Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	320/1674	4.55	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	215/1674	4.63	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	376/1423	4.65	4.36	4.27	4.16	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	282/1609	4.49	4.23	4.22	4.05	4.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	224/1585	4.24	4.04	3.96	3.88	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	146/1535	4.61	4.08	4.08	3.89	4.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	393/1651	4.10	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	6	4.40	1311/1673	4.34	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	257/1656	4.19	4.06	4.07	3.96	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	171/1586	4.69	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	453/1585	4.74	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	121/1582	4.42	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	1	11	4.57	612/1575	4.24	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	363/1380	3.90	3.94	3.94	3.78	4.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	309/1520	3.65	4.14	4.01	3.76	4.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	348/1515	4.21	4.37	4.24	3.97	4.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	525/1511	3.95	4.37	4.27	4.00	4.64
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	1	0	2	3	7	4.15	414/ 994	3.33	3.97	3.94	3.73	4.15
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	3.97	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	3.97	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.41	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	3	Under-grad	15	Non-major	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: RUSS 101  0201          University of Maryland                            Page 1495
Title       BASIC RUSSIAN I             Baltimore County                                  JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:   RUSINKO, ELAINE           Fall  2005                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      17
Questionnaires:  11                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                        Frequencies      Instructor   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  1  0  1  1  8  4.36  817/1674  4.55  4.23  4.27  4.07  4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  0  2  2  7  4.45  657/1674  4.63  4.26  4.23  4.16  4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  0  1  2  8  4.64  417/1423  4.65  4.36  4.27  4.16  4.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  4  0  0  2  1  4  4.29  812/1609  4.49  4.23  4.22  4.05  4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  1  0  2  5  3  3.82  996/1585  4.24  4.04  3.96  3.88  3.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  4  0  0  1  2  4  4.43  481/1535  4.61  4.08  4.08  3.89  4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1  0  1  0  3  4  2  3.60 1403/1651  4.10  4.20  4.18  4.10  3.60
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  0  8  3  4.27 1405/1673  4.34  4.65  4.69  4.67  4.27
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3  1  0  0  3  3  1  3.71 1267/1656  4.19  4.06  4.07  3.96  3.71

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0  0  0  0  1  4  6  4.45  931/1586  4.69  4.43  4.43  4.37  4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0  0  0  0  2  1  8  4.55 1191/1585  4.74  4.72  4.69  4.60  4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  1  0  2  4  4  3.91 1217/1582  4.42  4.30  4.26  4.17  3.91
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0  0  1  1  1  3  5  3.91 1216/1575  4.24  4.32  4.27  4.17  3.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  0  0  0  8  2  1  3.36 1113/1380  3.90  3.94  3.94  3.78  3.36

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0  3  0  3  3  0  2.67 1453/1520  3.65  4.14  4.01  3.76  2.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3  0  1  1  2  0  4  3.63 1267/1515  4.21  4.37  4.24  3.97  3.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3  0  1  0  4  2  1  3.25 1371/1511  3.95  4.37  4.27  4.00  3.25
4. Were special techniques successful                  3  4  1  1  1  1  0  2.50  964/ 994  3.33  3.97  3.94  3.73  2.50

            Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               10  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  97  ****  3.76  4.14  3.69  ****

            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 10  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  76  ****  3.36  3.98  3.32  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 10  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  77  ****  3.65  3.93  3.42  ****

            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 10  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  61  ****  4.03  4.09  3.87  ****
```

```
                                  Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: RUSS 201  0101           University of Maryland                        Page 1496
Title      BASIC RUSSIAN III             Baltimore County                             JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:   VINOGRADOVA, PO            Fall   2005                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    23
Questionnaires:  14                 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                         Frequencies      Instructor   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  1  0  0  3 10  4.50  607/1674  4.50 4.23 4.27 4.32 4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0  0  0  0  0  7  7  4.50  578/1674  4.50 4.26 4.23 4.26 4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  0  1  5  8  4.50  575/1423  4.50 4.36 4.27 4.36 4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  3  1  1  1  4  4  3.82 1278/1609  3.82 4.23 4.22 4.23 3.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  2  1  0  1  5  5  4.08  715/1585  4.08 4.04 3.96 3.91 4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2 1 0 0 2 9  4.50  373/1535  4.50 4.08 4.08 4.03 4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0  0  0  0  2  5  7  4.36  741/1651  4.36 4.20 4.18 4.20 4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0  0  0  0  0 10  4  4.29 1397/1673  4.29 4.65 4.69 4.67 4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 1 6 4  4.27  693/1656  4.27 4.06 4.07 4.10 4.27

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1  0  0  0  0  4  9  4.69  618/1586  4.69 4.43 4.43 4.48 4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1  0  0  0  0  3 10  4.77  896/1585  4.77 4.72 4.69 4.76 4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  0  4  9  4.69  394/1582  4.69 4.30 4.26 4.35 4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1  0  1  0  1  2  9  4.38  838/1575  4.38 4.32 4.27 4.39 4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 2 0 0 1 5 4  4.30  447/1380  4.30 3.94 3.94 4.03 4.30

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5  0  1  1  0  3  4  3.89  936/1520  3.89 4.14 4.01 4.03 3.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5  0  0  0  0  2  7  4.78  360/1515  4.78 4.37 4.24 4.28 4.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 0 1 1 7  4.67  507/1511  4.67 4.37 4.27 4.28 4.67
4. Were special techniques successful                   5  1  0  0  0  4  4  4.50  205/ 994  4.50 3.97 3.94 3.98 4.50

              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  13  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 265  **** 4.06 4.23 4.34 ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 13 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/ 278  **** 4.21 4.19 4.36 ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 13 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/ 260  **** 4.43 4.46 4.51 ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           13  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 259  **** 4.21 4.33 4.42 ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 13  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 233  **** 4.36 4.20 4.48 ****

              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 13  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  76  **** 3.36 3.98 3.97 ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 13  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  77  **** 3.65 3.93 4.20 ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       13  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  53  **** 4.19 4.45 4.50 ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   13  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  48  **** 3.86 4.12 4.50 ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 13  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  49  **** 3.74 4.27 4.82 ****

              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/  61  **** 4.03 4.09 4.23 ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    13  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  52  **** 4.21 4.26 4.53 ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      13  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  50  **** 4.23 4.44 4.42 ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       13  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  35  **** 4.22 4.36 4.63 ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     13  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  31  **** 4.25 4.34 4.50 ****
```

Frequency Distribution

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

```
P    0                                        responses to be significant
I    0            Other              2
?    0
```

```
Course-Section: RUSS 301  0101          University of Maryland                              Page 1497
Title          CONTINUING RUSSIAN II     Baltimore County                                  JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:    BLYUKHER, ALLA            Fall   2005                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    6
Questionnaires: 5                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                          Frequencies       Instructor   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  5  5.00    1/1674   5.00  4.23  4.27  4.26  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80  215/1674   4.80  4.26  4.23  4.21  4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80  203/1423   4.80  4.36  4.27  4.27  4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  2  3  4.60  374/1609   4.60  4.23  4.22  4.27  4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  0  2  3  4.60  265/1585   4.60  4.04  3.96  3.95  4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0  0  0  1  4  4.80  131/1535   4.80  4.08  4.08  4.15  4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  0  2  3  4.60  393/1651   4.60  4.20  4.18  4.16  4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/1673   5.00  4.65  4.69  4.68  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 1 0 0  0  1  3  4.75  185/1656   4.75  4.06  4.07  4.07  4.75

               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80  389/1586   4.80  4.43  4.43  4.42  4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80  811/1585   4.80  4.72  4.69  4.66  4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80  246/1582   4.80  4.30  4.26  4.26  4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80  279/1575   4.80  4.32  4.27  4.25  4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 2 0 0  0  1  2  4.67  200/1380   4.67  3.94  3.94  4.01  4.67

               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  229/1520   4.75  4.14  4.01  4.09  4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1  0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/1515   5.00  4.37  4.24  4.32  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0  0  0  1  3  4.75  414/1511   4.75  4.37  4.27  4.34  4.75
4. Were special techniques successful                  1   0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  115/ 994   4.75  3.97  3.94  3.96  4.75
```

```
                                       Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: RUSS 315  0101            University of Maryland                            Page 1498
Title        STUDIES IN RUSSIAN FIL         Baltimore County                               JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  STERN, GALA                     Fall   2005                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      6
Questionnaires:  5                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                              Frequencies        Instructor   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   5  5.00    1/1674  5.00  4.23  4.27  4.26  5.00
 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   0   2   3  4.60  460/1674  4.60  4.26  4.23  4.21  4.60
 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   0   0   3   2  4.40  697/1423  4.40  4.36  4.27  4.27  4.40
 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   0   0   1   4  4.80  173/1609  4.80  4.23  4.22  4.27  4.80
 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0   0   0   0   1   4  4.80  136/1585  4.80  4.04  3.96  3.95  4.80
 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1  0   0   0   1   3  4.75  169/1535  4.75  4.08  4.08  4.15  4.75
 7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   0   0   1   4  4.80  175/1651  4.80  4.20  4.18  4.16  4.80
 8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   5   0  4.00 1566/1673  4.00  4.65  4.69  4.68  4.00
 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0  0   0   0   2   2  4.50  381/1656  4.50  4.06  4.07  4.07  4.50

                 Lecture
 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   0   1   4  4.80  389/1586  4.80  4.43  4.43  4.42  4.80
 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   0   0   5  5.00    1/1585  5.00  4.72  4.69  4.66  5.00
 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   0   0   1   4  4.80  246/1582  4.80  4.30  4.26  4.26  4.80
 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0   0   0   2   3  4.60  579/1575  4.60  4.32  4.27  4.25  4.60
 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0  0   0   0   1   4  4.80  114/1380  4.80  3.94  3.94  4.01  4.80

                 Discussion
 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3  0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00    1/1520  5.00  4.14  4.01  4.09  5.00
 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3  0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00    1/1515  5.00  4.37  4.24  4.32  5.00
 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0  0   0   0   0   2  5.00    1/1511  5.00  4.37  4.27  4.34  5.00
 4. Were special techniques successful                  3   1   0   1   0   0   0  2.00  ****/ 994  ****  3.97  3.94  3.96  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA          Expected Grades         Reasons                 Type                    Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     0        0.00-0.99   0          A    2        Required for Majors  1      Graduate     0         Major       0
 28-55     0        1.00-1.99   1          B    2                                    
 56-83     0        2.00-2.99   1          C    0        General              2      Under-grad   5         Non-major   1
 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
                                           P    0                                    responses to be significant
                                           I    0        Other                1
                                           ?    0
```

Questionnaires: 5   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| | | Frequencies | | | | | | Instructor | | 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	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	298/1674	4.75	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	270/1674	4.75	4.26	4.23	4.31	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	262/1423	4.75	4.36	4.27	4.34	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	222/1609	4.75	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.04	3.96	4.01	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	169/1535	4.75	4.08	4.08	4.18	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	866/1651	4.25	4.20	4.18	4.23	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1656	5.00	4.06	4.07	4.19	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	496/1586	4.75	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	313/1582	4.75	4.30	4.26	4.31	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.32	4.27	4.35	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1380	5.00	3.94	3.94	4.04	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	229/1520	4.75	4.14	4.01	4.18	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.37	4.24	4.40	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.45	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 994	5.00	3.97	3.94	4.19	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	5	Non-major	2
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			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						