

Course-Section: RUSS 102 0101
 Title BASIC RUSSIAN II
 Instructor: RUSINKO, ELAINE
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1399
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	554/1576	4.56	4.34	4.30	4.11	4.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	528/1576	4.56	4.32	4.27	4.18	4.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	298/1342	4.75	4.48	4.32	4.19	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	1003/1520	4.08	4.30	4.25	4.09	4.08	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	4	8	4.13	778/1465	4.13	4.26	4.12	4.02	4.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	511/1434	4.42	4.22	4.14	3.94	4.42	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	4	2	3	7	3.81	1211/1547	3.81	4.12	4.19	4.10	3.81	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	1033/1574	4.56	4.55	4.64	4.59	4.56	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	871/1554	4.10	4.13	4.10	4.01	4.10	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	4	3	6	4.15	1176/1488	4.15	4.39	4.47	4.41	4.15	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	0	1	3	8	4.31	1337/1493	4.31	4.78	4.73	4.65	4.31	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	3	3	6	4.00	1101/1486	4.00	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	3	3	6	4.08	1080/1489	4.08	4.40	4.32	4.22	4.08	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	1	2	3	2	3	3.36	1077/1277	3.36	3.99	4.03	3.91	3.36	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	771/1279	4.10	4.30	4.17	3.96	4.10	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	736/1270	4.40	4.57	4.35	4.09	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	1	1	2	4	3.78	1029/1269	3.78	4.38	4.35	4.09	3.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	671/ 878	3.67	4.19	4.05	3.91	3.67	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	Required for Majors 5	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 1	B 4		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 2	C 2	General 1	Under-grad 16 Non-major 15
84-150	4	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 4	
			? 2		

Course-Section: RUSS 202 0101
 Title CONTINUING RUSSIAN I
 Instructor: VINOGRADOVA, PO
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1400
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.34	4.30	4.35	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	152/1576	4.90	4.32	4.27	4.32	4.90	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.48	4.32	4.41	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	719/1520	4.38	4.30	4.25	4.26	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	1	6	4.10	798/1465	4.10	4.26	4.12	4.09	4.10	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	9	4.60	323/1434	4.60	4.22	4.14	4.06	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	527/1547	4.50	4.12	4.19	4.22	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	7	2	4.22	1346/1574	4.22	4.55	4.64	4.62	4.22	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	138/1554	4.86	4.13	4.10	4.05	4.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	463/1488	4.78	4.39	4.47	4.44	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	607/1493	4.89	4.78	4.73	4.75	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	191/1486	4.89	4.33	4.32	4.29	4.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	217/1489	4.89	4.40	4.32	4.31	4.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	818/1277	3.88	3.99	4.03	4.01	3.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	312/1279	4.70	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.70	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	260/1270	4.90	4.57	4.35	4.30	4.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	535/1269	4.67	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	654/ 878	3.71	4.19	4.05	3.92	3.71	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	0	
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0	
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	2	
84-150	1	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		6
			? 1			

Course-Section: RUSS 300A 0101
 Title SPEC PROJ IN RUSSIAN L
 Instructor: YOUNG, STEVEN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1401
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	541/1576	4.57	4.34	4.30	4.30	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	121/1576	4.92	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1342	****	4.48	4.32	4.30	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	945/1520	4.17	4.30	4.25	4.25	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	12	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1465	****	4.26	4.12	4.09	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	12	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1434	****	4.22	4.14	4.15	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	5	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.12	4.19	4.21	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	739/1574	4.77	4.55	4.64	4.61	4.77	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	4	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	237/1554	4.80	4.13	4.10	4.09	4.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	248/1488	4.95	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.95	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1493	4.95	4.78	4.73	4.70	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	172/1486	4.89	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	194/1489	4.90	4.40	4.32	4.34	4.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	118/1277	4.76	3.99	4.03	4.11	4.76	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1022/1279	3.60	4.30	4.17	4.20	3.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	355/1270	4.80	4.57	4.35	4.42	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	928/1269	4.00	4.38	4.35	4.41	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.19	4.05	4.09	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.97	4.01	4.12	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.99	4.03	4.23	5.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.99	4.08	4.24	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	7	Under-grad	14	Non-major	12
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	13						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: RUSS 300A 0101
 Title SPEC PROJ IN RUSSIAN L
 Instructor: LIBERMAN, SAVEL (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1402
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	541/1576	4.57	4.34	4.30	4.30	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	121/1576	4.92	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1342	****	4.48	4.32	4.30	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	945/1520	4.17	4.30	4.25	4.25	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	12	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1465	****	4.26	4.12	4.09	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	12	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1434	****	4.22	4.14	4.15	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	5	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.12	4.19	4.21	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	739/1574	4.77	4.55	4.64	4.61	4.77	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	116/1554	4.80	4.13	4.10	4.09	4.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1488	4.95	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.95	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	557/1493	4.95	4.78	4.73	4.70	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	191/1486	4.89	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	194/1489	4.90	4.40	4.32	4.34	4.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	215/1277	4.76	3.99	4.03	4.11	4.76	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1022/1279	3.60	4.30	4.17	4.20	3.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	355/1270	4.80	4.57	4.35	4.42	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	928/1269	4.00	4.38	4.35	4.41	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.19	4.05	4.09	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.97	4.01	4.12	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.99	4.03	4.23	5.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.99	4.08	4.24	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	7	Under-grad	14	Non-major	12
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	13						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: RUSS 302 0101
 Title CONTINUING RUSSIAN III
 Instructor: YOUNG, STEVEN
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1403
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.34	4.30	4.30	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.32	4.27	4.28	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.48	4.32	4.30	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.30	4.25	4.25	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.26	4.12	4.09	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.22	4.14	4.15	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	339/1547	4.67	4.12	4.19	4.21	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1459/1574	4.00	4.55	4.64	4.61	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	623/1554	4.33	4.13	4.10	4.09	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.39	4.47	4.47	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.78	4.73	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.33	4.32	4.32	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.40	4.32	4.34	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1020/1277	3.50	3.99	4.03	4.11	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	445/1279	4.50	4.30	4.17	4.20	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	636/1270	4.50	4.57	4.35	4.42	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	644/1269	4.50	4.38	4.35	4.41	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	709/ 878	3.50	4.19	4.05	4.09	3.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: RUSS 304 0101
 Title INTERMED RUSSIAN CONV
 Instructor: ZHDANOVYCH, VIR
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1404
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.34	4.30	4.30	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	392/1576	4.67	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.48	4.32	4.30	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.30	4.25	4.25	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	264/1465	4.67	4.26	4.12	4.09	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.22	4.14	4.15	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.12	4.19	4.21	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1459/1574	4.00	4.55	4.64	4.61	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.13	4.10	4.09	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.39	4.47	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.78	4.73	4.70	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.33	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.40	4.32	4.34	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	692/1277	4.00	3.99	4.03	4.11	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.30	4.17	4.20	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.57	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.38	4.35	4.41	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	799/ 878	3.00	4.19	4.05	4.09	3.00

