# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | RUSS 102 01 | Term - Spring 2011 | Enrollment: | 21 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Basic Russian II | | Questionnaires: | 16 |
| Instructor: | Rusinko,Elaine | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course Mean | Org 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 | 2 | 14 | 4.88 | 158/1449 | 4.74 | 4.45 | 4.33 | 4.14 | 4.88 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 12 | 4.75 | 241/1446 | 4.73 | 4.47 | 4.29 | 4.20 | 4.75 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 14 | 4.88 | 157/1256 | 4.64 | 4.56 | 4.34 | 4.21 | 4.88 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 4.67 | 339/1402 | 4.58 | 4.50 | 4.27 | 4.10 | 4.67 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 11 | 4.63 | 267/1358 | 4.56 | 4.40 | 4.13 | 4.04 | 4.63 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 11 | 4.79 | 158/1327 | 4.79 | 4.35 | 4.16 | 3.92 | 4.79 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 7 | 4.44 | 572/1435 | 4.47 | 4.33 | 4.20 | 4.11 | 4.44 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 14 | 4.88 | 586/1446 | 4.59 | 4.68 | 4.67 | 4.57 | 4.88 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 7 | 4.31 | 573/1437 | 4.41 | 4.26 | 4.12 | 4.04 | 4.31 |
| **Lecture** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 13 | 4.81 | 354/1386 | 4.74 | 4.58 | 4.48 | 4.40 | 4.81 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 14 | 4.88 | 607/1390 | 4.94 | 4.83 | 4.74 | 4.67 | 4.88 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 10 | 4.63 | 491/1379 | 4.70 | 4.47 | 4.34 | 4.28 | 4.63 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 11 | 4.69 | 484/1379 | 4.79 | 4.58 | 4.36 | 4.26 | 4.69 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 8 | 4.31 | 508/1236 | 4.32 | 4.17 | 4.08 | 3.93 | 4.31 |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 4.38 | 502/1121 | 4.12 | 4.38 | 4.18 | 3.89 | 4.38 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 4.67 | 404/1122 | 4.76 | 4.64 | 4.36 | 4.09 | 4.67 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 4.42 | 683/1121 | 4.42 | 4.58 | 4.40 | 4.08 | 4.42 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 4.44 | 235/790 | 4.42 | 4.26 | 4.06 | 3.89 | 4.44 |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | RUSS 102 01 |
| --- | --- |
| Title: | Basic Russian II |
| Instructor: | Rusinko,Elaine |

| Term - Spring 2011 |
| --- |

| Enrollment: | 21 |
| --- | --- |
| Questionnaires: | 16 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

## Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 00-27 | 5 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 7 | Required for Majors | 9 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 3 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 5 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 3 | 2.00-2.99 | 1 | C | 3 | General | 5 | Under-grad | 16 | Non-major | 13 |
| 84-150 | 1 | 3.00-3.49 | 5 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 6 | F | 0 | Electives | 1 | **** - Means there are not enough responses | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | to be significant | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 1 | | | | | | |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | RUSS 102 02 | | | | | | | Term - Spring 2011 | | | | | | | | | Enrollment: | 12 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Basic Russian II | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Questionnaires: | 10 |
| Instructor: | Zhdanovych,Vira | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course Mean | Org Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | | | | | |
| **General** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 4.60 | 460/1449 | 4.74 | 4.45 | 4.33 | 4.14 | 4.60 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 4.70 | 297/1446 | 4.73 | 4.47 | 4.29 | 4.20 | 4.70 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 4.40 | 644/1256 | 4.64 | 4.56 | 4.34 | 4.21 | 4.40 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 4.50 | 528/1402 | 4.58 | 4.50 | 4.27 | 4.10 | 4.50 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 4.50 | 371/1358 | 4.56 | 4.40 | 4.13 | 4.04 | 4.50 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 144/1327 | 4.79 | 4.35 | 4.16 | 3.92 | 4.80 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 4.50 | 479/1435 | 4.47 | 4.33 | 4.20 | 4.11 | 4.50 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 3 | 4.30 | 1176/1446 | 4.59 | 4.68 | 4.67 | 4.57 | 4.30 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 4.50 | 364/1437 | 4.41 | 4.26 | 4.12 | 4.04 | 4.50 |
| **Lecture** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 4.67 | 614/1386 | 4.74 | 4.58 | 4.48 | 4.40 | 4.67 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5.00 | 1/1390 | 4.94 | 4.83 | 4.74 | 4.67 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 4.78 | 288/1379 | 4.70 | 4.47 | 4.34 | 4.28 | 4.78 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 4.89 | 197/1379 | 4.79 | 4.58 | 4.36 | 4.26 | 4.89 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4.33 | 492/1236 | 4.32 | 4.17 | 4.08 | 3.93 | 4.33 |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3.86 | 819/1121 | 4.12 | 4.38 | 4.18 | 3.89 | 3.86 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.86 | 222/1122 | 4.76 | 4.64 | 4.36 | 4.09 | 4.86 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 4.43 | 673/1121 | 4.42 | 4.58 | 4.40 | 4.08 | 4.43 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 4.40 | 259/790 | 4.42 | 4.26 | 4.06 | 3.89 | 4.40 |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | RUSS 102 02 | | | Term - Spring 2011 | | Enrollment: | 12 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Basic Russian II | | | | | Questionnaires: | 10 |
| Instructor: | Zhdanovych,Vira | | | | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Instructor Mean | Rank | Course Mean | Org Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

## Frequency Distribution

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

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | RUSS 202 01 | Term - Spring 2011 | | Enrollment: | 11 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Continuing Russian I | | | Questionnaires: | 9 |
| Instructor: | Zhdanovych,Vira | | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5.00 | 1/1449 | 5.00 | 4.45 | 4.33 | 4.32 | 5.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5.00 | 1/1446 | 5.00 | 4.47 | 4.29 | 4.27 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5.00 | 1/1256 | 5.00 | 4.56 | 4.34 | 4.36 | 5.00 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5.00 | 1/1402 | 5.00 | 4.50 | 4.27 | 4.28 | 5.00 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4.71 | 191/1358 | 4.71 | 4.40 | 4.13 | 4.13 | 4.71 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 4.50 | 404/1327 | 4.50 | 4.35 | 4.16 | 4.12 | 4.50 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5.00 | 1/1435 | 5.00 | 4.33 | 4.20 | 4.17 | 5.00 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 4.13 | 1303/1446 | 4.13 | 4.68 | 4.67 | 4.63 | 4.13 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4.71 | 184/1437 | 4.71 | 4.26 | 4.12 | 4.10 | 4.71 |
| **Lecture** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 4.88 | 254/1386 | 4.88 | 4.58 | 4.48 | 4.46 | 4.88 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5.00 | 1/1390 | 5.00 | 4.83 | 4.74 | 4.76 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5.00 | 1/1379 | 5.00 | 4.47 | 4.34 | 4.31 | 5.00 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5.00 | 1/1379 | 5.00 | 4.58 | 4.36 | 4.37 | 5.00 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 127/1236 | 4.80 | 4.17 | 4.08 | 4.16 | 4.80 |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 4.25 | 606/1121 | 4.25 | 4.38 | 4.18 | 4.11 | 4.25 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5.00 | 1/1122 | 5.00 | 4.64 | 4.36 | 4.34 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5.00 | 1/1121 | 5.00 | 4.58 | 4.40 | 4.39 | 5.00 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4.20 | 359/790 | 4.20 | 4.26 | 4.06 | 4.01 | 4.20 |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | RUSS 202 01 | Term - Spring 2011 | Enrollment: | 11 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Continuing Russian I | | Questionnaires: | 9 |
| Instructor: | Zhdanovych,Vira | | | |

| | | | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Questions | | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

