4.25	3.94	3.45
4. Were special techniques successful	7	11	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 758	3.73	3.71	4.01	3.80	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 102 0401  
 Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS  
 Instructor: PALMATEER, JASO  
 Enrollment: 38  
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 462  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	9	10	12	4.10	1052/1504	4.17	4.21	4.27	4.13	4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	13	16	4.45	572/1503	4.35	4.26	4.20	4.16	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	6	6	17	4.19	832/1290	4.46	4.39	4.28	4.19	4.19
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	3	6	5	13	3.93	1083/1453	4.06	4.16	4.21	4.11	3.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	0	10	7	8	3.70	991/1421	3.61	3.90	4.00	3.91	3.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	6	6	4	4	9	3.14	1278/1365	3.79	4.06	4.08	3.96	3.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	7	20	4.48	482/1485	4.27	4.32	4.16	4.13	4.48
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	6	21	3	3.81	1461/1504	4.35	4.53	4.69	4.66	3.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	0	9	6	6	3.86	1041/1483	3.93	4.07	4.06	3.97	3.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	5	24	4.77	402/1425	4.67	4.58	4.41	4.36	4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	9	20	4.69	940/1426	4.55	4.67	4.69	4.56	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	4	6	19	4.52	565/1418	4.39	4.30	4.25	4.20	4.52
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	5	7	15	4.21	913/1416	4.44	4.37	4.26	4.21	4.21
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	1	2	2	5	14	4.21	536/1199	3.90	3.90	3.97	3.82	4.21
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	2	2	5	2	6	3.47	1023/1312	3.69	3.83	4.00	3.69	3.47
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	2	1	2	2	10	4.00	910/1303	3.86	4.12	4.24	3.93	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	4	3	10	4.35	723/1299	4.19	4.22	4.25	3.94	4.35
4. Were special techniques successful	14	10	2	1	0	2	2	3.14	****/ 758	3.73	3.71	4.01	3.80	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	1	B	13						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C	5	General	4	Under-grad	31	Non-major	29
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 102 0501  
 Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS  
 Instructor: PALMATEER, JASO  
 Enrollment: 37  
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 463  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	15	16	4.34	775/1504	4.17	4.21	4.27	4.13	4.34
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	12	21	4.51	483/1503	4.35	4.26	4.20	4.16	4.51
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	10	22	4.54	469/1290	4.46	4.39	4.28	4.19	4.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	1	6	7	14	4.10	947/1453	4.06	4.16	4.21	4.11	4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	3	1	12	14	4.13	660/1421	3.61	3.90	4.00	3.91	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	3	1	7	4	10	3.68	1052/1365	3.79	4.06	4.08	3.96	3.68
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	9	23	4.57	380/1485	4.27	4.32	4.16	4.13	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	15	15	3	3.59	1475/1504	4.35	4.53	4.69	4.66	3.59
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	0	2	14	10	4.31	580/1483	3.93	4.07	4.06	3.97	4.31
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	31	4.89	209/1425	4.67	4.58	4.41	4.36	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	6	29	4.83	690/1426	4.55	4.67	4.69	4.56	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	8	27	4.77	233/1418	4.39	4.30	4.25	4.20	4.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	11	22	4.62	511/1416	4.44	4.37	4.26	4.21	4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	1	4	7	18	4.40	369/1199	3.90	3.90	3.97	3.82	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	2	5	10	4.28	579/1312	3.69	3.83	4.00	3.69	4.28
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	1	0	2	2	13	4.44	630/1303	3.86	4.12	4.24	3.93	4.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	1	2	0	15	4.61	494/1299	4.19	4.22	4.25	3.94	4.61
4. Were special techniques successful	17	8	2	2	1	1	4	3.30	638/ 758	3.73	3.71	4.01	3.80	3.30
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	33	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	33	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.07	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	33	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	33	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.01	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	33	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	33	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	33	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	33	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	33	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	33	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	33	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	33	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	33	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	33	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	33	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	33	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	33	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	33	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: ECON 102 0501  
 Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS  
 Instructor: PALMATEER, JASO  
 Enrollment: 37  
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 463  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	1	B	13						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	6	C	9	General	2	Under-grad	35	Non-major	32
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	23				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 102 0601  
 Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS  
 Instructor: GINDLING, THOMA  
 Enrollment: 38  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 464  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	10	14	4.46	609/1504	4.17	4.21	4.27	4.13	4.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	10	16	4.62	368/1503	4.35	4.26	4.20	4.16	4.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	7	19	4.73	270/1290	4.46	4.39	4.28	4.19	4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	363/1453	4.06	4.16	4.21	4.11	4.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	4	5	6	8	3.56	1078/1421	3.61	3.90	4.00	3.91	3.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	6	1	0	1	9	7	4.17	672/1365	3.79	4.06	4.08	3.96	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	0	2	5	17	4.48	482/1485	4.27	4.32	4.16	4.13	4.48
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	10	14	4.58	1041/1504	4.35	4.53	4.69	4.66	4.58
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	5	9	8	4.14	762/1483	3.93	4.07	4.06	3.97	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	21	4.84	270/1425	4.67	4.58	4.41	4.36	4.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	5	20	4.73	860/1426	4.55	4.67	4.69	4.56	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	9	15	4.50	578/1418	4.39	4.30	4.25	4.20	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	10	16	4.62	511/1416	4.44	4.37	4.26	4.21	4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	16	2	0	2	2	3	3.44	946/1199	3.90	3.90	3.97	3.82	3.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	1	1	2	3	3.63	966/1312	3.69	3.83	4.00	3.69	3.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	796/1303	3.86	4.12	4.24	3.93	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	705/1299	4.19	4.22	4.25	3.94	4.38
4. Were special techniques successful	18	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	3.73	3.71	4.01	3.80	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	1	A	4	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	6	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	27	Non-major	25
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	11	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	16				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					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	3	0	0	1	4	17	16	4.26	876/1504	4.17	4.21	4.27	4.13	4.26
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	2	12	24	4.58	414/1503	4.35	4.26	4.20	4.16	4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	12	26	4.68	322/1290	4.46	4.39	4.28	4.19	4.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	15	0	2	0	5	16	4.52	418/1453	4.06	4.16	4.21	4.11	4.52
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	5	3	2	5	7	16	3.94	827/1421	3.61	3.90	4.00	3.91	3.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	26	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	407/1365	3.79	4.06	4.08	3.96	4.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	1	1	10	26	4.61	349/1485	4.27	4.32	4.16	4.13	4.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	4	34	4.89	674/1504	4.35	4.53	4.69	4.66	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	25	5	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	850/1483	3.93	4.07	4.06	3.97	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	25	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	712/1425	4.67	4.58	4.41	4.36	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	27	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	1284/1426	4.55	4.67	4.69	4.56	4.24
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	26	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	539/1418	4.39	4.30	4.25	4.20	4.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	2	1	3	8	4.21	904/1416	4.44	4.37	4.26	4.21	4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	23	15	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1199	3.90	3.90	3.97	3.82	4.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	2	0	0	3	14	4.42	444/1312	3.69	3.83	4.00	3.69	4.42
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	1	0	2	3	11	4.35	719/1303	3.86	4.12	4.24	3.93	4.35
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	0	1	3	2	12	4.39	696/1299	4.19	4.22	4.25	3.94	4.39
4. Were special techniques successful	22	15	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/ 758	3.73	3.71	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.07	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.24	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	3.83	****
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	40	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	A 21	Required for Majors	5
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	B 12		Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	3
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 41
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
#### - Means there are not enough					

P 0  
I 0  
? 1

Other

24

responses to be significant

Course-Section: ECON 102 0701  
 Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 50  
 Questionnaires: 41

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 466  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	3	0	0	1	4	17	16	4.26	876/1504	4.17	4.21	4.27	4.13	4.26
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	2	12	24	4.58	414/1503	4.35	4.26	4.20	4.16	4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	12	26	4.68	322/1290	4.46	4.39	4.28	4.19	4.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	15	0	2	0	5	16	4.52	418/1453	4.06	4.16	4.21	4.11	4.52
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	5	3	2	5	7	16	3.94	827/1421	3.61	3.90	4.00	3.91	3.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	26	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	407/1365	3.79	4.06	4.08	3.96	4.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	1	1	10	26	4.61	349/1485	4.27	4.32	4.16	4.13	4.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	4	34	4.89	674/1504	4.35	4.53	4.69	4.66	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	1	6	12	13	4.16	741/1483	3.93	4.07	4.06	3.97	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	3	8	19	4.53	748/1425	4.67	4.58	4.41	4.36	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	1	5	9	15	4.27	1264/1426	4.55	4.67	4.69	4.56	4.24
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	1	1	9	20	4.55	526/1418	4.39	4.30	4.25	4.20	4.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	3	27	4.84	221/1416	4.44	4.37	4.26	4.21	4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	16	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	386/1199	3.90	3.90	3.97	3.82	4.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	2	0	0	3	14	4.42	444/1312	3.69	3.83	4.00	3.69	4.42
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	1	0	2	3	11	4.35	719/1303	3.86	4.12	4.24	3.93	4.35
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	0	1	3	2	12	4.39	696/1299	4.19	4.22	4.25	3.94	4.39
4. Were special techniques successful	22	15	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/ 758	3.73	3.71	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.07	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.24	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	3.83	****
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	40	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	A 21	Required for Majors	5
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	B 12		Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	3
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 41
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
#### - Means there are not enough					