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 0 Major 3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 0		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 3 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 2	
			? 0		

Course-Section: RUSS 350 0101
 Title RUSSIAN COMPLEM READIN
 Instructor: ZHDANOVYCH, VIR
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1405
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1539/1576	3.00	4.34	4.30	4.30	3.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1523/1576	3.00	4.32	4.27	4.28	3.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1341/1342	2.00	4.48	4.32	4.30	2.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1512/1520	2.50	4.30	4.25	4.25	2.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1386/1465	3.00	4.26	4.12	4.09	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1380/1434	3.00	4.22	4.14	4.15	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1538/1547	2.00	4.12	4.19	4.21	2.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1079/1574	4.50	4.55	4.64	4.61	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1448/1554	3.00	4.13	4.10	4.09	3.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1452/1488	3.00	4.39	4.47	4.47	3.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1473/1493	3.50	4.78	4.73	4.70	3.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1330/1486	3.50	4.33	4.32	4.32	3.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1313/1489	3.50	4.40	4.32	4.34	3.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1267/1277	2.00	3.99	4.03	4.11	2.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1064/1279	3.50	4.30	4.17	4.20	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	928/1270	4.00	4.57	4.35	4.42	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1116/1269	3.50	4.38	4.35	4.41	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	799/ 878	3.00	4.19	4.05	4.09	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: RUSS 402 0101
 Title ADVANCED RUSSIAN II
 Instructor: ZHDANOVYCH, VIR
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1406
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1539/1576	3.00	4.34	4.30	4.46	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1523/1576	3.00	4.32	4.27	4.35	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	1323/1342	2.75	4.48	4.32	4.46	2.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1362/1520	3.50	4.30	4.25	4.38	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1102/1465	3.75	4.26	4.12	4.22	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	878/1434	4.00	4.22	4.14	4.30	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	1459/1547	3.00	4.12	4.19	4.24	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1459/1574	4.00	4.55	4.64	4.69	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	1448/1554	3.00	4.13	4.10	4.24	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	0	1	1	3.25	1428/1488	3.25	4.39	4.47	4.55	3.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	1484/1493	3.25	4.78	4.73	4.80	3.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	1421/1486	3.00	4.33	4.32	4.41	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	1415/1489	3.00	4.40	4.32	4.38	3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	1.00	1274/1277	1.00	3.99	4.03	4.04	1.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	1186/1279	3.00	4.30	4.17	4.31	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1054/1270	3.75	4.57	4.35	4.53	3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	1210/1269	3.00	4.38	4.35	4.55	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	862/ 878	2.00	4.19	4.05	4.33	2.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: RUSS 415 0101
 Title POLITICAL RUSSIAN
 Instructor: YOUNG, STEVEN
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1407
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	787/1576	4.40	4.34	4.30	4.46	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	476/1576	4.60	4.32	4.27	4.35	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.48	4.32	4.46	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.30	4.25	4.38	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	175/1465	4.80	4.26	4.12	4.22	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.22	4.14	4.30	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.12	4.19	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	1537/1574	3.80	4.55	4.64	4.69	3.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.13	4.10	4.24	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.39	4.47	4.55	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.78	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.33	4.32	4.41	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.40	4.32	4.38	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1149/1277	3.00	3.99	4.03	4.04	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	381/1279	4.60	4.30	4.17	4.31	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	559/1270	4.60	4.57	4.35	4.53	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	386/1269	4.80	4.38	4.35	4.55	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	464/ 878	4.00	4.19	4.05	4.33	4.00
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.97	4.01	3.90	****
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	4.99	4.03	3.97	****
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	4.99	4.08	3.88	****

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 4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 1		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0 Under-grad 5 Non-major 1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	4
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant