Course-Section: RUSS 102 0101 University of Maryland Title BASIC RUSSIAN II

Instructor: RUSINKO, ELAINE

Enrollment: 27 Questionnaires: 18 Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 1327 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eauer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	482/1522	4.61	4.36	4.30	4.14	4.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	9	4.33	787/1522	4.33	4.33	4.26	4.18	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	478/1285	4.56	4.45	4.30	4.22	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	2	4		4.27	781/1476	4.27	4.33	4.22	4.09	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	1	3	11	4.35	475/1412	4.35	4.26	4.06	4.01	4.35
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned		1	0	1	1	5		4.41	423/1381	4.41		4.08	3.93	4.41
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	2		4.59	406/1500	4.59	4.14	4.18	4.16	4.59
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	1	0	7			1185/1517			4.65	4.62	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness		0	0	0	3	6			782/1497		4.21			4.14
J. now would you grade the overall teaching criteotiveness		Ü	Ü	O	3	O	5		702/1157		1.21		1.02	
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	4	12	4.59	705/1440	4.59	4.45	4.45	4.40	4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	840/1448	4.76	4.79	4.71	4.63	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	_		4.41	708/1436	4.41	4.39	4.29	4.24	4.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	267/1432	4.82	4.47	4.29	4.23	4.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	4	2	9	4.33	408/1221		3.91			4.33
J. Did addiovisual techniques emhance your understanding	2		U	U	-	2	,	1.33	400/1221	1.33	3.91	3.93	3.00	1.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	499/1280	4.38	4.28	4.10	3.92	4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	0	1	14	4.75	375/1277	4.75	4.60	4.34	4.13	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	816/1269	4.20	4.47	4.31	4.04	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	1	1	2	4		3.93					3.87	
1. Wele special techniques successiul	2	2	_	_	2	-	U	3.93	303/ 034	3.93	4.10	1.02	3.07	3.93
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	4.50	4.35	4.33	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 217	****	4.50	4.51	4.51	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.41	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 205	****	5.00	4.42	4.28	****
5. Were requirements for tab reports crearry specified	Ι/	U	U	U	Τ	U	U	3.00	/ 205		5.00	4.23	4.20	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.13	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	4.03	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 65	****	5.00	4.49	3.85	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 78	****	4.83	4.45	3.88	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 80	****	4.83	4.11	3.79	****
5. Were criteria for grading made crear	Ι/	U	U	U	U	1	U	4.00	/ 60		4.03	4.11	3.13	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	3.60	4.41	3.90	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	4.00	4.30	3.90	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 39	****	3.00	4.40	3.99	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	3.00		4.00	****
·	17	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 34	****	2.75	4.31		****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1/	U	U	U	U	Т	U	4.00	***/ 34		2.75	4.30	4.11	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	4.33	4.63	4.53	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.19	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.41	4.19	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.59	4.31	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 18	****	****	4.54	4.31	****
J. WELE CHELE ENOUGH PLOCEOUS TOL ALL CHE SCUGENES	Τ./	U	U	Т	U	U	U	∠.00			•• ••	4.47	#.TT	

Course-Section: RUSS 102 0101 Title BASIC RUSSIAN II Instructor:

27

RUSINKO, ELAINE

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 18 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 1327 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	1	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	11						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	17	Non-major	15
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	2						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: RUSS 202 0101

Title CONTINUING RUSSIAN I

Instructor: VINOGRADOVA, PO

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 1328 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	669/1522	4.45	4.36	4.30	4.34	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	750/1522	4.36	4.33	4.26	4.29	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	817/1285	4.18	4.45	4.30	4.36	4.18
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	703/1476	4.33	4.33	4.22	4.20	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	5	4	4.09	703/1412	4.09	4.26	4.06	4.00	4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	663/1381	4.20	4.19	4.08	3.97	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	1	4	4	3.73	1204/1500	3.73	4.14	4.18	4.20	3.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.56	4.65	4.63	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	654/1497	4.25	4.21	4.11	4.11	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	798/1440	4.50	4.45	4.45	4.42	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	548/1448	4.89	4.79	4.71	4.78	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	539/1436	4.56	4.39	4.29	4.29	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	454/1432	4.67	4.47	4.29	4.31	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	540/1221	4.14	3.91	3.93	4.02	4.14
Discussion		_		_	_									
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	834/1280	3.89	4.28	4.10	4.08	3.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	652/1277	4.44	4.60	4.34	4.33	4.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful	2 2	0 1	0	0 1	2 1	1	6 5	4.44	637/1269 330/ 854	4.44	4.47 4.16	4.31	4.33	4.44 4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	U	Τ.	Т	1	5	4.25	330/ 054	4.25	4.10	4.02	4.00	4.25
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.62	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 228	****	4.50	4.35	4.56	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 217	****	4.50	4.51	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.72	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 205	****	5.00	4.23	4.37	****
Seminar	1.0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0 00	****/ 70	****	F 00	4 50	4 50	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10 10	0	0	1 0	0 1	0	0		****/ 79 ****/ 77	****	5.00 5.00	4.58 4.52	4.58	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 65	****	5.00	4.49	5.00 5.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 78	****	4.83	4.45	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 80	****	4.83	4.11	4.00	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3 00	****/ 47	****	3.60	4.41	4.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 45	****	4.00	4.30	4.58	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 39	****	3.00	4.40	4.75	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 35	****	3.00	4.31	4.75	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 34	****	2.75	4.30	4.17	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 37	****	4.33	4.63	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 23	****	****	4.41	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 33	****	****	4.69	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 18	***	****	4.49	****	****

Course-Section: RUSS 202 0101

Title CONTINUING RUSSIAN I

Instructor: VINOGRADOVA, PO

Enrollment: 14
Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007 Page 1328 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	 А	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	С	0	General	2	Under-grad	11	Non-major	7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	2			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: RUSS 302 0101 University of Maryla Title CONTINUING RUSSIAN III Baltimore County Instructor: BLYUKHER, ALLA Spring 2007

Enrollment:

6

University of Maryland Page 1329
Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007
Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

(uestionnaires:	3	Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire
`	acocidinatics.	5	Deddelle	COULDC	n varaacron	Queberonnarie

	Frequencies NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 1						Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.36	4.30	4.34	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3		1/1522		4.33	4.26	4.25	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.45	4.30	4.30	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	316/1476	4.67	4.33	4.22	4.26	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	339/1412	4.50	4.26	4.06	4.03	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	806/1381	4.00	4.19	4.08	4.13	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	988/1500	4.00	4.14	4.18	4.13	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.56	4.65	4.62	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1497	5.00	4.21	4.11	4.13	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	Ο	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.45	4.45	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1448	5.00	4.79	4.71	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1436	5.00	4.39	4.29	4.30	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1432		4.47	4.29	4.29	5.00
Diamondo														
Discussion	0	0	^	0	0	0	_	г оо	1 /1 000	г оо	4.28	4 10	4 1 4	F 00
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1280	5.00		4.10	4.14	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	-	0	0	3	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.60	4.34	4.38	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.47	4.31	4.39	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	Τ	U	U	Τ	U	Τ	4.00	426/ 854	4.00	4.16	4.02	4.00	4.00
Tree en		. ה. ב												

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0		2	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	3	Non-major	1
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	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	1				
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: RUSS 315 0101 University of Maryland Title STUDIES IN RUSSIAN FIL Baltimore County

Baltimore County Spring 2007 Page 1330

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: STERN, GALA
Enrollment: 5

Questionnaires: 5

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eque	ncie	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	492/1522	4.60	4.36	4.30	4.34	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	201/1522	4.80	4.33	4.26	4.25	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	425/1285	4.60	4.45	4.30	4.30	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	473/1476	4.50	4.33	4.22	4.26	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1412	5.00	4.26	4.06	4.03	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1381	5.00	4.19	4.08	4.13	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	160/1500	4.80	4.14	4.18	4.13	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	714/1517	4.80	4.56	4.65	4.62	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	264/1497	4.67	4.21	4.11	4.13	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	452/1440	4.75	4.45	4.45	4.46	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.79	4.71	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	295/1436	4.75	4.39	4.29	4.30	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.47	4.29	4.29	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1221	5.00	3.91	3.93	3.94	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	184/1280	4.80	4.28	4.10	4.14	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.60	4.34	4.38	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	332/1269	4.80	4.47	4.31	4.39	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 854	5.00	4.16	4.02	4.00	5.00

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	С	1	General	2	Under-grad	5	Non-major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	_			
				2	Ο						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: RUSS 332 0101

STRUCTURE OF RUSSIAN

YOUNG, STEVEN

6

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 5

Spring 2007

Page 1331

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

								-	ncies				tructor	Course	-		Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	246/1522	4.80	4.36	4.30	4.34	4.80
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	432/1522	4.60	4.33	4.26	4.25	4.60
3. Did th	ne exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	425/1285	4.60	4.45	4.30	4.30	4.60
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	473/1476	4.50	4.33	4.22	4.26	4.50
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	430/1412	4.40	4.26	4.06	4.03	4.40
6. Did wr	ritten as:	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	519/1381	4.33	4.19	4.08	4.13	4.33
7. Was th	ne grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	630/1500	4.40	4.14	4.18	4.13	4.40
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	714/1517	4.80	4.56	4.65	4.62	4.80
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	718/1497	4.20	4.21	4.11	4.13	4.20
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	353/1440	4.80	4.45	4.45	4.46	4.80		
2. Did th	ne instru	n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.79	4.71	4.71	5.00		
3. Was le	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clear						0	0	0	2	3	4.60	478/1436	4.60	4.39	4.29	4.30	4.60
4. Did th	ne lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	294/1432	4.80	4.47	4.29	4.29	4.80
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1221	****	3.91	3.93	3.94	****
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1280	****	4.28	4.10	4.14	****
2. Were a	all stude	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1277	****	4.60	4.34	4.38	****
3. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1269	****	4.47	4.31	4.39	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 A 1		Red	auir	ed f	or Ma	iors	 s	1	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	3
28-55											-	_	or addac	-	-		-	
	56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 1						nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	5	Non-	-major	2
84-150								_				-	3		-	-1011		_
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoue	ıh	
	-			P 0									respons				_	•
				I 0		Oth	ner					4	-		5			

Course-Section: RUSS 350 0101 University of Maryland Title RUSSIAN COMPLEM READIN Baltimore County Instructor:

YOUNG, STEVEN Spring 2007

Enrollment: 6 Questionnaires: 5

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1332

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eque	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	733/1522	4.40	4.36	4.30	4.34	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	432/1522	4.60	4.33	4.26	4.25	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	425/1285	4.60	4.45	4.30	4.30	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	792/1476	4.25	4.33	4.22	4.26	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	283/1412	4.60	4.26	4.06	4.03	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	604/1381	4.25	4.19	4.08	4.13	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	839/1500	4.20	4.14	4.18	4.13	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	994/1517	4.60	4.56	4.65	4.62	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	654/1497	4.25	4.21	4.11	4.13	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	682/1440	4.60	4.45	4.45	4.46	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.79	4.71	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	478/1436	4.60	4.39	4.29	4.30	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	294/1432	4.80	4.47	4.29	4.29	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1221	****	3.91	3.93	3.94	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	390/1280	4.50	4.28	4.10	4.14	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	594/1277	4.50	4.60	4.34	4.38	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	586/1269	4.50	4.47	4.31	4.39	4.50
Frequ	.ency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ty	pe			Majors	;
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 3		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	 3	0	Graduat	 e	0	 Majo		3

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

Course-Section: RUSS 402 0101 University of Maryland Title ADVANCED RUSSIAN II Baltimore County Instructor: BLYUKHER, ALLA Spring 2007

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 1

2

niversity of Maryland Page 1333
Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007
Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

			and the second second
Ctudent	College	Fraluation	Ouestionnaire

General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1522 5.00 4.36 4.30 4.42 5. 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 3. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 4. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 8. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. O O O O O O D D D D D D D D D D D D D					Frequencies				Insti	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect		
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1522 5.00 4.36 4.30 4.42 5. 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1522 5.00 4.33 4.26 4.34 5. 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1285 5.00 4.45 4.30 4.42 5. 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1476 5.00 4.45 4.30 4.42 5. 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1476 5.00 4.26 4.06 4.11 5. 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1412 5.00 4.26 4.06 4.11 5. 5. 5. Did assigned reading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1500 5.00 4.14 4.18 4.25 5. 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1517 5.00 4.56 4.65 4.71 5. 5. 5. 5. 5. 5. 5. 5. 5. 5. 5. 5. 5.	Questions			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1522 5.00 4.36 4.30 4.42 5. 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1522 5.00 4.33 4.26 4.34 5. 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1285 5.00 4.45 4.30 4.42 5. 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1476 5.00 4.45 4.30 4.42 5. 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1476 5.00 4.26 4.06 4.11 5. 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1412 5.00 4.26 4.06 4.11 5. 5. 5. Did assigned reading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1500 5.00 4.14 4.18 4.25 5. 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1517 5.00 4.56 4.65 4.71 5. 5. 5. 5. 5. 5. 5. 5. 5. 5. 5. 5. 5.	General																
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1522 5.00 4.33 4.26 4.34 5. 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1285 5.00 4.45 4.30 4.42 5. 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1476 5.00 4.33 4.22 4.31 5. 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1476 5.00 4.26 4.06 4.11 5. 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1412 5.00 4.26 4.06 4.11 5. 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1500 5.00 4.14 4.18 4.25 5. 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1517 5.00 4.56 4.65 4.71 5. 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1517 5.00 4.56 4.65 4.71 5. 8. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1440 5.00 4.45 4.45 4.52 5. 8. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1448 5.00 4.79 4.71 4.75 5. 8. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1436 5.00 4.39 4.29 4.32 5. 9. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1432 5.00 4.47 4.29 4.34 5. 9. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1221 5.00 3.91 3.93 4.04 5. 9. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1269 5.00 4.47 4.31 4.49 5. 9. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1269 5.00 4.47 4.31 4.49 5. 9. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1269 5.00 4.47 4.31 4.49 5. 9. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1269 5.00 4.47 4.31 4.49 5. 9. Proceedings of the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1269 5.00 4.47 4.31 4.49 5. 9. Proceedings of the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1269 5.00 4.16 4.02 4.31 5. 9. Proceedings of the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0 0 0 0					0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.36	4.30	4.42	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1285 5.00 4.45 4.30 4.42 5. 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1476 5.00 4.23 4.22 4.31 5. 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1412 5.00 4.26 4.06 4.11 5. 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1381 5.00 4.19 4.08 4.21 5. 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1500 5.00 4.14 4.18 4.25 5. 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1500 5.00 4.14 4.18 4.25 5. 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1517 5.00 4.56 4.65 4.71 5. Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1440 5.00 4.45 4.45 4.52 5. 3. Was lecture material presented in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1448 5.00 4.79 4.71 4.75 5. 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1436 5.00 4.39 4.29 4.32 5. 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1436 5.00 4.39 4.29 4.32 5. 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1221 5.00 3.91 3.93 4.04 5. 5. Did account account account and open discussion 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1269 5.00 4.47 4.31 4.49 5. 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1269 5.00 4.47 4.31 4.49 5. 4. Were special techniques successful 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1269 5.00 4.47 4.31 4.49 5. 4. Were special techniques successful	1 0	J .		0	0	0	-	0	0	1		, -					5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1476 5.00 4.33 4.22 4.31 5. 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1412 5.00 4.26 4.06 4.11 5. 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1381 5.00 4.19 4.08 4.21 5. 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1500 5.00 4.14 4.18 4.25 5. 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1517 5.00 4.56 4.65 4.71 5. Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1440 5.00 4.45 4.45 4.52 5. 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1448 5.00 4.79 4.71 4.75 5. 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1448 5.00 4.39 4.29 4.32 5. 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1432 5.00 4.47 4.29 4.34 5. 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1221 5.00 3.91 3.93 4.04 5. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1277 5.00 4.60 4.34 4.50 5. 3. Did the instructor encouraged to participate 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1269 5.00 4.47 4.21 4.31 4.49 5. 4. Were special techniques successful 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1269 5.00 4.47 4.31 4.49 5. 4. Were special techniques successful 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1854 5.00 4.16 4.02 4.31 5.				0					-	1		, -					5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1412 5.00 4.26 4.06 4.11 5.6 Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1381 5.00 4.19 4.08 4.21 5.7 Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1500 5.00 4.14 4.18 4.25 5.8 How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1517 5.00 4.56 4.65 4.71 5. Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1517 5.00 4.45 4.45 4.52 5.2 Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1448 5.00 4.79 4.71 4.75 5.3 Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1436 5.00 4.39 4.29 4.32 5.4 Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1432 5.00 4.47 4.29 4.34 5.5 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1221 5.00 3.91 3.93 4.04 5.2 Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1269 5.00 4.47 4.31 4.49 5.3 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1269 5.00 4.47 4.31 4.49 5.4 Were special techniques successful	-			0	0	0	0		0	1							5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1381 5.00 4.19 4.08 4.21 5.7 Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1500 5.00 4.14 4.18 4.25 5.8 How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1517 5.00 4.56 4.65 4.71 5. Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1440 5.00 4.45 4.45 4.52 5.2 Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1448 5.00 4.79 4.71 4.75 5.3 Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1436 5.00 4.39 4.29 4.32 5.4 Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1432 5.00 4.47 4.29 4.34 5.5 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1221 5.00 3.91 3.93 4.04 5.2 Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1277 5.00 4.60 4.34 4.50 5.3 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1269 5.00 4.47 4.31 4.49 5.4 Were special techniques successful 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1269 5.00 4.16 4.02 4.31 5.				0	-	-	-	-	-	1		,					5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1500 5.00 4.14 4.18 4.25 5. 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1517 5.00 4.56 4.65 4.71 5. Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1440 5.00 4.45 4.45 4.52 5. 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1448 5.00 4.79 4.71 4.75 5. 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1436 5.00 4.39 4.29 4.32 5. 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1432 5.00 4.47 4.29 4.34 5. 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1221 5.00 3.91 3.93 4.04 5. 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1269 5.00 4.47 4.31 4.49 5. 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1269 5.00 4.47 4.31 4.49 5. 4. Were special techniques successful	2 2				0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,					5.00
Lecture Lect					0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1500	5.00	4.14	4.18	4.25	5.00
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1440 5.00 4.45 4.45 4.52 5. 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1448 5.00 4.79 4.71 4.75 5. 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1436 5.00 4.39 4.29 4.32 5. 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1432 5.00 4.47 4.29 4.34 5. 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1221 5.00 3.91 3.93 4.04 5. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1280 5.00 4.28 4.10 4.28 5. 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1277 5.00 4.60 4.34 4.50 5. 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1269 5.00 4.47 4.31 4.49 5. 4. Were special techniques successful 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1854 5.00 4.16 4.02 4.31 5.	3 3			0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.56	4.65	4.71	5.00
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1440 5.00 4.45 4.45 4.52 5. 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1448 5.00 4.79 4.71 4.75 5. 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1436 5.00 4.39 4.29 4.32 5. 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1432 5.00 4.47 4.29 4.34 5. 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1221 5.00 3.91 3.93 4.04 5. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1280 5.00 4.28 4.10 4.28 5. 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1277 5.00 4.60 4.34 4.50 5. 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1269 5.00 4.47 4.31 4.49 5. 4. Were special techniques successful 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1854 5.00 4.16 4.02 4.31 5.	_																