P 0  
I 0  
? 1

Other

24

responses to be significant

Course-Section: ECON 102 0801  
 Title PRIN OF MACROECONOMICS  
 Instructor: Deverirman, Emm  
 Enrollment: 34  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 467  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	284/1504	4.17	4.21	4.27	4.13	4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	556/1503	4.35	4.26	4.20	4.16	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	270/1290	4.46	4.39	4.28	4.19	4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	810/1453	4.06	4.16	4.21	4.11	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	532/1421	3.61	3.90	4.00	3.91	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	420/1365	3.79	4.06	4.08	3.96	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	830/1485	4.27	4.32	4.16	4.13	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	726/1504	4.35	4.53	4.69	4.66	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	2	7	4	4.15	741/1483	3.93	4.07	4.06	3.97	4.15
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	125/1425	4.67	4.58	4.41	4.36	4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	351/1426	4.55	4.67	4.69	4.56	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	450/1418	4.39	4.30	4.25	4.20	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	187/1416	4.44	4.37	4.26	4.21	4.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	139/1199	3.90	3.90	3.97	3.82	4.73
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	530/1312	3.69	3.83	4.00	3.69	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	450/1303	3.86	4.12	4.24	3.93	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	570/1299	4.19	4.22	4.25	3.94	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	343/ 758	3.73	3.71	4.01	3.80	4.17

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	14	Non-major	15
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ECON 121 0101  
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I  
 Instructor: ST MARTIN, JEAN  
 Enrollment: 41  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 468  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	4	18	4.67	357/1504	4.50	4.21	4.27	4.13	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	21	4.83	151/1503	4.64	4.26	4.20	4.16	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	180/1290	4.65	4.39	4.28	4.19	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	418/1453	4.42	4.16	4.21	4.11	4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	1	5	8	7	4.00	745/1421	4.13	3.90	4.00	3.91	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	0	2	6	11	4.30	525/1365	4.31	4.06	4.08	3.96	4.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	88/1485	4.71	4.32	4.16	4.13	4.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	0	23	4.92	591/1504	4.93	4.53	4.69	4.66	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	258/1483	4.41	4.07	4.06	3.97	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1425	4.82	4.58	4.41	4.36	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1426	4.87	4.67	4.69	4.56	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	1	20	4.78	219/1418	4.62	4.30	4.25	4.20	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	127/1416	4.61	4.37	4.26	4.21	4.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	16	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	****/1199	3.90	3.90	3.97	3.82	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	4	3	10	4.35	512/1312	4.24	3.83	4.00	3.69	4.35
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	518/1303	4.50	4.12	4.24	3.93	4.59
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	2	5	9	4.24	810/1299	4.45	4.22	4.25	3.94	4.24
4. Were special techniques successful	7	15	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 758	3.00	3.71	4.01	3.80	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	8	General	1	Under-grad	25	Non-major	21
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	8	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	21				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 121 0201  
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I  
 Instructor: ST MARTIN, JEAN  
 Enrollment: 42  
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 469  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	2	1	0	6	20	4.41	684/1504	4.50	4.21	4.27	4.13	4.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	1	5	22	4.66	324/1503	4.64	4.26	4.20	4.16	4.66
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	1	7	20	4.59	431/1290	4.65	4.39	4.28	4.19	4.59
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	4	0	1	0	10	14	4.48	470/1453	4.42	4.16	4.21	4.11	4.48
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	2	5	8	11	3.96	792/1421	4.13	3.90	4.00	3.91	3.96
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	7	1	0	1	7	12	4.38	441/1365	4.31	4.06	4.08	3.96	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	7	21	4.69	270/1485	4.71	4.32	4.16	4.13	4.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/1504	4.93	4.53	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	1	9	15	4.56	290/1483	4.41	4.07	4.06	3.97	4.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	5	22	4.69	541/1425	4.82	4.58	4.41	4.36	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	26	4.90	525/1426	4.87	4.67	4.69	4.56	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	1	6	21	4.59	475/1418	4.62	4.30	4.25	4.20	4.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	1	6	20	4.45	701/1416	4.61	4.37	4.26	4.21	4.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	18	1	0	0	3	7	4.36	403/1199	3.90	3.90	3.97	3.82	4.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	1	4	5	4.09	691/1312	4.24	3.83	4.00	3.69	4.09
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	288/1303	4.50	4.12	4.24	3.93	4.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	474/1299	4.45	4.22	4.25	3.94	4.64
4. Were special techniques successful	20	5	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	****/ 758	3.00	3.71	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.07	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	1
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	B 15		Graduate 0
56-83	12	2.00-2.99	C 6	General	3
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 1		Under-grad 31
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	3
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1	Other	23
				#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	

Course-Section: ECON 121 0301  
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I  
 Instructor: ST MARTIN, JEAN  
 Enrollment: 50  
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 470  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	7	24	4.59	442/1504	4.50	4.21	4.27	4.13	4.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	6	24	4.64	346/1503	4.64	4.26	4.20	4.16	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	6	25	4.64	378/1290	4.65	4.39	4.28	4.19	4.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	0	3	7	17	4.39	606/1453	4.42	4.16	4.21	4.11	4.39
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	1	7	4	15	4.11	679/1421	4.13	3.90	4.00	3.91	4.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	11	0	0	3	4	15	4.55	267/1365	4.31	4.06	4.08	3.96	4.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	4	3	25	4.58	380/1485	4.71	4.32	4.16	4.13	4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	0	33	4.88	691/1504	4.93	4.53	4.69	4.66	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	2	8	16	4.54	314/1483	4.41	4.07	4.06	3.97	4.54
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	32	4.94	107/1425	4.82	4.58	4.41	4.36	4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	33	4.97	151/1426	4.87	4.67	4.69	4.56	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	0	0	6	26	4.59	475/1418	4.62	4.30	4.25	4.20	4.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	1	31	4.79	268/1416	4.61	4.37	4.26	4.21	4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	21	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	429/1199	3.90	3.90	3.97	3.82	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	208/1312	4.24	3.83	4.00	3.69	4.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	227/1303	4.50	4.12	4.24	3.93	4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	375/1299	4.45	4.22	4.25	3.94	4.73
4. Were special techniques successful	19	11	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	****/ 758	3.00	3.71	4.01	3.80	****
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	33	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	1	B	14						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	4	C	5	General	3	Under-grad	34	Non-major	33
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	13	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	25				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ECON 121 0401  
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING I  
 Instructor: COLE, RICHARD  
 Enrollment: 41  
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 471  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	4	10	18	4.33	788/1504	4.50	4.21	4.27	4.13	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	8	20	4.42	618/1503	4.64	4.26	4.20	4.16	4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	10	21	4.55	469/1290	4.65	4.39	4.28	4.19	4.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	0	5	6	16	4.29	741/1453	4.42	4.16	4.21	4.11	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	12	19	4.45	365/1421	4.13	3.90	4.00	3.91	4.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	2	2	10	9	4.00	782/1365	4.31	4.06	4.08	3.96	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	5	25	4.67	290/1485	4.71	4.32	4.16	4.13	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	31	4.94	460/1504	4.93	4.53	4.69	4.66	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	7	11	6	3.96	919/1483	4.41	4.07	4.06	3.97	3.96
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	5	25	4.67	572/1425	4.82	4.58	4.41	4.36	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	8	23	4.61	1050/1426	4.87	4.67	4.69	4.56	4.61
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	10	20	4.52	565/1418	4.62	4.30	4.25	4.20	4.52
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	3	7	20	4.30	829/1416	4.61	4.37	4.26	4.21	4.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	20	3	0	5	2	2	3.00	1050/1199	3.90	3.90	3.97	3.82	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	2	4	5	9	3.77	892/1312	4.24	3.83	4.00	3.69	3.77
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	2	0	6	7	6	3.71	1059/1303	4.50	4.12	4.24	3.93	3.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	5	7	9	4.19	834/1299	4.45	4.22	4.25	3.94	4.19
4. Were special techniques successful	12	12	4	0	0	2	3	3.00	680/ 758	3.00	3.71	4.01	3.80	3.00
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.07	****
Field Work														
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	31	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A 6	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0	Major 1
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	1	B 14			
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	7	C 8	General 0	Under-grad 33	Non-major 32
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	8	D 1			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 29		



Course-Section: ECON 122 0201  
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING II  
 Instructor: GERKIN, ELIZABE  
 Enrollment: 42  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 472  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	2	2	8	5	3.94	1153/1504	4.03	4.21	4.27	4.13	3.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	8	6	4.12	981/1503	4.14	4.26	4.20	4.16	4.12
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	9	7	4.35	691/1290	4.30	4.39	4.28	4.19	4.35
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	0	3	3	3	3.70	1214/1453	3.66	4.16	4.21	4.11	3.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	5	6	4	3.75	967/1421	3.92	3.90	4.00	3.91	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	3	2	3	3	3.55	1133/1365	3.64	4.06	4.08	3.96	3.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	5	8	4.24	784/1485	4.38	4.32	4.16	4.13	4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	691/1504	4.50	4.53	4.69	4.66	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	10	4	0	3.20	1340/1483	3.49	4.07	4.06	3.97	3.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	5	6	6	4.06	1147/1425	4.11	4.58	4.41	4.36	4.06
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	7	7	4.25	1268/1426	4.25	4.67	4.69	4.56	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	5	7	4	3.82	1132/1418	3.95	4.30	4.25	4.20	3.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	6	4	5	3.65	1205/1416	3.90	4.37	4.26	4.21	3.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	9	1	3	1	1	2	3.00	1050/1199	3.07	3.90	3.97	3.82	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	1	0	2	2	3.50	1011/1312	3.50	3.83	4.00	3.69	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	563/1303	4.50	4.12	4.24	3.93	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	855/1299	4.17	4.22	4.25	3.94	4.17
4. Were special techniques successful	11	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 758	****	3.71	4.01	3.80	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 122 0401  
 Title PRIN OF ACCOUNTING II  
 Instructor: GERKIN, ELIZABE  
 Enrollment: 39  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 473  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	5	9	10	4.12	1029/1504	4.03	4.21	4.27	4.13	4.12
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	10	10	4.17	937/1503	4.14	4.26	4.20	4.16	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	2	7	14	4.24	800/1290	4.30	4.39	4.28	4.19	4.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	3	6	4	7	3.62	1249/1453	3.66	4.16	4.21	4.11	3.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	2	1	8	10	4.09	685/1421	3.92	3.90	4.00	3.91	4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	2	5	5	9	3.74	1018/1365	3.64	4.06	4.08	3.96	3.74
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	0	6	17	4.52	433/1485	4.38	4.32	4.16	4.13	4.52
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	20	4	4.12	1368/1504	4.50	4.53	4.69	4.66	4.12
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	5	13	3	3.77	1111/1483	3.49	4.07	4.06	3.97	3.77
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	2	10	11	4.16	1094/1425	4.11	4.58	4.41	4.36	4.16
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	3	9	12	4.24	1276/1426	4.25	4.67	4.69	4.56	4.24
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	1	11	10	4.08	987/1418	3.95	4.30	4.25	4.20	4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	3	7	13	4.16	945/1416	3.90	4.37	4.26	4.21	4.16
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	10	2	2	6	0	4	3.14	1032/1199	3.07	3.90	3.97	3.82	3.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	1	1	3	0	3.00	****/1312	3.50	3.83	4.00	3.69	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	2	3	1	0	2.83	****/1303	4.50	4.12	4.24	3.93	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	1	2	3	0	3.33	****/1299	4.17	4.22	4.25	3.94	****
4. Were special techniques successful	19	3	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 758	****	3.71	4.01	3.80	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	7	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	25	Non-major	22
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	25				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 301 0101  
 Title INTERMED ACCOUNTING I  
 Instructor: CROTEAU, MARCIA  
 Enrollment: 32  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 474  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	10	8	4.37	750/1504	4.37	4.21	4.27	4.27	4.37
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	11	4.53	472/1503	4.53	4.26	4.20	4.22	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	9	10	4.53	488/1290	4.53	4.39	4.28	4.31	4.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	8	6	3.95	1062/1453	3.95	4.16	4.21	4.23	3.95
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	479/1421	4.33	3.90	4.00	4.01	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	8	6	3.94	854/1365	3.94	4.06	4.08	4.08	3.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	180/1485	4.78	4.32	4.16	4.17	4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	394/1504	4.94	4.53	4.69	4.65	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	10	5	4.33	543/1483	4.33	4.07	4.06	4.08	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	456/1425	4.74	4.58	4.41	4.43	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	643/1426	4.84	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	656/1418	4.44	4.30	4.25	4.26	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	574/1416	4.56	4.37	4.26	4.27	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	0	1	2	7	2	3.83	780/1199	3.83	3.90	3.97	4.02	3.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	137/1312	4.86	3.83	4.00	4.09	4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	248/1303	4.86	4.12	4.24	4.27	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	780/1299	4.29	4.22	4.25	4.30	4.29
4. Were special techniques successful	12	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	****	3.71	4.01	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	5	C	4	General	2	Under-grad	19	Non-major	17
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	8	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	16				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 302 0101  
 Title INTERMED ACCOUNTING II  
 Instructor: CROTEAU, MARCIA  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 475  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course		Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect				
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4					5	Mean	Rank	Mean
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	5	14	4.39	712/1504	4.39	4.21	4.27	4.27	4.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	6	13	4.35	736/1503	4.35	4.26	4.20	4.22	4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	7	14	4.59	421/1290	4.59	4.39	4.28	4.31	4.59
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	9	9	4.09	957/1453	4.09	4.16	4.21	4.23	4.09
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	6	14	4.48	347/1421	4.48	3.90	4.00	4.01	4.48
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	4	9	7	3.83	954/1365	3.83	4.06	4.08	4.08	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	88/1485	4.91	4.32	4.16	4.17	4.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	329/1504	4.96	4.53	4.69	4.65	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	1	1	0	8	7	4.12	782/1483	4.12	4.07	4.06	4.08	4.12
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	18	4.74	456/1425	4.74	4.58	4.41	4.43	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	596/1426	4.87	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	8	13	4.43	669/1418	4.43	4.30	4.25	4.26	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	2	4	13	4.45	701/1416	4.45	4.37	4.26	4.27	4.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	0	1	3	3	10	4.29	463/1199	4.29	3.90	3.97	4.02	4.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	0	2	5	2	3.45	1031/1312	3.45	3.83	4.00	4.09	3.45
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	2	4	1	4	3.64	1086/1303	3.64	4.12	4.24	4.27	3.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	0	4	0	5	3.80	1038/1299	3.80	4.22	4.25	4.30	3.80
4. Were special techniques successful	12	7	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	****/ 758	****	3.71	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.14	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	3	Under-grad	23	Non-major	21
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 311 0101  
 Title INTERM MICROECON ANALY  
 Instructor: BRADLEY, MICHAEL  
 Enrollment: 38  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 476  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	1	2	7	6	3.78	1257/1504	4.00	4.21	4.27	4.27	3.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	9	5	4.00	1052/1503	4.13	4.26	4.20	4.22	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	2	10	4.11	887/1290	4.30	4.39	4.28	4.31	4.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	680/1453	4.03	4.16	4.21	4.23	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	1	3	2	8	3.81	935/1421	3.87	3.90	4.00	4.01	3.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	11	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1065/1365	3.83	4.06	4.08	4.08	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	4	10	4.35	648/1485	4.41	4.32	4.16	4.17	4.35
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1504	4.51	4.53	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	1	6	4	3	3.47	1250/1483	3.88	4.07	4.06	4.08	3.47
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	7	9	4.39	920/1425	4.57	4.58	4.41	4.43	4.39
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	667/1426	4.65	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	0	5	6	5	3.67	1201/1418	4.02	4.30	4.25	4.26	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	3	5	7	3.78	1158/1416	4.26	4.37	4.26	4.27	3.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	11	3	0	0	0	3	3.00	1050/1199	3.81	3.90	3.97	4.02	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	5	1	2	2	4	2.93	1178/1312	3.95	3.83	4.00	4.09	2.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	1	2	4	6	3.93	975/1303	4.29	4.12	4.24	4.27	3.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	4	3	6	4.00	922/1299	4.33	4.22	4.25	4.30	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	12	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 758	****	3.71	4.01	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	4	C	6	General	1	Under-grad	18	Non-major	14
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	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	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 311 0201  
 Title INTERM MICROECON ANALY  
 Instructor: BRADLEY, MICHAEL  
 Enrollment: 35  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 477  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	4	3	4	3.62	1318/1504	4.00	4.21	4.27	4.27	3.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	1	4	4	3.54	1294/1503	4.13	4.26	4.20	4.22	3.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	3	5	4.00	937/1290	4.30	4.39	4.28	4.31	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1229/1453	4.03	4.16	4.21	4.23	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	3	4	2	3.25	1239/1421	3.87	3.90	4.00	4.01	3.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1365	3.83	4.06	4.08	4.08	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	738/1485	4.41	4.32	4.16	4.17	4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	0	11	4.75	891/1504	4.51	4.53	4.69	4.65	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	1041/1483	3.88	4.07	4.06	4.08	3.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	688/1425	4.57	4.58	4.41	4.43	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	1065/1426	4.65	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	2	3	5	3.92	1089/1418	4.02	4.30	4.25	4.26	3.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	806/1416	4.26	4.37	4.26	4.27	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	0	0	5	1	0	3.17	1027/1199	3.81	3.90	3.97	4.02	3.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1312	3.95	3.83	4.00	4.09	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1303	4.29	4.12	4.24	4.27	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1299	4.33	4.22	4.25	4.30	****
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 758	****	3.71	4.01	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	1	Under-grad	13	Non-major	12
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 311 0301  
 Title INTERM MICROECON ANALY  
 Instructor: LORD, WILLIAM  
 Enrollment: 35  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 478  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	889/1504	4.00	4.21	4.27	4.27	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	495/1503	4.13	4.26	4.20	4.22	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	431/1290	4.30	4.39	4.28	4.31	4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	775/1453	4.03	4.16	4.21	4.23	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	365/1421	3.87	3.90	4.00	4.01	4.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	782/1365	3.83	4.06	4.08	4.08	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	455/1485	4.41	4.32	4.16	4.17	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	2	4.17	1337/1504	4.51	4.53	4.69	4.65	4.17
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	710/1483	3.88	4.07	4.06	4.08	4.18
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	665/1425	4.57	4.58	4.41	4.43	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	1128/1426	4.65	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	905/1418	4.02	4.30	4.25	4.26	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	623/1416	4.26	4.37	4.26	4.27	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	271/1199	3.81	3.90	3.97	4.02	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	632/1312	3.95	3.83	4.00	4.09	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	833/1303	4.29	4.12	4.24	4.27	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	504/1299	4.33	4.22	4.25	4.30	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 758	****	3.71	4.01	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	10
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 311 0401  
 Title INTERM MICROECON ANALY  
 Instructor: LORD, WILLIAM  
 Enrollment: 42  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 479  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	10	10	4.36	750/1504	4.00	4.21	4.27	4.27	4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	11	11	4.50	495/1503	4.13	4.26	4.20	4.22	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	8	13	4.50	507/1290	4.30	4.39	4.28	4.31	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	15	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	1136/1453	4.03	4.16	4.21	4.23	3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	2	4	6	7	3.95	815/1421	3.87	3.90	4.00	4.01	3.95
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	17	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1365	3.83	4.06	4.08	4.08	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	5	15	4.50	455/1485	4.41	4.32	4.16	4.17	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	16	5	4.14	1360/1504	4.51	4.53	4.69	4.65	4.14
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	2	14	2	4.00	850/1483	3.88	4.07	4.06	4.08	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	492/1425	4.57	4.58	4.41	4.43	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	926/1426	4.65	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	12	8	4.29	818/1418	4.02	4.30	4.25	4.26	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	8	11	4.43	727/1416	4.26	4.37	4.26	4.27	4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	236/1199	3.81	3.90	3.97	4.02	4.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	221/1312	3.95	3.83	4.00	4.09	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	356/1303	4.29	4.12	4.24	4.27	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	705/1299	4.33	4.22	4.25	4.30	4.38
4. Were special techniques successful	14	7	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 758	****	3.71	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.20	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.13	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	3	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	17
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	9	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	19				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 312 0101  
 Title INTERM MACROECON ANALY  
 Instructor: NG, HOCK-GUAN  
 Enrollment: 34  
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 480  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	7	20	4.57	469/1504	4.31	4.21	4.27	4.27	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	5	22	4.57	426/1503	4.40	4.26	4.20	4.22	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	23	4.67	344/1290	4.37	4.39	4.28	4.31	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	2	4	21	4.61	331/1453	4.33	4.16	4.21	4.23	4.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	3	1	3	18	4.31	509/1421	4.13	3.90	4.00	4.01	4.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	1	2	2	19	4.63	211/1365	4.41	4.06	4.08	4.08	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	2	25	4.70	260/1485	4.31	4.32	4.16	4.17	4.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	5.00	1/1504	4.64	4.53	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	10	15	4.54	314/1483	4.19	4.07	4.06	4.08	4.54
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	26	4.90	194/1425	4.74	4.58	4.41	4.43	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	6	21	4.66	981/1426	4.70	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.66
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	3	22	4.74	275/1418	4.49	4.30	4.25	4.26	4.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	5	22	4.69	420/1416	4.48	4.37	4.26	4.27	4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	16	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	247/1199	4.14	3.90	3.97	4.02	4.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	3	2	3	0	12	3.80	877/1312	3.74	3.83	4.00	4.09	3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	1	5	1	13	4.14	863/1303	3.98	4.12	4.24	4.27	4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	3	5	12	4.29	780/1299	4.32	4.22	4.25	4.30	4.29
4. Were special techniques successful	9	18	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 758	****	3.71	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	28	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	28	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	28	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****

