Baltimore County Spring 2008

Course-Section: RUSS 102 0101

38

BASIC RUSSIAN II

RUSINKO, ELAINE

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland Page 1469 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

8

Instructor

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

responses to be significant

			and the second second
Ctudont	Conrac	Erra Luation	Ouestionnaire
bludent	COULSE	Evaluation	Ouescionnaire

Frequencies

		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean			
		 Genera																
1. Did you	ı gain nev	w insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	1	0	0	0	2	1	26	4.83	281/1670	4.83	4.36	4.31	4.23	4.83
2. Did the	instruc	tor make clear	the ex	pected goals	1	0	0	1	2	5	21	4.59	516/1666	4.59	4.31	4.27	4.30	4.59
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	1	0	0	1	1	3	24	4.72	352/1406	4.72	4.48	4.32	4.31	4.72
4. Did oth	ner evalua	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	3	5	0	2	0	4	16	4.55	509/1615	4.55	4.34	4.24	4.17	4.55
5. Did ass	signed rea	adings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	6	0	2	2	5	14	4.35	549/1566	4.35	4.26	4.07	4.03	4.35
6. Did wri	6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learn						0	1	1	4	13	4.53	406/1528	4.53	4.23	4.12	4.00	4.53
7. Was the	7. Was the grading system clearly explained						1	0	4	5	19	4.41	705/1650	4.41	4.16	4.22	4.28	4.41
8. How man	8. How many times was class cancelled						0	0	0	5	24	4.83	823/1667	4.83	4.47	4.67	4.61	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivened						0	0	2	1	6	15	4.42	547/1626	4.42	4.08	4.11	4.07	4.42
		Logtum																
1 Wara th	Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared							0	1	1	22	4.88	323/1559	4.88	4.38	4.46	4.47	4.88
		tor seem inter			6 6	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	777/1560	4.83	4.75	4.72	4.68	4.83
				xplained clearly	7	0	0	0	2	5	16	4.61	562/1549	4.61	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.61
		s contribute t			6	0	0	1	1	1	21	4.75	407/1546	4.75	4.40	4.32	4.32	
				our understanding	6	1	2	1	4	6		3.91	807/1323				3.91	
J. Dia aaa	IIOVIDUUI	ccciniiqueb en	ilalice j	our underbeamaring	Ü	_	_	-	•	Ü		3.71	00771323	3.71	3.70	1.00	3.71	3.71
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	17	0	2	0	1	1	9	4.15	749/1384	4.15	4.29	4.10	3.92	4.15
2. Were al	l studen	ts actively en	.courage	d to participate	17	0	0	1	1	0	11	4.62	517/1378	4.62	4.56	4.29	4.09	4.62
3. Did the	instruc	tor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	18	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	867/1378	4.25	4.45	4.31	4.08	4.25
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succe	ssful		17	2	2	0	5	1	3	3.27	791/ 904	3.27	4.11	4.03	3.94	3.27
				Frequ	.encv	Dist	ribu	ıtior	1									
				1														
Credits Ea	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade							Rea	sons	3			Тур	e			Majors	
00-27 3 0.00-0.99 0 A 11						Rec	uire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	 s 1	.6	Graduate	:	0	Majo	 or	6
28-55 6 1.00-1.99 1 B 11							-			3 -						3-		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C 5		Ger	neral	_				2	Under-gr	ad 3	0	Non-	-major	24
84-150 5 3.00-3.49 3 D 0																		
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 12 F 0						Ele	ectiv	res				0	#### - M	leans t	here a	re not	. enoug	rh

Other

Ρ

I

0

0

1

Course-Section: RUSS 202 0101 University of Maryland Title CONTINUING RUSSIAN I Baltimore County Instructor:

Page 1470 AUG 6, 2008 VINOGRADOVA, PO Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor

NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Enrollment:	7	
Questionnaires:	6	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

? 0

Questions

		Genera	1															
1. Did you	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	271/1670	4.83	4.36	4.31	4.32	4.83
2. Did the	e instru	ctor make clear	the exp	pected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	870/1666	4.33	4.31	4.27	4.27	4.33
3. Did the	e exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.48	4.32	4.39	5.00
4. Did oth	her evalı	uations reflect	the exp	pected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1615	****	4.34	4.24	4.29	****
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	559/1566	4.33	4.26	4.07	4.00	4.33
6. Did wr	itten as:	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0 £	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	346/1528	4.60	4.23	4.12	4.11	4.60
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.16	4.22	4.20	5.00
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	1022/1667	4.67	4.47	4.67	4.64	4.67
9. How wor	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectivenes	s 1	0	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	953/1626	4.00	4.08	4.11	4.06	4.00
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	673/1559	4.67	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.67
2. Did the	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	777/1560	4.83	4.75	4.72	4.73	4.83
3. Was led	cture mat	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	488/1549	4.67	4.34	4.31	4.25	4.67
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.40	4.32	4.30	5.00
5. Did aud	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	235/1323	4.67	3.96	4.00	4.08	4.67
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	372/1384	4.60	4.29	4.10	4.07	4.60
				d to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.56	4.29	4.25	5.00
				d open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.45	4.31	4.26	5.00
		echniques succe			1	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	328/ 904	4.33	4.11	4.03	4.01	4.33
				Fre	quency	7 Dis	trib	utio	n									
				110	1401107	220	0112	u010.										
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades	5			Re	ason	s			Тур	e			Majors	3
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Re	guir	 ed f	or M	ajor:	 3	1	Graduate	·	0	Majo	 or	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 3			_			-								
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 0		Ge	nera	1				0	Under-gr	rad	6	Non-	-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 1														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		El	ecti	ves				1	#### - M	leans t	here a	are not	enoug	jh
				P 0									response	s to b	e sign	nificar	ıt -	
				I 0		Ot	her					4	_					