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1448 5.00 4.79 4.71 4.75 5. 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1436 5.00 4.39 4.29 4.32 5. 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1432 5.00 4.47 4.29 4.34 5. 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1221 5.00 3.91 3.93 4.04 5. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1280 5.00 4.28 4.10 4.28 5. 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1277 5.00 4.60 4.34 4.50 5. 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1269 5.00 4.47 4.31 4.49 5. 4. Were special techniques successful 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1854 5.00 4.16 4.02 4.31 5.		Lecture															
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1436 5.00 4.39 4.29 4.32 5. 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1432 5.00 4.47 4.29 4.34 5. 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1221 5.00 3.91 3.93 4.04 5. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1280 5.00 4.28 4.10 4.28 5. 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1277 5.00 4.60 4.34 4.50 5. 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1269 5.00 4.47 4.31 4.49 5. 4. Were special techniques successful 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 854 5.00 4.16 4.02 4.31 5.	1. Were the instruct	cor's lectures well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.45	4.45	4.52	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1432 5.00 4.47 4.29 4.34 5. 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1221 5.00 3.91 3.93 4.04 5. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1280 5.00 4.28 4.10 4.28 5. 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1277 5.00 4.60 4.34 4.50 5. 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1269 5.00 4.47 4.31 4.49 5. 4. Were special techniques successful 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 854 5.00 4.16 4.02 4.31 5.	2. Did the instructo	2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject				0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.79	4.71	4.75	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1221 5.00 3.91 3.93 4.04 5. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1280 5.00 4.28 4.10 4.28 5. 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1277 5.00 4.60 4.34 4.50 5. 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1269 5.00 4.47 4.31 4.49 5. 4. Were special techniques successful 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 854 5.00 4.16 4.02 4.31 5.	3. Was lecture mater	rial presented and	explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.39	4.29	4.32	5.00
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1280 5.00 4.28 4.10 4.28 5. 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1277 5.00 4.60 4.34 4.50 5. 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1269 5.00 4.47 4.31 4.49 5. 4. Were special techniques successful 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 854 5.00 4.16 4.02 4.31 5.	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned			0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.47	4.29	4.34	5.00
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1280 5.00 4.28 4.10 4.28 5. 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1277 5.00 4.60 4.34 4.50 5. 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1269 5.00 4.47 4.31 4.49 5. 4. Were special techniques successful 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 854 5.00 4.16 4.02 4.31 5.	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding			0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1221	5.00	3.91	3.93	4.04	5.00
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1280 5.00 4.28 4.10 4.28 5. 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1277 5.00 4.60 4.34 4.50 5. 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1269 5.00 4.47 4.31 4.49 5. 4. Were special techniques successful 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 854 5.00 4.16 4.02 4.31 5.		Diagnasion															
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1277 5.00 4.60 4.34 4.50 5. 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1269 5.00 4.47 4.31 4.49 5. 4. Were special techniques successful 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 854 5.00 4.16 4.02 4.31 5.					0	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	1/1200	E 00	1 20	4 10	1 20	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1269 5.00 4.47 4.31 4.49 5. 4. Were special techniques successful 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/854 5.00 4.16 4.02 4.31 5.					-	-	-	-	-	1		,					5.00
4. Were special techniques successful 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/854 5.00 4.16 4.02 4.31 5.				-	-	-	-	-	-	_							5.00
				0	-			0		1							5.00
Frequency Distribution	4. Were special techniques successiul					U	U	U	U	1	3.00	1/ 654	3.00	4.10	4.02	4.31	5.00
	Frequency Distribution																
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors	Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	:S				Reasons				Type			Maiors		

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Cum. GPA		d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	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	0	F	0	Electives	s 0 $\#\#\#$ - Means there are 1		are not enough		
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				2	0						