

Course-Section: RUSS 101 1
 Title Basic Russian I
 Instructor: Rusinko, Elaine
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1336
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course Mean | Dept 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 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 10 | 4.69 | 374/1509 | 4.81 | 4.42 | 4.31 | 4.18 | 4.69 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 5.00 | 1/1509 | 4.83 | 4.39 | 4.26 | 4.25 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 5.00 | 1/1287 | 4.83 | 4.48 | 4.30 | 4.24 | 5.00 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 4.64 | 313/1459 | 4.55 | 4.32 | 4.22 | 4.11 | 4.64 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 4.92 | 72/1406 | 4.73 | 4.19 | 4.09 | 4.02 | 4.92 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 10 | 4.82 | 103/1384 | 4.76 | 4.17 | 4.11 | 3.98 | 4.82 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 12 | 4.86 | 121/1489 | 4.66 | 4.07 | 4.17 | 4.20 | 4.86 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 1 | 4.07 | 1357/1506 | 4.24 | 4.55 | 4.67 | 4.66 | 4.07 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5 | 4.45 | 396/1463 | 4.35 | 4.16 | 4.09 | 4.02 | 4.45 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 5.00 | 1/1438 | 4.79 | 4.48 | 4.46 | 4.44 | 5.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 5.00 | 1/1421 | 4.93 | 4.75 | 4.73 | 4.66 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 5.00 | 1/1411 | 4.82 | 4.39 | 4.31 | 4.27 | 5.00 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 5.00 | 1/1405 | 4.64 | 4.45 | 4.32 | 4.27 | 5.00 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 4.55 | 248/1236 | 3.98 | 3.92 | 4.00 | 3.87 | 4.55 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 7 | 4.08 | 718/1260 | 4.04 | 4.32 | 4.14 | 3.95 | 4.08 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 4.75 | 344/1255 | 4.49 | 4.53 | 4.33 | 4.15 | 4.75 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 4.92 | 212/1258 | 4.38 | 4.46 | 4.38 | 4.18 | 4.92 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 6 | 4.27 | 322/ 873 | 3.75 | 4.14 | 4.03 | 3.89 | 4.27 |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|---|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 2 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 5 | Required for Majors | 6 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 2 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 7 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C | 0 | General | 6 | Under-grad | 14 | Non-major | 12 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 | 0 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 1 | F | 1 | Electives | 0 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 1 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: RUSS 101 2
 Title Basic Russian I
 Instructor: Rusinko, Elaine
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1337
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course Mean | Dept 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 | 1 | 14 | 4.93 | 111/1509 | 4.81 | 4.42 | 4.31 | 4.18 | 4.93 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 4.67 | 356/1509 | 4.83 | 4.39 | 4.26 | 4.25 | 4.67 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 11 | 4.67 | 359/1287 | 4.83 | 4.48 | 4.30 | 4.24 | 4.67 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 4.45 | 536/1459 | 4.55 | 4.32 | 4.22 | 4.11 | 4.45 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 10 | 4.53 | 313/1406 | 4.73 | 4.19 | 4.09 | 4.02 | 4.53 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 4.70 | 199/1384 | 4.76 | 4.17 | 4.11 | 3.98 | 4.70 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 10 | 4.47 | 513/1489 | 4.66 | 4.07 | 4.17 | 4.20 | 4.47 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 6 | 4.40 | 1166/1506 | 4.24 | 4.55 | 4.67 | 4.66 | 4.40 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 4 | 4.25 | 628/1463 | 4.35 | 4.16 | 4.09 | 4.02 | 4.25 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 9 | 4.57 | 712/1438 | 4.79 | 4.48 | 4.46 | 4.44 | 4.57 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 12 | 4.86 | 665/1421 | 4.93 | 4.75 | 4.73 | 4.66 | 4.86 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 10 | 4.64 | 442/1411 | 4.82 | 4.39 | 4.31 | 4.27 | 4.64 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 4.29 | 874/1405 | 4.64 | 4.45 | 4.32 | 4.27 | 4.29 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3.42 | 1026/1236 | 3.98 | 3.92 | 4.00 | 3.87 | 3.42 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 8 | 4.00 | 746/1260 | 4.04 | 4.32 | 4.14 | 3.95 | 4.00 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 4.23 | 796/1255 | 4.49 | 4.53 | 4.33 | 4.15 | 4.23 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 3.85 | 1037/1258 | 4.38 | 4.46 | 4.38 | 4.18 | 3.85 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 3.22 | 776/ 873 | 3.75 | 4.14 | 4.03 | 3.89 | 3.22 |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|-----------------------|---|--------------|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A 4 | Required for Majors 1 | Graduate 0 | Major 1 |
| 28-55 | 3 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B 6 | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C 1 | General 6 | Under-grad 15 | Non-major 14 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 | 1 | D 0 | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 1 | F 0 | Electives 2 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | |
| | | | | P 0 | | | |
| | | | | I 0 | Other 1 | | |
| | | | | ? 0 | | | |

