

Course-Section: RUSS 102 0101
 Title BASIC RUSSIAN II
 Instructor: RUSINKO, ELAINE
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1297
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	487/1481	4.57	4.26	4.29	4.14	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	517/1481	4.50	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	178/1249	4.85	4.37	4.27	4.14	4.85	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	406/1424	4.54	4.27	4.21	4.06	4.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	297/1396	4.50	4.07	3.98	3.89	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	303/1342	4.50	4.12	4.07	3.88	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	425/1459	4.54	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.54	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	561/1480	4.92	4.64	4.68	4.64	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	304/1450	4.55	4.10	4.09	3.97	4.55	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	466/1409	4.73	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	659/1407	4.83	4.77	4.69	4.57	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	300/1399	4.73	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	456/1400	4.64	4.35	4.27	4.19	4.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	299/1179	4.45	3.94	3.96	3.85	4.45	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	400/1262	4.44	4.18	4.05	3.77	4.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	238/1259	4.88	4.40	4.29	4.06	4.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	240/1256	4.88	4.34	4.30	4.08	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	145/ 788	4.63	4.03	4.00	3.80	4.63	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: RUSS 202 0101
 Title CONTINUING RUSSIAN I
 Instructor: YOUNG, STEVE
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1298
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	918/1481	4.20	4.26	4.29	4.40	4.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	517/1481	4.50	4.26	4.23	4.29	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	498/1249	4.50	4.37	4.27	4.36	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	645/1424	4.33	4.27	4.21	4.28	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	643/1396	4.10	4.07	3.98	3.94	4.10	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	683/1342	4.11	4.12	4.07	4.05	4.11	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	5	4	4.10	909/1459	4.10	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.10	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	1114/1480	4.40	4.64	4.68	4.68	4.40	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	692/1450	4.20	4.10	4.09	4.15	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	514/1409	4.70	4.46	4.42	4.47	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	728/1407	4.80	4.77	4.69	4.78	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	567/1399	4.50	4.30	4.26	4.29	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	791/1400	4.33	4.35	4.27	4.34	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	1	0	2	2	0	3.00	1041/1179	3.00	3.94	3.96	4.05	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	0	3	2	3.43	1026/1262	3.43	4.18	4.05	4.11	3.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	402/1259	4.71	4.40	4.29	4.34	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	658/1256	4.43	4.34	4.30	4.28	4.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	1	0	0	3	3	4.00	394/ 788	4.00	4.03	4.00	3.98	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: RUSS 271 0101
 Title MOD RUSSIAN CIV & CULT
 Instructor: RUSINKO, ELAINE
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1299
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	3	20	4.79	244/1481	4.79	4.26	4.29	4.40	4.79	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	18	4.56	446/1481	4.56	4.26	4.23	4.29	4.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	8	14	4.36	655/1249	4.36	4.37	4.27	4.36	4.36	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	1	6	15	4.42	545/1424	4.42	4.27	4.21	4.28	4.42	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	2	18	4.54	274/1396	4.54	4.07	3.98	3.94	4.54	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	7	15	4.40	405/1342	4.40	4.12	4.07	4.05	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	9	13	4.36	659/1459	4.36	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.64	4.68	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	2	7	11	4.45	417/1450	4.45	4.10	4.09	4.15	4.45	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	19	4.75	417/1409	4.75	4.46	4.42	4.47	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	200/1407	4.96	4.77	4.69	4.78	4.96	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	2	22	4.80	212/1399	4.80	4.30	4.26	4.29	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	0	1	21	4.71	374/1400	4.71	4.35	4.27	4.34	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	2	21	4.83	104/1179	4.83	3.94	3.96	4.05	4.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	1	4	12	4.44	400/1262	4.44	4.18	4.05	4.11	4.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	3	2	13	4.56	548/1259	4.56	4.40	4.29	4.34	4.56	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	3	1	14	4.61	506/1256	4.61	4.34	4.30	4.28	4.61	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	0	0	3	6	5	4.14	347/ 788	4.14	4.03	4.00	3.98	4.14	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	5.00	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.26	4.53	4.83	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	4.24	4.44	4.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.19	4.35	4.72	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	3.98	3.92	3.55	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	6	Under-grad	25	Non-major	5
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	1						

Course-Section: RUSS 302 0101
 Title CONTINUING RUSSIAN III
 Instructor: BLYUNHER, ALLA
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1300
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.26	4.29	4.29	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.26	4.23	4.23	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	203/1249	4.80	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	178/1424	4.80	4.27	4.21	4.27	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1396	5.00	4.07	3.98	4.00	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.12	4.07	4.12	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.19	4.16	4.17	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	839/1480	4.80	4.64	4.68	4.65	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	139/1450	4.80	4.10	4.09	4.10	4.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	334/1409	4.80	4.46	4.42	4.43	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	212/1399	4.80	4.30	4.26	4.27	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.35	4.27	4.28	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1179	****	3.94	3.96	4.02	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1262	5.00	4.18	4.05	4.14	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.40	4.29	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	457/1256	4.67	4.34	4.30	4.34	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 788	****	4.03	4.00	4.07	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.48	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	4.13	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	4.33	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	3.68	4.26	3.90	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	3.50	4.42	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	3.90	4.55	4.88	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.28	4.75	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.42	4.65	4.88	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: RUSS 402 0101
 Title ADVANCED RUSSIAN II
 Instructor: BLYUKHER, ALLA
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1301
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	461/1481	4.60	4.26	4.29	4.45	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	183/1481	4.80	4.26	4.23	4.32	4.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	203/1249	4.80	4.37	4.27	4.44	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.27	4.21	4.35	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1396	5.00	4.07	3.98	4.09	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.12	4.07	4.21	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	344/1459	4.60	4.19	4.16	4.25	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	1260/1480	4.20	4.64	4.68	4.20	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	334/1450	4.50	4.10	4.09	4.28	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.46	4.42	4.51	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.30	4.26	4.36	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.35	4.27	4.38	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	487/1179	4.20	3.94	3.96	4.07	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1262	5.00	4.18	4.05	4.33	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	588/1259	4.50	4.40	4.29	4.57	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.34	4.30	4.60	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	394/ 788	4.00	4.03	4.00	4.26	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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