3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	28	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	28	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	28	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

Course-Section: ECON 312 0101  
 Title INTERM MACROECON ANALY  
 Instructor: NG, HOCK-GUAN  
 Enrollment: 34  
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 480  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	11	2.00-2.99	10	C	6	General	5	Under-grad	30	Non-major	19
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	9	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	23				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 312 0201  
 Title INTERM MACROECON ANALY  
 Instructor: NG, HOCK-GUAN  
 Enrollment: 36  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 481  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies						Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	6	5	16	4.37	737/1504	4.31	4.21	4.27	4.27	4.37
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	19	4.59	391/1503	4.40	4.26	4.20	4.22	4.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	2	20	4.48	534/1290	4.37	4.39	4.28	4.31	4.48
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	5	19	4.72	222/1453	4.33	4.16	4.21	4.23	4.72
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	4	3	17	4.44	374/1421	4.13	3.90	4.00	4.01	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	4	2	19	4.50	297/1365	4.41	4.06	4.08	4.08	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	2	2	22	4.77	190/1485	4.31	4.32	4.16	4.17	4.77
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/1504	4.64	4.53	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	4	7	13	4.38	493/1483	4.19	4.07	4.06	4.08	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	25	4.96	72/1425	4.74	4.58	4.41	4.43	4.96
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	2	3	20	4.58	1073/1426	4.70	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	3	21	4.69	342/1418	4.49	4.30	4.25	4.26	4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	1	21	4.65	459/1416	4.48	4.37	4.26	4.27	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	9	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	102/1199	4.14	3.90	3.97	4.02	4.81
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	3	13	4.59	310/1312	3.74	3.83	4.00	4.09	4.59
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	431/1303	3.98	4.12	4.24	4.27	4.69
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	233/1299	4.32	4.22	4.25	4.30	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	11	14	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 758	****	3.71	4.01	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	2	B	9						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	5	C	9	General	6	Under-grad	27	Non-major	17
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 312 0301  
 Title INTERM MACROECON ANALY  
 Instructor: CARPENTER, ROBE  
 Enrollment: 41  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 482  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	2	9	14	4.26	889/1504	4.31	4.21	4.27	4.27	4.26
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	14	10	4.22	880/1503	4.40	4.26	4.20	4.22	4.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	6	15	4.26	783/1290	4.37	4.39	4.28	4.31	4.26
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	17	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	1104/1453	4.33	4.16	4.21	4.23	3.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	1	9	14	4.31	509/1421	4.13	3.90	4.00	4.01	4.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	22	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/1365	4.41	4.06	4.08	4.08	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	4	6	10	6	3.69	1210/1485	4.31	4.32	4.16	4.17	3.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	22	3	4.08	1392/1504	4.64	4.53	4.69	4.65	4.08
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	5	11	4	3.95	919/1483	4.19	4.07	4.06	4.08	3.95
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	5	18	4.54	748/1425	4.74	4.58	4.41	4.43	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	4	20	4.69	926/1426	4.70	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	8	14	4.38	727/1418	4.49	4.30	4.25	4.26	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	2	5	16	4.23	887/1416	4.48	4.37	4.26	4.27	4.23
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	12	2	2	4	3	2	3.08	1044/1199	4.14	3.90	3.97	4.02	3.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	2	0	4	2	3	3.36	1062/1312	3.74	3.83	4.00	4.09	3.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	1	1	4	0	5	3.64	1086/1303	3.98	4.12	4.24	4.27	3.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	2	0	2	0	7	3.91	996/1299	4.32	4.22	4.25	4.30	3.91
4. Were special techniques successful	16	9	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 758	****	3.71	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****

3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

Course-Section: ECON 312 0301  
 Title INTERM MACROECON ANALY  
 Instructor: CARPENTER, ROBE  
 Enrollment: 41  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 482  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	13	General	1	Under-grad	27	Non-major	20
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	7	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	24				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 312 0401  
 Title INTERM MACROECON ANALY  
 Instructor: TAKACS, WENDY E  
 Enrollment: 46  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 483  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	6	7	9	4.04	1074/1504	4.31	4.21	4.27	4.27	4.04
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	3	6	12	4.22	891/1503	4.40	4.26	4.20	4.22	4.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	3	9	9	4.09	902/1290	4.37	4.39	4.28	4.31	4.09
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	14	0	2	0	2	5	4.11	935/1453	4.33	4.16	4.21	4.23	4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	2	1	6	6	4	3.47	1131/1421	4.13	3.90	4.00	4.01	3.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	14	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	717/1365	4.41	4.06	4.08	4.08	4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	2	7	11	4.09	948/1485	4.31	4.32	4.16	4.17	4.09
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	12	11	4.48	1112/1504	4.64	4.53	4.69	4.65	4.48
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	1	0	6	3	7	3.88	1009/1483	4.19	4.07	4.06	4.08	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	7	13	4.57	700/1425	4.74	4.58	4.41	4.43	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	620/1426	4.70	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	5	4	11	4.14	947/1418	4.49	4.30	4.25	4.26	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	3	3	13	4.35	791/1416	4.48	4.37	4.26	4.27	4.35
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	16	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1199	4.14	3.90	3.97	4.02	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	2	1	0	4	3.22	1102/1312	3.74	3.83	4.00	4.09	3.22
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	2	1	1	1	4	3.44	1131/1303	3.98	4.12	4.24	4.27	3.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	816/1299	4.32	4.22	4.25	4.30	4.22
4. Were special techniques successful	15	6	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 758	****	3.71	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****

3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

Course-Section: ECON 312 0401  
 Title INTERM MACROECON ANALY  
 Instructor: TAKACS, WENDY E  
 Enrollment: 46  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 483  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	5	C	5	General	1	Under-grad	24	Non-major	22
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	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	20				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 320 0101  
 Title QUANT MTHDS:MANAGEMENT  
 Instructor: PALMATEER, JASO  
 Enrollment: 37  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 484  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	367/1504	4.42	4.21	4.27	4.27	4.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	2	15	4.60	380/1503	4.52	4.26	4.20	4.22	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	356/1290	4.54	4.39	4.28	4.31	4.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	3	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	418/1453	4.66	4.16	4.21	4.23	4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	1	1	4	2	8	3.94	827/1421	3.70	3.90	4.00	4.01	3.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	4	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	252/1365	4.50	4.06	4.08	4.08	4.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	1	17	4.75	200/1485	4.66	4.32	4.16	4.17	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	2	1	3	8	6	3.75	1467/1504	3.94	4.53	4.69	4.65	3.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	2	9	6	4.11	782/1483	4.13	4.07	4.06	4.08	4.11
-----														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	1	3	13	4.56	724/1425	4.68	4.58	4.41	4.43	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	967/1426	4.73	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	514/1418	4.48	4.30	4.25	4.26	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	2	12	4.53	603/1416	4.43	4.37	4.26	4.27	4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	1	2	3	11	4.41	359/1199	4.46	3.90	3.97	4.02	4.41
-----														
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/1312	4.00	3.83	4.00	4.09	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/1303	4.20	4.12	4.24	4.27	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	****/1299	4.60	4.22	4.25	4.30	****
4. Were special techniques successful	18	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 758	****	3.71	4.01	4.00	****
-----														
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.14	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	20
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 320 0201  
 Title QUANT MTHDS:MANAGEMENT  
 Instructor: PALMATEER, JASO  
 Enrollment: 40  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 485  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	1	8	6	4.19	972/1504	4.42	4.21	4.27	4.27	4.19
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	602/1503	4.52	4.26	4.20	4.22	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	601/1290	4.54	4.39	4.28	4.31	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	172/1453	4.66	4.16	4.21	4.23	4.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	2	2	2	2	5	3.46	1137/1421	3.70	3.90	4.00	4.01	3.46
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	0	5	8	4.43	395/1365	4.50	4.06	4.08	4.08	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	2	12	4.56	391/1485	4.66	4.32	4.16	4.17	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	14	2	4.13	1368/1504	3.94	4.53	4.69	4.65	4.13
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	6	5	4.14	751/1483	4.13	4.07	4.06	4.08	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	331/1425	4.68	4.58	4.41	4.43	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	738/1426	4.73	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	709/1418	4.48	4.30	4.25	4.26	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	806/1416	4.43	4.37	4.26	4.27	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	271/1199	4.46	3.90	3.97	4.02	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	716/1312	4.00	3.83	4.00	4.09	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	833/1303	4.20	4.12	4.24	4.27	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	504/1299	4.60	4.22	4.25	4.30	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 758	****	3.71	4.01	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	17	Non-major	14
84-150	13	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	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 374 0101  
 Title FUND FINANCIAL MGMT  
 Instructor: LAMDIN, DOUGLAS  
 Enrollment: 71  
 Questionnaires: 51