Course-Section: RUSS 201 1
 Title Basic Russian III
 Instructor: Vinogradova, Pol
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1338
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course Mean | Dept 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 | 10 | 4.69 | 374/1509 | 4.69 | 4.42 | 4.31 | 4.34 | 4.69 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 10 | 4.62 | 412/1509 | 4.62 | 4.39 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.62 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 11 | 4.77 | 250/1287 | 4.77 | 4.48 | 4.30 | 4.35 | 4.77 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 4.62 | 335/1459 | 4.62 | 4.32 | 4.22 | 4.30 | 4.62 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 4.58 | 281/1406 | 4.58 | 4.19 | 4.09 | 4.09 | 4.58 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 4.50 | 349/1384 | 4.50 | 4.17 | 4.11 | 4.09 | 4.50 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 9 | 4.54 | 422/1489 | 4.54 | 4.07 | 4.17 | 4.19 | 4.54 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 5 | 4.23 | 1273/1506 | 4.23 | 4.55 | 4.67 | 4.61 | 4.23 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 4.70 | 190/1463 | 4.70 | 4.16 | 4.09 | 4.08 | 4.70 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 4.60 | 675/1438 | 4.60 | 4.48 | 4.46 | 4.48 | 4.60 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 4.90 | 537/1421 | 4.90 | 4.75 | 4.73 | 4.76 | 4.90 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 4.60 | 496/1411 | 4.60 | 4.39 | 4.31 | 4.37 | 4.60 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 4.70 | 419/1405 | 4.70 | 4.45 | 4.32 | 4.39 | 4.70 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 3 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3.57 | 950/1236 | 3.57 | 3.92 | 4.00 | 4.11 | 3.57 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 4.40 | 505/1260 | 4.40 | 4.32 | 4.14 | 4.19 | 4.40 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 4.90 | 205/1255 | 4.90 | 4.53 | 4.33 | 4.37 | 4.90 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 4.44 | 680/1258 | 4.44 | 4.46 | 4.38 | 4.44 | 4.44 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 3.50 | 705/ 873 | 3.50 | 4.14 | 4.03 | 4.04 | 3.50 |

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 1 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B 4 | | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 2 | C 2 | General 3 | Under-grad 13 | Non-major 12 |
| 84-150 | 2 | 3.00-3.49 | 0 | D 0 | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 6 | F 0 | Electives 2 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | |
| | | | | P 0 | | | |
| | | | | I 0 | Other 0 | | |
| | | | | ? 1 | | | |

Course-Section: RUSS 301 1
 Title Continuing Russian II
 Instructor: Zhdanovych,Vira
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1339
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course Mean | Dept 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 | 0 | 8 | 5.00 | 1/1509 | 5.00 | 4.42 | 4.31 | 4.32 | 5.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 4.88 | 141/1509 | 4.88 | 4.39 | 4.26 | 4.25 | 4.88 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 4.75 | 261/1287 | 4.75 | 4.48 | 4.30 | 4.33 | 4.75 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1459 | 5.00 | 4.32 | 4.22 | 4.26 | 5.00 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 4.63 | 253/1406 | 4.63 | 4.19 | 4.09 | 4.12 | 4.63 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 4.50 | 349/1384 | 4.50 | 4.17 | 4.11 | 4.15 | 4.50 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 4.88 | 109/1489 | 4.88 | 4.07 | 4.17 | 4.14 | 4.88 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 4.63 | 973/1506 | 4.63 | 4.55 | 4.67 | 4.67 | 4.63 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4.14 | 750/1463 | 4.14 | 4.16 | 4.09 | 4.08 | 4.14 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.86 | 291/1438 | 4.86 | 4.48 | 4.46 | 4.43 | 4.86 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1421 | 5.00 | 4.75 | 4.73 | 4.73 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1411 | 5.00 | 4.39 | 4.31 | 4.29 | 5.00 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1405 | 5.00 | 4.45 | 4.32 | 4.32 | 5.00 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | 1131/1236 | 3.00 | 3.92 | 4.00 | 4.07 | 3.00 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1260 | 5.00 | 4.32 | 4.14 | 4.22 | 5.00 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1255 | 5.00 | 4.53 | 4.33 | 4.37 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1258 | 5.00 | 4.46 | 4.38 | 4.42 | 5.00 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 873 | **** | 4.14 | 4.03 | 4.08 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|-----------------------|---|-------------|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A 1 | Required for Majors 7 | Graduate 0 | Major 6 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B 5 | | | |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C 2 | General 0 | Under-grad 8 | Non-major 2 |
| 84-150 | 2 | 3.00-3.49 | 3 | D 0 | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 3 | F 0 | Electives 0 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | |
| | | | | P 0 | | | |
| | | | | I 0 | Other 1 | | |
| | | | | ? 0 | | | |

Course-Section: RUSS 303 1
 Title Continuing Russ Conv I
 Instructor: Zhdanovych,Vira
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1340
 MAR 22, 2010
 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 | 2 | 5 | 4.71 | 351/1509 | 4.71 | 4.42 | 4.31 | 4.32 | 4.71 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4.43 | 667/1509 | 4.43 | 4.39 | 4.26 | 4.25 | 4.43 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.50 | 519/1287 | 4.50 | 4.48 | 4.30 | 4.33 | 4.50 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 191/1459 | 4.75 | 4.32 | 4.22 | 4.26 | 4.75 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 4.43 | 423/1406 | 4.43 | 4.19 | 4.09 | 4.12 | 4.43 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3.83 | 993/1384 | 3.83 | 4.17 | 4.11 | 4.15 | 3.83 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 4.43 | 569/1489 | 4.43 | 4.07 | 4.17 | 4.14 | 4.43 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1506 | 5.00 | 4.55 | 4.67 | 4.67 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.86 | 99/1463 | 4.86 | 4.16 | 4.09 | 4.08 | 4.86 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4.83 | 319/1438 | 4.83 | 4.48 | 4.46 | 4.43 | 4.83 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5.00 | 1/1421 | 5.00 | 4.75 | 4.73 | 4.73 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 4.67 | 416/1411 | 4.67 | 4.39 | 4.31 | 4.29 | 4.67 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4.83 | 251/1405 | 4.83 | 4.45 | 4.32 | 4.32 | 4.83 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3.67 | 904/1236 | 3.67 | 3.92 | 4.00 | 4.07 | 3.67 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1260 | 5.00 | 4.32 | 4.14 | 4.22 | 5.00 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 4.71 | 390/1255 | 4.71 | 4.53 | 4.33 | 4.37 | 4.71 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.86 | 299/1258 | 4.86 | 4.46 | 4.38 | 4.42 | 4.86 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 152/ 873 | 4.67 | 4.14 | 4.03 | 4.08 | 4.67 |

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

Course-Section: RUSS 401 1
 Title Advanced Russian I
 Instructor: Young, Steven R
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1341
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course Mean | Dept 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 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 410/1509 | 4.67 | 4.42 | 4.31 | 4.39 | 4.67 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 356/1509 | 4.67 | 4.39 | 4.26 | 4.26 | 4.67 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 359/1287 | 4.67 | 4.48 | 4.30 | 4.38 | 4.67 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 280/1459 | 4.67 | 4.32 | 4.22 | 4.32 | 4.67 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 223/1406 | 4.67 | 4.19 | 4.09 | 4.11 | 4.67 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 225/1384 | 4.67 | 4.17 | 4.11 | 4.23 | 4.67 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.00 | 986/1489 | 4.00 | 4.07 | 4.17 | 4.18 | 4.00 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/1506 | 5.00 | 4.55 | 4.67 | 4.67 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 209/1463 | 4.67 | 4.16 | 4.09 | 4.18 | 4.67 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 588/1438 | 4.67 | 4.48 | 4.46 | 4.50 | 4.67 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/1421 | 5.00 | 4.75 | 4.73 | 4.76 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/1411 | 5.00 | 4.39 | 4.31 | 4.35 | 5.00 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 459/1405 | 4.67 | 4.45 | 4.32 | 4.34 | 4.67 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 176/1236 | 4.67 | 3.92 | 4.00 | 4.03 | 4.67 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 746/1260 | 4.00 | 4.32 | 4.14 | 4.25 | 4.00 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 904/1255 | 4.00 | 4.53 | 4.33 | 4.46 | 4.00 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 932/1258 | 4.00 | 4.46 | 4.38 | 4.51 | 4.00 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 442/ 873 | 4.00 | 4.14 | 4.03 | 4.26 | 4.00 |

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 2 | |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B 1 | | | | |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C 0 | General | 0 | Under-grad 3 | Non-major 1 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 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 | 0 | | |
| | | | | ? 0 | | | | |