## Frequency Distribution

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

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | RUSS 302 01 |
| Title: | Continuing Russian III |
| Instructor: | Young,Steven R |

Term - Spring 2011

| Enrollment: 11 |
| Questionnaires: 7 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1449 | 5.00 | 4.45 | 4.33 | 4.38 | 5.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4.71 | 285/1446 | 4.71 | 4.47 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.71 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 4.71 | 313/1256 | 4.71 | 4.56 | 4.34 | 4.39 | 4.71 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4.71 | 281/1402 | 4.71 | 4.50 | 4.27 | 4.37 | 4.71 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3.83 | 994/1358 | 3.83 | 4.40 | 4.13 | 4.14 | 3.83 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 4.57 | 337/1327 | 4.57 | 4.35 | 4.16 | 4.23 | 4.57 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 4.14 | 878/1435 | 4.14 | 4.33 | 4.20 | 4.25 | 4.14 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4.71 | 836/1446 | 4.71 | 4.68 | 4.67 | 4.68 | 4.71 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4.83 | 105/1437 | 4.83 | 4.26 | 4.12 | 4.14 | 4.83 |
| **Lecture** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 4.57 | 735/1386 | 4.57 | 4.58 | 4.48 | 4.53 | 4.57 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1390 | 5.00 | 4.83 | 4.74 | 4.76 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 4.50 | 635/1379 | 4.50 | 4.47 | 4.34 | 4.38 | 4.50 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4.83 | 267/1379 | 4.83 | 4.58 | 4.36 | 4.40 | 4.83 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4.00 | 709/1236 | 4.00 | 4.17 | 4.08 | 4.18 | 4.00 |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4.20 | 637/1121 | 4.20 | 4.38 | 4.18 | 4.31 | 4.20 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.20 | 776/1122 | 4.20 | 4.64 | 4.36 | 4.46 | 4.20 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.00 | 855/1121 | 4.00 | 4.58 | 4.40 | 4.53 | 4.00 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2.67 | 774/790 | 2.67 | 4.26 | 4.06 | 4.11 | 2.67 |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | RUSS 302 01 | Term - Spring 2011 | | Enrollment: | 11 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Continuing Russian III | | | Questionnaires: | 7 |
| Instructor: | Young,Steven R | | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| **Seminar** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/67 | **** | 5.00 | 4.58 | 5.00 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/66 | **** | 5.00 | 4.36 | 4.70 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/64 | **** | 5.00 | 4.25 | 4.48 | **** |

## Frequency Distribution

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

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | RUSS 304 01 | Term - Spring 2011 | Enrollment: | 6 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Intermed Russian Conv II | | Questionnaires: | 6 |
| Instructor: | Zhdanovych,Vira | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | 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 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4.25 | 903/1449 | 4.25 | 4.45 | 4.33 | 4.38 | 4.25 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 241/1446 | 4.75 | 4.47 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.75 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 339/1402 | 4.67 | 4.50 | 4.27 | 4.37 | 4.67 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.50 | 371/1358 | 4.50 | 4.40 | 4.13 | 4.14 | 4.50 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.50 | 404/1327 | 4.50 | 4.35 | 4.16 | 4.23 | 4.50 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4.50 | 479/1435 | 4.50 | 4.33 | 4.20 | 4.25 | 4.50 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1446 | 5.00 | 4.68 | 4.67 | 4.68 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.50 | 364/1437 | 4.50 | 4.26 | 4.12 | 4.14 | 4.50 |
| **Lecture** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/1386 | 5.00 | 4.58 | 4.48 | 4.53 | 5.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/1390 | 5.00 | 4.83 | 4.74 | 4.76 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/1379 | 5.00 | 4.47 | 4.34 | 4.38 | 5.00 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/1379 | 5.00 | 4.58 | 4.36 | 4.40 | 5.00 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.50 | 1012/1236 | 3.50 | 4.17 | 4.08 | 4.18 | 3.50 |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1121 | 5.00 | 4.38 | 4.18 | 4.31 | 5.00 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1122 | 5.00 | 4.64 | 4.36 | 4.46 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1121 | 5.00 | 4.58 | 4.40 | 4.53 | 5.00 |

## Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 3 | Required for Majors | 4 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 1 |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | RUSS 304 01 | Term - Spring 2011 | Enrollment: | 6 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Intermed Russian Conv II | | Questionnaires: | 6 |
| Instructor: | Zhdanovych,Vira | | | |

| Questions | | | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course Mean | Org Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | | | | | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 1 | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 1 | C | 0 | General 0    Under-grad 6    Non-major 5 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 | 0 | D | 0 | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 0 | F | 0 | Electives 0    **** - Means there are not enough responses |
| | | | | P | 0 | to be significant |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other 0 |
| | | | | ? | 2 | |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | RUSS 350 01 | | Term - Spring 2011 | | | | | | Enrollment: | 8 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Russian Complem Reading | | | | | | | | Questionnaires: | 6 |
| Instructor: | Zhdanovych,Vira | | | | | | | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | 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 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4.83 | 192/1449 | 4.83 | 4.45 | 4.33 | 4.38 | 4.83 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4.83 | 158/1446 | 4.83 | 4.47 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.83 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/1256 | 5.00 | 4.56 | 4.34 | 4.39 | 5.00 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 236/1402 | 4.75 | 4.50 | 4.27 | 4.37 | 4.75 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5.00 | 1/1358 | 5.00 | 4.40 | 4.13 | 4.14 | 5.00 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5.00 | 1/1327 | 5.00 | 4.35 | 4.16 | 4.23 | 5.00 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 4.00 | 970/1435 | 4.00 | 4.33 | 4.20 | 4.25 | 4.00 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4.67 | 888/1446 | 4.67 | 4.68 | 4.67 | 4.68 | 4.67 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4.67 | 226/1437 | 4.67 | 4.26 | 4.12 | 4.14 | 4.67 |
| **Lecture** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4.83 | 320/1386 | 4.83 | 4.58 | 4.48 | 4.53 | 4.83 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5.00 | 1/1390 | 5.00 | 4.83 | 4.74 | 4.76 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5.00 | 1/1379 | 5.00 | 4.47 | 4.34 | 4.38 | 5.00 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5.00 | 1/1379 | 5.00 | 4.58 | 4.36 | 4.40 | 5.00 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1236 | 5.00 | 4.17 | 4.08 | 4.18 | 5.00 |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1121 | 5.00 | 4.38 | 4.18 | 4.31 | 5.00 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1122 | 5.00 | 4.64 | 4.36 | 4.46 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 328/1121 | 4.80 | 4.58 | 4.40 | 4.53 | 4.80 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/790 | **** | 4.26 | 4.06 | 4.11 | **** |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | RUSS 350 01 | | Term - Spring 2011 | | | | | | | | | | Enrollment: | 8 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Russian Complem Reading | | | | | | | | | | | | Questionnaires: | 6 |
| Instructor: | Zhdanovych,Vira | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | \multicolumn{5}{c}{Frequencies} | | | | | \multicolumn{2}{c}{Instructor} | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

## Frequency Distribution

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

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | RUSS 402 01 |
|---|---|
| Title: | Advanced Russian II |
| Instructor: | Zhdanovych,Vira |