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 486  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	0	5	15	29	4.35	763/1504	4.35	4.21	4.27	4.27	4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	3	12	33	4.50	495/1503	4.50	4.26	4.20	4.22	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	0	8	40	4.70	311/1290	4.70	4.39	4.28	4.31	4.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	2	2	5	9	30	4.31	705/1453	4.31	4.16	4.21	4.23	4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	8	7	4	9	8	13	3.39	1179/1421	3.39	3.90	4.00	4.01	3.39
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	13	4	4	4	7	18	3.84	947/1365	3.84	4.06	4.08	4.08	3.84
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	5	7	36	4.54	412/1485	4.54	4.32	4.16	4.17	4.54
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	27	22	4.45	1138/1504	4.45	4.53	4.69	4.65	4.45
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	0	0	2	3	18	15	4.21	679/1483	4.21	4.07	4.06	4.08	4.21
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	7	40	4.74	456/1425	4.74	4.58	4.41	4.43	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	3	6	40	4.68	954/1426	4.68	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.68
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	2	2	11	32	4.48	617/1418	4.48	4.30	4.25	4.26	4.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	2	11	33	4.49	649/1416	4.49	4.37	4.26	4.27	4.49
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	8	4	2	5	7	22	4.03	628/1199	4.03	3.90	3.97	4.02	4.03
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	30	0	2	3	1	4	11	3.90	814/1312	3.90	3.83	4.00	4.09	3.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	30	0	3	1	1	4	12	4.00	910/1303	4.00	4.12	4.24	4.27	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	30	0	0	2	4	4	11	4.14	869/1299	4.14	4.22	4.25	4.30	4.14
4. Were special techniques successful	30	9	1	1	4	1	5	3.67	****/ 758	****	3.71	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

Course-Section: ECON 374 0101  
 Title FUND FINANCIAL MGMT  
 Instructor: LAMDIN, DOUGLAS  
 Enrollment: 71  
 Questionnaires: 51

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 486  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	28	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	15						
56-83	11	2.00-2.99	7	C	4	General	3	Under-grad	51	Non-major	47
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	13	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	42				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 385 0101  
 Title ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT  
 Instructor: GINDLING, THOMA  
 Enrollment: 38  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 487  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course		Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect				
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	7	13	4.65	367/1504	4.65	4.21	4.27	4.27	4.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	6	13	4.55	437/1503	4.55	4.26	4.20	4.22	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	311/1290	4.70	4.39	4.28	4.31	4.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	2	2	5	9	4.17	878/1453	4.17	4.16	4.21	4.23	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	7	3	5	3.37	1193/1421	3.37	3.90	4.00	4.01	3.37
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	5	4	9	4.05	754/1365	4.05	4.06	4.08	4.08	4.05
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	170/1485	4.79	4.32	4.16	4.17	4.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	10	9	4.47	1112/1504	4.47	4.53	4.69	4.65	4.47
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	12	7	4.37	506/1483	4.37	4.07	4.06	4.08	4.37
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	331/1425	4.80	4.58	4.41	4.43	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	620/1426	4.85	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	191/1418	4.80	4.30	4.25	4.26	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	209/1416	4.84	4.37	4.26	4.27	4.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	14	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	636/1199	4.00	3.90	3.97	4.02	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	2	0	4	3.86	845/1312	3.86	3.83	4.00	4.09	3.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	1012/1303	3.86	4.12	4.24	4.27	3.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	656/1299	4.43	4.22	4.25	4.30	4.43
4. Were special techniques successful	13	5	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 758	****	3.71	4.01	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	6	C	1	General	3	Under-grad	20	Non-major	19
84-150	14	3.00-3.49	6	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	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 405 0101  
 Title BENEFIT-COST EVALUATIO  
 Instructor: GOLDFARB, MARSH (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 49  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 488  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	1	1	5	0	2	3.11	1439/1504	3.11	4.21	4.27	4.33	3.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	2	2	3	1	3.11	1405/1503	3.11	4.26	4.20	4.18	3.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	937/1290	4.00	4.39	4.28	4.32	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	2	1	4	1	3.50	1282/1453	3.50	4.16	4.21	4.22	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	2	0	3	2	0	1	2.83	1353/1421	2.83	3.90	4.00	4.02	2.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	3	1	2	1	3.14	1275/1365	3.14	4.06	4.08	4.09	3.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	3	3	1	1	0	2.00	1477/1485	2.00	4.32	4.16	4.14	2.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	8	0	0	3.00	1493/1504	3.00	4.53	4.69	4.73	3.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	543/1483	4.07	4.07	4.06	4.11	4.07
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	784/1425	4.42	4.58	4.41	4.38	4.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	1232/1426	4.54	4.67	4.69	4.72	4.54
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	709/1418	4.20	4.30	4.25	4.25	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	921/1416	4.10	4.37	4.26	4.26	4.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	3	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1199	****	3.90	3.97	4.05	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	1224/1312	2.67	3.83	4.00	4.07	2.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1153/1303	3.33	4.12	4.24	4.34	3.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	1239/1299	2.67	4.22	4.25	4.38	2.67
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 758	****	3.71	4.01	4.17	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ECON 405 0101  
 Title BENEFIT-COST EVALUATIO  
 Instructor: DASGUPTA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 49  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 489  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	1	1	5	0	2	3.11	1439/1504	3.11	4.21	4.27	4.33	3.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	2	2	3	1	3.11	1405/1503	3.11	4.26	4.20	4.18	3.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	937/1290	4.00	4.39	4.28	4.32	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	2	1	4	1	3.50	1282/1453	3.50	4.16	4.21	4.22	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	2	0	3	2	0	1	2.83	1353/1421	2.83	3.90	4.00	4.02	2.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	3	1	2	1	3.14	1275/1365	3.14	4.06	4.08	4.09	3.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	3	3	1	1	0	2.00	1477/1485	2.00	4.32	4.16	4.14	2.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	8	0	0	3.00	1493/1504	3.00	4.53	4.69	4.73	3.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1093/1483	4.07	4.07	4.06	4.11	4.07
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	971/1425	4.42	4.58	4.41	4.38	4.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	825/1426	4.54	4.67	4.69	4.72	4.54
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	1013/1418	4.20	4.30	4.25	4.25	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	1029/1416	4.10	4.37	4.26	4.26	4.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1199	****	3.90	3.97	4.05	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	1224/1312	2.67	3.83	4.00	4.07	2.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1153/1303	3.33	4.12	4.24	4.34	3.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	1239/1299	2.67	4.22	4.25	4.38	2.67
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 758	****	3.71	4.01	4.17	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ECON 408 0101  
 Title: MANAGERIAL ECONOMICS  
 Instructor: DASGUPTA, NANDI  
 Enrollment: 57  
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 490  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	15	17	4.44	639/1504	4.44	4.21	4.27	4.33	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	1	11	20	4.52	483/1503	4.52	4.26	4.20	4.18	4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	8	24	4.62	400/1290	4.62	4.39	4.28	4.32	4.62
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	2	4	18	4.67	270/1453	4.67	4.16	4.21	4.22	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	2	0	5	10	12	4.03	725/1421	4.03	3.90	4.00	4.02	4.03
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	18	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	420/1365	4.40	4.06	4.08	4.09	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	3	7	22	4.52	444/1485	4.52	4.32	4.16	4.14	4.52
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	3	30	4.91	657/1504	4.91	4.53	4.69	4.73	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	2	0	0	3	8	12	4.39	469/1483	4.39	4.07	4.06	4.11	4.39
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	10	23	4.62	649/1425	4.62	4.58	4.41	4.38	4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	6	28	4.82	690/1426	4.82	4.67	4.69	4.72	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	1	9	21	4.45	643/1418	4.45	4.30	4.25	4.25	4.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	0	8	24	4.59	544/1416	4.59	4.37	4.26	4.26	4.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	15	0	1	0	4	12	4.59	224/1199	4.59	3.90	3.97	4.05	4.59
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	2	0	3	5	3.82	870/1312	3.82	3.83	4.00	4.07	3.82
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	0	2	1	3	5	4.00	910/1303	4.00	4.12	4.24	4.34	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	786/1299	4.27	4.22	4.25	4.38	4.27
4. Were special techniques successful	24	5	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	****/ 758	****	3.71	4.01	4.17	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General	6	Under-grad	35	Non-major	32
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	8	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	24				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 412 0101  
 Title TOPICS IN MACROECONOMI  
 Instructor: GRIBBON, JOSEPH  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 491  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	239/1504	4.78	4.21	4.27	4.33	4.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	437/1503	4.56	4.26	4.20	4.18	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	459/1290	4.56	4.39	4.28	4.32	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	118/1453	4.88	4.16	4.21	4.22	4.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1421	5.00	3.90	4.00	4.02	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	260/1365	4.56	4.06	4.08	4.09	4.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	536/1485	4.44	4.32	4.16	4.14	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.53	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	433/1483	4.43	4.07	4.06	4.11	4.43
-----														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	724/1425	4.56	4.58	4.41	4.38	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	549/1426	4.89	4.67	4.69	4.72	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	514/1418	4.56	4.30	4.25	4.25	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	701/1416	4.44	4.37	4.26	4.26	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	587/1199	4.13	3.90	3.97	4.05	4.13
-----														
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	444/1312	4.43	3.83	4.00	4.07	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	652/1303	4.43	4.12	4.24	4.34	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.22	4.25	4.38	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 758	****	3.71	4.01	4.17	****
-----														
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.63	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	4.29	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ECON 413 0101  
 Title INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIO  
 Instructor: CARROLL, KATHLE  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 492  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	914/1504	4.23	4.21	4.27	4.33	4.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	3	4.00	1052/1503	4.00	4.26	4.20	4.18	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	2	5	3.77	1075/1290	3.77	4.39	4.28	4.32	3.77
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	5	3	3.77	1186/1453	3.77	4.16	4.21	4.22	3.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	6	4	3.92	839/1421	3.92	3.90	4.00	4.02	3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	782/1365	4.00	4.06	4.08	4.09	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	6	3	3.92	1066/1485	3.92	4.32	4.16	4.14	3.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.53	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	4	6	3	3.92	961/1483	3.92	4.07	4.06	4.11	3.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	748/1425	4.54	4.58	4.41	4.38	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	643/1426	4.85	4.67	4.69	4.72	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	799/1418	4.31	4.30	4.25	4.25	4.31
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	675/1416	4.46	4.37	4.26	4.26	4.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	10	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/1199	****	3.90	3.97	4.05	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	530/1312	4.33	3.83	4.00	4.07	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	450/1303	4.67	4.12	4.24	4.34	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	445/1299	4.67	4.22	4.25	4.38	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 758	****	3.71	4.01	4.17	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	8
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 421 0101  
 Title INTRO TO ECONOMETRICS  
 Instructor: NG, HOCK-GUAN  
 Enrollment: 33  
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 493  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	9	18	4.38	737/1504	4.38	4.21	4.27	4.33	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	7	19	4.42	633/1503	4.42	4.26	4.20	4.18	4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	8	20	4.52	497/1290	4.52	4.39	4.28	4.32	4.52
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	9	19	4.62	310/1453	4.62	4.16	4.21	4.22	4.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	1	4	11	12	4.00	745/1421	4.00	3.90	4.00	4.02	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	2	7	19	4.61	223/1365	4.61	4.06	4.08	4.09	4.61
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	8	20	4.44	550/1485	4.44	4.32	4.16	4.14	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.53	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	6	7	15	4.32	555/1483	4.32	4.07	4.06	4.11	4.32
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	6	26	4.81	315/1425	4.81	4.58	4.41	4.38	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	7	23	4.66	981/1426	4.66	4.67	4.69	4.72	4.66
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	8	6	17	4.29	808/1418	4.29	4.30	4.25	4.25	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	2	7	20	4.38	776/1416	4.38	4.37	4.26	4.26	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	1	2	6	21	4.45	320/1199	4.45	3.90	3.97	4.05	4.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	2	6	10	4.32	549/1312	4.32	3.83	4.00	4.07	4.32
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	1	5	3	9	4.11	881/1303	4.11	4.12	4.24	4.34	4.11
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	1	5	3	9	4.11	890/1299	4.11	4.22	4.25	4.38	4.11
4. Were special techniques successful	14	14	1	1	0	2	0	2.75	****/ 758	****	3.71	4.01	4.17	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	Required for Majors	1	Graduate 2 Major 6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0			
56-83	6	2.00-2.99 5	General	8	Under-grad 30 Non-major 26
84-150	13	3.00-3.49 5			
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00 11	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
		P 0			
		I 0	Other	18	
		? 0			

Course-Section: ECON 434 0101  
 Title REGIONAL ECONOMICS  
 Instructor: MCCONNELL, VIRG  
 Enrollment: 41  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 494  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	13	10	4.27	876/1504	4.27	4.21	4.27	4.33	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	14	8	4.15	946/1503	4.15	4.26	4.20	4.18	4.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	12	11	4.31	741/1290	4.31	4.39	4.28	4.32	4.31
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	11	9	4.08	963/1453	4.08	4.16	4.21	4.22	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	6	9	11	4.19	596/1421	4.19	3.90	4.00	4.02	4.19
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	5	10	8	3.81	967/1365	3.81	4.06	4.08	4.09	3.81
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	9	13	4.31	705/1485	4.31	4.32	4.16	4.14	4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	18	7	4.23	1287/1504	4.23	4.53	4.69	4.73	4.23
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	6	7	4	3.88	1009/1483	3.88	4.07	4.06	4.11	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	4	10	11	4.19	1076/1425	4.19	4.58	4.41	4.38	4.19
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	7	18	4.65	981/1426	4.65	4.67	4.69	4.72	4.65
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3	6	11	6	3.77	1159/1418	3.77	4.30	4.25	4.25	3.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	11	11	4.27	862/1416	4.27	4.37	4.26	4.26	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	4	1	7	5	3	3.10	1042/1199	3.10	3.90	3.97	4.05	3.10
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	2	4	2	5	3.77	897/1312	3.77	3.83	4.00	4.07	3.77
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	1	3	3	5	3.77	1044/1303	3.77	4.12	4.24	4.34	3.77
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	613/1299	4.46	4.22	4.25	4.38	4.46
4. Were special techniques successful	13	8	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	****/ 758	****	3.71	4.01	4.17	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	2	Major	12
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	7	C	3	General	6	Under-grad	24	Non-major	14
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 442 0101  
 Title EUROPEAN ECONOMIC HIST  
 Instructor: MITCH, DAVID F  
 Enrollment: 36  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 495  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	684/1504	4.42	4.21	4.27	4.33	4.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	403/1503	4.58	4.26	4.20	4.18	4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	240/1290	4.77	4.39	4.28	4.32	4.77
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	352/1453	4.58	4.16	4.21	4.22	4.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	290/1421	4.55	3.90	4.00	4.02	4.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	462/1365	4.36	4.06	4.08	4.09	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	4	7	4.42	577/1485	4.42	4.32	4.16	4.14	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.53	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	772/1483	4.13	4.07	4.06	4.11	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	8	2	4.20	1076/1425	4.20	4.58	4.41	4.38	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	878/1426	4.73	4.67	4.69	4.72	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	2	5	3	3.82	1136/1418	3.82	4.30	4.25	4.25	3.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	4	6	4.27	854/1416	4.27	4.37	4.26	4.26	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	455/1199	4.30	3.90	3.97	4.05	4.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	297/1312	4.60	3.83	4.00	4.07	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	299/1303	4.80	4.12	4.24	4.34	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	303/1299	4.80	4.22	4.25	4.38	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	154/ 758	4.60	3.71	4.01	4.17	4.60

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	4	Under-grad	12	Non-major	3
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 453 0101  
 Title HOUSEHOLD ECONOMICS  
 Instructor: LORD, WILLIAM  
 Enrollment: 28  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 496  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	2	3	6	4	3.80	1244/1504	3.80	4.21	4.27	4.33	3.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	7	3	3.87	1154/1503	3.87	4.26	4.20	4.18	3.87
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	691/1290	4.36	4.39	4.28	4.32	4.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	10	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1001/1453	4.00	4.16	4.21	4.22	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	2	3	3	5	3.85	911/1421	3.85	3.90	4.00	4.02	3.85
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	12	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/1365	****	4.06	4.08	4.09	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	806/1485	4.21	4.32	4.16	4.14	4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	10	4	4.20	1314/1504	4.20	4.53	4.69	4.73	4.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	4	1	3	3.88	1020/1483	3.88	4.07	4.06	4.11	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	572/1425	4.67	4.58	4.41	4.38	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	967/1426	4.67	4.67	4.69	4.72	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	4	3	6	4.00	1013/1418	4.00	4.30	4.25	4.25	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	887/1416	4.23	4.37	4.26	4.26	4.23
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	600/1199	4.10	3.90	3.97	4.05	4.10
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	976/1312	3.60	3.83	4.00	4.07	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	356/1303	4.75	4.12	4.24	4.34	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	570/1299	4.50	4.22	4.25	4.38	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	12	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	****	3.71	4.01	4.17	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	2	Under-grad	16	Non-major	14
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 457 0101  
 Title ECONOMY OF SOVIET UNIO  
 Instructor: BRADLEY, MICHAEL  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 497  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	3	7	4.21	940/1504	4.21	4.21	4.27	4.33	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	4	4	3.79	1192/1503	3.79	4.26	4.20	4.18	3.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	2	8	4.21	817/1290	4.21	4.39	4.28	4.32	4.21
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	1229/1453	3.67	4.16	4.21	4.22	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	6	4	3.79	952/1421	3.79	3.90	4.00	4.02	3.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1003/1365	3.75	4.06	4.08	4.09	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	806/1485	4.21	4.32	4.16	4.14	4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	525/1504	4.93	4.53	4.69	4.73	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	657/1483	4.23	4.07	4.06	4.11	4.23
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	748/1425	4.54	4.58	4.41	4.38	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	808/1426	4.77	4.67	4.69	4.72	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	799/1418	4.31	4.30	4.25	4.25	4.31
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	2	8	4.23	887/1416	4.23	4.37	4.26	4.26	4.23
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	8	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	636/1199	4.00	3.90	3.97	4.05	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	651/1312	4.17	3.83	4.00	4.07	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	851/1303	4.17	4.12	4.24	4.34	4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	855/1299	4.17	4.22	4.25	4.38	4.17
4. Were special techniques successful	8	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 758	****	3.71	4.01	4.17	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 4	General	0
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 14
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	10
			? 0		

Course-Section: ECON 463 0101  
 Title THEORY OF PUBLIC FINAN  
 Instructor: COATES, DENNIS  
 Enrollment: 40  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 498  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	1	1	6	16	4.54	495/1504	4.54	4.21	4.27	4.33	4.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	2	1	10	11	4.25	848/1503	4.25	4.26	4.20	4.18	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	5	10	9	4.17	853/1290	4.17	4.39	4.28	4.32	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	1	0	2	6	11	4	3.74	1200/1453	3.74	4.16	4.21	4.22	3.74
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	2	3	3	4	8	4	3.32	1217/1421	3.32	3.90	4.00	4.02	3.32
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	2	2	7	8	4	3.43	1186/1365	3.43	4.06	4.08	4.09	3.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	0	1	6	16	4.50	455/1485	4.50	4.32	4.16	4.14	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	14	10	4.42	1164/1504	4.42	4.53	4.69	4.73	4.42
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	1	3	10	4	3.94	933/1483	3.94	4.07	4.06	4.11	3.94
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	10	11	4.52	760/1425	4.52	4.58	4.41	4.38	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	1036/1426	4.62	4.67	4.69	4.72	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	3	7	11	4.38	727/1418	4.38	4.30	4.25	4.25	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	1	4	15	4.57	554/1416	4.57	4.37	4.26	4.26	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	16	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/1199	****	3.90	3.97	4.05	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	2	2	1	0	2	2.71	1217/1312	2.71	3.83	4.00	4.07	2.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	910/1303	4.00	4.12	4.24	4.34	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	869/1299	4.14	4.22	4.25	4.38	4.14

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	5	General	4	Under-grad	27	Non-major	25
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	7	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	16				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 467 0101  
 Title HEALTH ECONOMICS  
 Instructor: SORKIN, ALAN L  
 Enrollment: 44  
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 499  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	0	6	11	12	4.00	1092/1504	4.00	4.21	4.27	4.33	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	6	12	10	3.87	1150/1503	3.87	4.26	4.20	4.18	3.87
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	7	8	13	3.94	996/1290	3.94	4.39	4.28	4.32	3.94
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	23	2	0	2	2	2	3.25	1366/1453	3.25	4.16	4.21	4.22	3.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	2	6	11	8	3.55	1090/1421	3.55	3.90	4.00	4.02	3.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	28	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/1365	****	4.06	4.08	4.09	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	3	4	6	16	4.10	938/1485	4.10	4.32	4.16	4.14	4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	2	28	4.93	460/1504	4.93	4.53	4.69	4.73	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	6	15	4	3.81	1093/1483	3.81	4.07	4.06	4.11	3.81
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	1	4	23	4.60	665/1425	4.60	4.58	4.41	4.38	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	3	5	21	4.53	1104/1426	4.53	4.67	4.69	4.72	4.53
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	2	4	8	15	4.13	955/1418	4.13	4.30	4.25	4.25	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	3	6	18	4.30	829/1416	4.30	4.37	4.26	4.26	4.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	21	3	0	1	4	1	3.00	1050/1199	3.00	3.90	3.97	4.05	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	7	0	2	4	6	3.11	1131/1312	3.11	3.83	4.00	4.07	3.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	4	3	5	4	3	2.95	1211/1303	2.95	4.12	4.24	4.34	2.95
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	4	3	6	3	3	2.89	1215/1299	2.89	4.22	4.25	4.38	2.89
4. Were special techniques successful	12	18	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 758	****	3.71	4.01	4.17	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	3.56	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	30	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	4.29	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	4.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.37	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.33	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	29	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.19	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 11		0
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	C 10	General	1
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	D 0	Under-grad	31
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
#### - Means there are not enough					

P 0  
I 0  
? 0

Other

27

responses to be significant

Course-Section: ECON 471 0101  
 Title MONEY & CAPITAL MARKET  
 Instructor: Morris, Russell  
 Enrollment: 38  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 500  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	2	4	6	12	4.04	1074/1504	4.04	4.21	4.27	4.33	4.04
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	2	8	13	4.28	816/1503	4.28	4.26	4.20	4.18	4.28
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	5	7	12	4.20	832/1290	4.20	4.39	4.28	4.32	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	11	2	1	0	2	9	4.07	963/1453	4.07	4.16	4.21	4.22	4.07
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	3	4	16	4.36	449/1421	4.36	3.90	4.00	4.02	4.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	1	3	3	9	4.25	581/1365	4.25	4.06	4.08	4.09	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	5	17	4.56	391/1485	4.56	4.32	4.16	4.14	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	525/1504	4.92	4.53	4.69	4.73	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	1	3	9	5	3.84	1051/1483	3.84	4.07	4.06	4.11	3.84
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	3	8	13	4.32	981/1425	4.32	4.58	4.41	4.38	4.32
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	9	13	4.46	1162/1426	4.46	4.67	4.69	4.72	4.46
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	5	9	10	4.12	964/1418	4.12	4.30	4.25	4.25	4.12
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	5	6	12	4.04	1015/1416	4.04	4.37	4.26	4.26	4.04
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	19	3	0	0	1	2	2.83	****/1199	****	3.90	3.97	4.05	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	3	2	3	3.78	892/1312	3.78	3.83	4.00	4.07	3.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	217/1303	4.89	4.12	4.24	4.34	4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	741/1299	4.33	4.22	4.25	4.38	4.33
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	3.69	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	2	A	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	5	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	26	Non-major	26
84-150	19	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	23				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 475 0101  
 Title FINANCIAL INVSTMNT ANA  
 Instructor: COATES, DENNIS  
 Enrollment: 42  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 501  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	2	3	6	15	4.31	826/1504	4.31	4.21	4.27	4.33	4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	3	12	9	4.08	1008/1503	4.08	4.26	4.20	4.18	4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	5	7	13	4.23	800/1290	4.23	4.39	4.28	4.32	4.23
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	9	13	4.31	718/1453	4.31	4.16	4.21	4.22	4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	2	4	4	13	4.08	692/1421	4.08	3.90	4.00	4.02	4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	5	9	10	4.00	782/1365	4.00	4.06	4.08	4.09	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	4	21	4.77	190/1485	4.77	4.32	4.16	4.14	4.77
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	7	18	4.72	940/1504	4.72	4.53	4.69	4.73	4.72
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	0	4	8	8	4.05	827/1483	4.05	4.07	4.06	4.11	4.05
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	9	14	4.44	853/1425	4.44	4.58	4.41	4.38	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	3	11	10	4.20	1290/1426	4.20	4.67	4.69	4.72	4.20
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	4	12	7	3.96	1047/1418	3.96	4.30	4.25	4.25	3.96
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	4	5	14	4.24	887/1416	4.24	4.37	4.26	4.26	4.24
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	20	2	0	1	1	1	2.80	****/1199	****	3.90	3.97	4.05	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	1	2	4	2	3.50	1011/1312	3.50	3.83	4.00	4.07	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	1	3	3	3	3.80	1032/1303	3.80	4.12	4.24	4.34	3.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	5	2	3	3.80	1038/1299	3.80	4.22	4.25	4.38	3.80
4. Were special techniques successful	18	2	0	3	2	1	1	3.00	680/ 758	3.00	3.71	4.01	4.17	3.00
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	3.69	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 11		Graduate
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	1
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	23