Course-Section: RUSS 302 0101 University of Maryland Page 1471 Title Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 CONTINUING RUSSIAN III Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: YOUNG, STEVEN

Enrollment: 10

Questionnaires: 8

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

								_	ncies	5			ructor		_		Level	
		Question	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did you	u gain ne	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	234/1670	4.88	4.36	4.31	4.24	4.88
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	198/1666	4.88	4.31	4.27	4.18	4.88
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	212/1406	4.88	4.48	4.32	4.22	4.88
4. Did otl	her evalı	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	196/1615	4.88	4.34	4.24	4.18	4.88
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ate to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	226/1566	4.75	4.26	4.07	4.04	4.75
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	221/1528	4.75	4.23	4.12	4.07	4.75
		g system clearly		ined	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	406/1650		4.16	4.22	4.12	4.63
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	4	4		1157/1667		4.47	4.67	4.67	
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	531/1626	4.43	4.08	4.11	4.06	4.43
		Lectur					_	_		_	_							
		actor's lecture			0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	521/1559		4.38	4.46	4.40	4.75
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	0	8		1/1560		4.75	4.72	4.67	5.00
				xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2		4.75	366/1549	4.75	4.34	4.31	4.25	4.75
		es contribute t			0	0 2	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	265/1546		4.40	4.32	4.24	
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques en	nance y	our understanding	0	2	U	U	U	1	5	4.83	144/1323	4.83	3.96	4.00	3.99	4.83
		Discus	aion															
1 Did al:	ace dieci			what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	257/1384	4.75	4.29	4.10	4.12	4.75
				d to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	4		1/1378	5.00	4.56	4.29	4.30	5.00
				d open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	4		1/1378		4.45	4.31	4.33	5.00
		echniques succe		a open arbeabbion	4	1	0	0	0	0	3		1/ 904		4.11		4.03	5.00
1	poorar oc	Joining and Dagger	55242		-	_	ŭ	ŭ	ŭ	Ü	9	3.00	2, 301	3.00		1.05	1.05	3.00
				Frequ	iency	Dist	tribu	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 6		Re	quire	ed f	or Ma	ajor	 3	1	Graduat	 е	1	Majo	 or	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 2														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Gei	nera:	L				1	Under-g	rad	7	Non-	-major	3
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				0	#### - Means there				_	ιh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	her					6						
				3 0														

Course-Section: RUSS 304 0101 University of Maryland Page 1472 INTERMED RUSSIAN CONV Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Title Instructor: ZHDANOVYCH, VIR Spring 2008 Enrollment: 6

? 0

Questionnaires: 6	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
-------------------	---

								equei		3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 L															
1. Did you	u qain ne	w insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	1216/1670	4.00	4.36	4.31	4.24	4.00
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	233/1666	4.83	4.31	4.27	4.18	4.83
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflect	the e	xpected goals	1	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.48	4.32	4.22	5.00
4. Did oth	her evalu	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	245/1615	4.80	4.34	4.24	4.18	4.80
5. Did ass	signed re	adings contrib	ite to	what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	187/1566	4.80	4.26	4.07	4.04	4.80
6. Did wr	itten ass	ignments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	421/1528	4.50	4.23	4.12	4.07	4.50
7. Was the	. Was the grading system clearly explained . How many times was class cancelled					1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	229/1650	4.80	4.16	4.22	4.12	4.80
8. How mar	ny times '	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.47	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How wor	How would you grade the overall teaching effectivene					0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	637/1626	4.33	4.08	4.11	4.06	4.33
		Lecture	<b>a</b>															
1 Were th	he instru	ctor's lecture		prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	387/1559	4.83	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.83
		tor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.75	4.72	4.67	5.00
				xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.34	4.31	4.25	5.00
		s contribute to			0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	,	4.83	4.40	4.32	4.24	4.83
				our understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	235/1323	4.67	3.96	4.00	3.99	4.67
		-	_	_														
		Discus																
				what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1		4.80	221/1384	4.80	4.29	4.10	4.12	4.80
		_	_	d to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.56	4.29	4.30	5.00
		_		d open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	,	5.00	4.45	4.31	4.33	5.00
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succes	ssful		1	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	4.11	4.03	4.03	5.00
				Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits Ea	arnod	Cum CDA		Exported Crades				Por	asons	,			Ty	00			Majors	
	ts Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades																	, 
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	3	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	4
	28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 1																	
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 1 C 0					Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	6	Non-	major	2	
84-150 3 3.00-3.49 0 D 0																		
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0					Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	ıh	
				P 0								_	respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
I O					Ot1	her					6							

Course-Section: RUSS 350 0101 University of Maryland Page 1473 Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Title RUSSIAN COMPLEM READIN Job IRBR3029

Instructor: YOUNG, STEVEN

Enrollment: 9 Questionnaires: 5

56-83

Grad.

84-150

0

1

2.00-2.99

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

0

0

3

Spring 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eque	ncie	3		Inst	tructor	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	Λ	0	0	1	1	Λ	3	4 00	1216/1670	4.00	4.36	4.31	4.24	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	784/1666		4.31	4.27	4.18	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1406		4.48	4.32	4.22	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60		4.60	4.34	4.24	4.18	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	187/1566		4.26	4.07	4.04	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	560/1528		4.23	4.12	4.07	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	272/1650		4.16	4.22	4.12	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	3		1082/1667	4.60	4.47	4.67	4.67	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	2		403/1626		4.08	4.11	4.06	4.50
									,					
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	1022/1559	4.40	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	1326/1560	4.40	4.75	4.72	4.67	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.34	4.31	4.25	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	595/1546	4.60	4.40	4.32	4.24	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1323	5.00	3.96	4.00	3.99	5.00
Diamondo														
Discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	1 67	204/1204	1 67	4 00	4 10	1 10	1 67
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	2		324/1384 1/1378	4.67 5.00	4.29 4.56	4.10 4.29	4.12 4.30	4.67 5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2 2	0	0	0	0	0	3		1/1378		4.45	4.29	4.33	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	1	0	2		328/ 904			4.03	4.03	
4. Weie special techniques successiul	۷	U	U	U		U	4	4.33	320/ 904	4.33	4.11	4.03	4.03	4.33
Freq	ıency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
													_	
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	ason	5			Ty	pe			Majors	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 4		Red	guir	ed fo	or Ma	aior	 s	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r •	5
28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 0						J ·						5		-

General

Other

Electives

0

0

4

Under-grad

5

responses to be significant

### - Means there are not enough

Non-major

0

С

D

F

Ρ

I

?

0

0

0

0

0

0

Baltimore County Spring 2008

Course-Section: RUSS 402 0101 University of Maryland Title ADVANCED RUSSIAN II Instructor: ZHDANOVYCH, VIR

Enrollment:	4
Questionnaires:	3

Page 1474 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student C	Ourge Ft	ralııation	Ouestionnaire

			Fr	eque:	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.36	4.31	4.45	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.31	4.27	4.35	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.48	4.32	4.48	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.34	4.24	4.37	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.26	4.07	4.17	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.23	4.12	4.26	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.16	4.22	4.28	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.47	4.67	4.73	5.00
$9.\ \mbox{How would}$ you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1626	5.00	4.08	4.11	4.28	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.38	4.46	4.58	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.75	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	488/1549	4.67	4.34	4.31	4.43	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.40	4.32	4.43	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1323	5.00	3.96	4.00	4.10	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.29	4.10	4.32	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.56	4.29	4.55	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.45	4.31	4.60	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	0	2		328/ 904	4.33	4.11	4.03	4.22	4.33
Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00.27 0 0.00.09 0 7 2								0			0	Maio		

Credits E	Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades			Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	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	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	2	-			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: RUSS 419 0101 University of Maryland Page 1475 Title THEORY/PRAC TRANSLATIO Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Spring 2008

Instructor: YOUNG, STEVEN

Enrollment: 7

Questionnaires: 5

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

Ouestions					NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	3 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
x																		
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course						0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.36	4.31	4.45	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals						0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	259/1666	4.80	4.31	4.27	4.35	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals						0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.48	4.32	4.48	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals						0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.34	4.24	4.37	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	187/1566	4.80	4.26	4.07	4.17	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	173/1528	4.80	4.23	4.12	4.26	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained						0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	429/1650	4.60	4.16	4.22	4.28	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled						0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	1256/1667	4.40	4.47	4.67	4.73	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness						0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	403/1626	4.50	4.08	4.11	4.28	4.50
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared							0	0	1	0	4	4.60	772/1559	4.60	4.38	4.46	4.58	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	1163/1560	4.60	4.75	4.72	4.80	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly						0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	294/1549	4.80	4.34	4.31	4.43	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	595/1546	4.60	4.40	4.32	4.43	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding						2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1323	5.00	3.96	4.00	4.10	5.00
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.29	4.10	4.32	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate						0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.56	4.29	4.55	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion						0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.45	4.31	4.60	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful						0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	4.11	4.03	4.22	5.00
				Frequ	ency	7 Dis	tribu	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades						Reasons							Type				Majors	
00-27	-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 4					Required for Majors						0	Graduate 0		Major		 5	
28-55						_				J						5		-
56-83						General						0	Under-g	rad	5	Non-	major	0
84-150													5				3	
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0				F 0		Electives						0	#### - Means there are not enough					
P 0													respons				_	
	I 0 Other									4			5					
i o other																		

?

0