**Term - Spring 2011**

| Enrollment: | 8 |
|---|---|
| Questionnaires: | 5 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Instructor Mean | Rank | Course Mean | Org Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **General** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1449 | 5.00 | 4.45 | 4.33 | 4.46 | 5.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1446 | 5.00 | 4.47 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 367/1256 | 4.67 | 4.56 | 4.34 | 4.43 | 4.67 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1402 | 5.00 | 4.50 | 4.27 | 4.35 | 5.00 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 163/1358 | 4.75 | 4.40 | 4.13 | 4.21 | 4.75 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 180/1327 | 4.75 | 4.35 | 4.16 | 4.28 | 4.75 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4.50 | 479/1435 | 4.50 | 4.33 | 4.20 | 4.27 | 4.50 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 788/1446 | 4.75 | 4.68 | 4.67 | 4.71 | 4.75 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 226/1437 | 4.67 | 4.26 | 4.12 | 4.20 | 4.67 |
| **Lecture** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/1386 | 5.00 | 4.58 | 4.48 | 4.55 | 5.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/1390 | 5.00 | 4.83 | 4.74 | 4.78 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 437/1379 | 4.67 | 4.47 | 4.34 | 4.40 | 4.67 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/1379 | 5.00 | 4.58 | 4.36 | 4.44 | 5.00 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 220/1236 | 4.67 | 4.17 | 4.08 | 4.13 | 4.67 |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1121 | **** | 4.38 | 4.18 | 4.39 | **** |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1122 | **** | 4.64 | 4.36 | 4.54 | **** |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1121 | **** | 4.58 | 4.40 | 4.60 | **** |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/790 | **** | 4.26 | 4.06 | 4.27 | **** |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | RUSS 402 01 | Term - Spring 2011 | | Enrollment: | 8 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Advanced Russian II | | | Questionnaires: | 5 |
| Instructor: | Zhdanovych,Vira | | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

## Frequency Distribution

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

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | RUSS 415 01 | Term - Spring 2011 | Enrollment: | 12 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Political Russian | | Questionnaires: | 10 |
| Instructor: | Young,Steven R | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Instructor Mean | Rank | Course Mean | Org Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **General** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 4.80 | 218/1449 | 4.80 | 4.45 | 4.33 | 4.46 | 4.80 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 4.89 | 112/1446 | 4.89 | 4.47 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.89 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 4.67 | 367/1256 | 4.67 | 4.56 | 4.34 | 4.43 | 4.67 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 4.88 | 129/1402 | 4.88 | 4.50 | 4.27 | 4.35 | 4.88 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5.00 | 1/1358 | 5.00 | 4.40 | 4.13 | 4.21 | 5.00 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5.00 | 1/1327 | 5.00 | 4.35 | 4.16 | 4.28 | 5.00 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 4.67 | 313/1435 | 4.67 | 4.33 | 4.20 | 4.27 | 4.67 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 4.56 | 984/1446 | 4.56 | 4.68 | 4.67 | 4.71 | 4.56 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1437 | 5.00 | 4.26 | 4.12 | 4.20 | 5.00 |
| **Lecture** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5.00 | 1/1386 | 5.00 | 4.58 | 4.48 | 4.55 | 5.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5.00 | 1/1390 | 5.00 | 4.83 | 4.74 | 4.78 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1379 | 5.00 | 4.47 | 4.34 | 4.40 | 5.00 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1379 | 5.00 | 4.58 | 4.36 | 4.44 | 5.00 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4.00 | 709/1236 | 4.00 | 4.17 | 4.08 | 4.13 | 4.00 |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1121 | 5.00 | 4.38 | 4.18 | 4.39 | 5.00 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1122 | 5.00 | 4.64 | 4.36 | 4.54 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1121 | 5.00 | 4.58 | 4.40 | 4.60 | 5.00 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4.25 | 329/790 | 4.25 | 4.26 | 4.06 | 4.27 | 4.25 |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | RUSS 415 01 | | Term - Spring 2011 | | | Enrollment: | 12 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Political Russian | | | | | Questionnaires: | 10 |
| Instructor: | Young,Steven R | | | | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

## 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 | 1 | Major | 3 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 3 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C | 0 | General | 1 | Under-grad | 9 | Non-major | 7 |
| 84-150 | 2 | 3.00-3.49 | 2 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 1 | 3.50-4.00 | 4 | F | 0 | Electives | 4 | **** - Means there are not enough responses | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | to be significant | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 1 | | | | | | |