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

Course-Section: ECON 478 0101  
 Title REAL ESTATE ECON AND F  
 Instructor: GETTER, DARYL  
 Enrollment: 61  
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 502  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	6	4	23	4.34	775/1504	4.34	4.21	4.27	4.33	4.34
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	4	2	6	21	4.14	954/1503	4.14	4.26	4.20	4.18	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	0	4	6	21	4.14	866/1290	4.14	4.39	4.28	4.32	4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	1	5	10	15	4.16	890/1453	4.16	4.16	4.21	4.22	4.16
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	18	3	1	3	4	6	3.53	1101/1421	3.53	3.90	4.00	4.02	3.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	2	2	2	7	12	4.00	782/1365	4.00	4.06	4.08	4.09	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	5	3	24	4.34	659/1485	4.34	4.32	4.16	4.14	4.34
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	34	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.53	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	1	0	12	15	4.46	385/1483	4.46	4.07	4.06	4.11	4.46
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	3	29	4.79	348/1425	4.79	4.58	4.41	4.38	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	31	4.86	620/1426	4.86	4.67	4.69	4.72	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	4	5	23	4.41	695/1418	4.41	4.30	4.25	4.25	4.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	5	4	24	4.47	662/1416	4.47	4.37	4.26	4.26	4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	22	0	2	3	3	2	3.50	919/1199	3.50	3.90	3.97	4.05	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	1	2	1	9	4.38	483/1312	4.38	3.83	4.00	4.07	4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	497/1303	4.62	4.12	4.24	4.34	4.62
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	415/1299	4.69	4.22	4.25	4.38	4.69
4. Were special techniques successful	22	8	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	****/ 758	****	3.71	4.01	4.17	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	15						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	8	C	10	General	4	Under-grad	35	Non-major	33
84-150	23	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	28				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 481 0101  
 Title INTERNATIONAL TRADE TH  
 Instructor: TAKACS, WENDY E  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 503  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	2	7	13	4.25	889/1504	4.25	4.21	4.27	4.33	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	4	4	13	4.13	972/1503	4.13	4.26	4.20	4.18	4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	5	14	4.38	671/1290	4.38	4.39	4.28	4.32	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	16	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	631/1453	4.38	4.16	4.21	4.22	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	4	2	5	3	9	3.48	1131/1421	3.48	3.90	4.00	4.02	3.48
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	13	0	0	4	0	7	4.27	558/1365	4.27	4.06	4.08	4.09	4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	4	16	4.50	455/1485	4.50	4.32	4.16	4.14	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	12	4.50	1087/1504	4.50	4.53	4.69	4.73	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	421/1483	4.44	4.07	4.06	4.11	4.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	8	14	4.57	712/1425	4.57	4.58	4.41	4.38	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	451/1426	4.91	4.67	4.69	4.72	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	5	9	8	4.04	1000/1418	4.04	4.30	4.25	4.25	4.04
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	6	14	4.48	662/1416	4.48	4.37	4.26	4.26	4.48
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	18	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1199	****	3.90	3.97	4.05	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	2	2	2	3	3.67	947/1312	3.67	3.83	4.00	4.07	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	0	1	1	6	4.22	815/1303	4.22	4.12	4.24	4.34	4.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	445/1299	4.67	4.22	4.25	4.38	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	15	7	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 758	****	3.71	4.01	4.17	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	7	General	5	Under-grad	23	Non-major	21
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 482 0101  
 Title INTERNATIONAL FINANCE  
 Instructor: MCINTYRE, KEVIN  
 Enrollment: 34  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 504  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	725/1504	4.39	4.21	4.27	4.33	4.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	7	9	4.39	678/1503	4.39	4.26	4.20	4.18	4.39
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	507/1290	4.50	4.39	4.28	4.32	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	440/1453	4.50	4.16	4.21	4.22	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	1	6	8	4.12	669/1421	4.12	3.90	4.00	4.02	4.12
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	407/1365	4.42	4.06	4.08	4.09	4.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	5	10	4.33	670/1485	4.33	4.32	4.16	4.14	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	394/1504	4.94	4.53	4.69	4.73	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	657/1483	4.23	4.07	4.06	4.11	4.23
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	402/1425	4.76	4.58	4.41	4.38	4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	690/1426	4.82	4.67	4.69	4.72	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	695/1418	4.41	4.30	4.25	4.25	4.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	662/1416	4.47	4.37	4.26	4.26	4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	11	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/1199	****	3.90	3.97	4.05	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1312	****	3.83	4.00	4.07	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1303	****	4.12	4.24	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1299	****	4.22	4.25	4.38	****
4. Were special techniques successful	16	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 758	****	3.71	4.01	4.17	****
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	4.29	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	4	Under-grad	19	Non-major	18
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	1	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	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 490 0101  
 Title ANALYTIC METHODS IN EC  
 Instructor: THOMAS, MARK S  
 Enrollment: 40  
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 505  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	2	10	8	6	3.41	1388/1504	3.41	4.21	4.27	4.33	3.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	9	8	9	3.76	1207/1503	3.76	4.26	4.20	4.18	3.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	8	5	14	4.07	911/1290	4.07	4.39	4.28	4.32	4.07
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	1	3	6	1	6	3.47	1297/1453	3.47	4.16	4.21	4.22	3.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	16	2	2	5	1	3	3.08	1294/1421	3.08	3.90	4.00	4.02	3.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	3	2	2	3	7	3.53	1143/1365	3.53	4.06	4.08	4.09	3.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	3	7	3	13	3.69	1214/1485	3.69	4.32	4.16	4.14	3.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	25	4	4.14	1360/1504	4.14	4.53	4.69	4.73	4.14
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	1	2	9	5	1	3.17	1352/1483	3.17	4.07	4.06	4.11	3.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	2	2	8	8	6	3.54	1302/1425	3.54	4.58	4.41	4.38	3.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	5	10	11	4.23	1276/1426	4.23	4.67	4.69	4.72	4.23
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	2	8	8	8	3.85	1123/1418	3.85	4.30	4.25	4.25	3.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	3	1	1	7	7	7	3.78	1153/1416	3.78	4.37	4.26	4.26	3.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	9	3	2	2	5	5	3.41	959/1199	3.41	3.90	3.97	4.05	3.41
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	7	2	4	3.64	956/1312	3.64	3.83	4.00	4.07	3.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	2	0	6	1	5	3.50	1121/1303	3.50	4.12	4.24	4.34	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	0	9	1	3	3.36	1149/1299	3.36	4.22	4.25	4.38	3.36
4. Were special techniques successful	15	8	0	1	4	0	1	3.17	****/ 758	****	3.71	4.01	4.17	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	3.56	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.16	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	3.81	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	1	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	3.69	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.63	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	4.29	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	4.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.37	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.33	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.12	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	28	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.19	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.83	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.24	****	****

5. Were there enough proctors for all the students

27 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 \*\*\*\*/ 16 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.51 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\*

Course-Section: ECON 490 0101  
 Title ANALYTIC METHODS IN EC  
 Instructor: THOMAS, MARK S  
 Enrollment: 40  
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 505  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5	C	5	General	7	Under-grad	29	Non-major	25
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 493 0501  
 Title INDIV RESEARCH IN ECON  
 Instructor: CARROLL, KATHLE  
 Enrollment: 1  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 506  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies						Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.21	4.27	4.33	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.26	4.20	4.18	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.39	4.28	4.32	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1453	5.00	4.16	4.21	4.22	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	5.00	3.90	4.00	4.02	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1365	5.00	4.06	4.08	4.09	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1485	5.00	4.32	4.16	4.14	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.53	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1483	5.00	4.07	4.06	4.11	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ECON 600 0101  
 Title POLICY CONSQ:ECON ANAL  
 Instructor: BRENNAN, TIMOTH  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 507  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	327/1504	4.70	4.21	4.27	4.44	4.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	795/1503	4.30	4.26	4.20	4.28	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	4	4.20	832/1290	4.20	4.39	4.28	4.36	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	718/1453	4.30	4.16	4.21	4.34	4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	745/1421	4.00	3.90	4.00	4.27	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	645/1365	4.20	4.06	4.08	4.35	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	3	3	3.60	1246/1485	3.60	4.32	4.16	4.24	3.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	657/1504	4.90	4.53	4.69	4.79	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	0	4	2	3.86	1041/1483	3.86	4.07	4.06	4.20	3.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.58	4.41	4.51	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	502/1426	4.90	4.67	4.69	4.80	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	799/1418	4.30	4.30	4.25	4.36	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	525/1416	4.60	4.37	4.26	4.38	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	894/1199	3.57	3.90	3.97	4.04	3.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	1	3	3	3.50	1011/1312	3.50	3.83	4.00	4.31	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	887/1303	4.10	4.12	4.24	4.58	4.10
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	741/1299	4.33	4.22	4.25	4.56	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	0	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	****	3.71	4.01	4.24	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ECON 602 0101  
 Title MACROECONOMIC ANALYSIS  
 Instructor: Cunningham, Bre  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 508  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	176/1504	4.85	4.21	4.27	4.44	4.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	145/1503	4.85	4.26	4.20	4.28	4.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	240/1290	4.77	4.39	4.28	4.36	4.77
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	135/1453	4.85	4.16	4.21	4.34	4.85
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	563/1421	4.23	3.90	4.00	4.27	4.23
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	139/1365	4.75	4.06	4.08	4.35	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	260/1485	4.69	4.32	4.16	4.24	4.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	1022/1504	4.62	4.53	4.69	4.79	4.62
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	84/1483	4.91	4.07	4.06	4.20	4.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	143/1425	4.92	4.58	4.41	4.51	4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	451/1426	4.92	4.67	4.69	4.80	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	101/1418	4.92	4.30	4.25	4.36	4.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	209/1416	4.85	4.37	4.26	4.38	4.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	7	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1199	5.00	3.90	3.97	4.04	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	183/1312	4.78	3.83	4.00	4.31	4.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	333/1303	4.78	4.12	4.24	4.58	4.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	223/1299	4.89	4.22	4.25	4.56	4.89
4. Were special techniques successful	7	6	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 758	****	3.71	4.01	4.24	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	4	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	16
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ECON 612 0101  
 Title ECONOMETRICS II  
 Instructor: MARCOTTE, DAVID  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 509  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	1	6	5	4.15	1000/1504	4.15	4.21	4.27	4.44	4.15
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	6	2	3.62	1267/1503	3.62	4.26	4.20	4.28	3.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	937/1290	4.00	4.39	4.28	4.36	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	957/1453	4.08	4.16	4.21	4.34	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	692/1421	4.08	3.90	4.00	4.27	4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	7	3	4.08	737/1365	4.08	4.06	4.08	4.35	4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	761/1485	4.25	4.32	4.16	4.24	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	891/1504	4.75	4.53	4.69	4.79	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	989/1483	3.90	4.07	4.06	4.20	3.90
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	1050/1425	4.23	4.58	4.41	4.51	4.23
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	808/1426	4.77	4.67	4.69	4.80	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	2	4	2	3	3.15	1319/1418	3.15	4.30	4.25	4.36	3.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	3	5	3	3.75	1167/1416	3.75	4.37	4.26	4.38	3.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	987/1199	3.33	3.90	3.97	4.04	3.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1011/1312	3.50	3.83	4.00	4.31	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	910/1303	4.00	4.12	4.24	4.58	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	741/1299	4.33	4.22	4.25	4.56	4.33

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	4	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	13
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ECON 699 0101  
 Title ASIAN ECON HISTORY  
 Instructor: MITCH  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 510  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1092/1504	4.00	4.21	4.27	4.44	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	312/1503	4.67	4.26	4.20	4.28	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.39	4.28	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	680/1453	4.33	4.16	4.21	4.34	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	5.00	3.90	4.00	4.27	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1365	5.00	4.06	4.08	4.35	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1485	5.00	4.32	4.16	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.53	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	338/1483	4.50	4.07	4.06	4.20	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	971/1425	4.33	4.58	4.41	4.51	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	1013/1418	4.00	4.30	4.25	4.36	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	806/1416	4.33	4.37	4.26	4.38	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	716/1312	4.00	3.83	4.00	4.31	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.12	4.24	4.58	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.22	4.25	4.56	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 758	5.00	3.71	4.01	4.24	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	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	2	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						