University of Maryland Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Spring 2009

Course-Section: RUSS 102 0101 Title BASIC RUSSIAN II Instructor: RUSINKO, ELAINE

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 16

Page 1399 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Mean Mean Mean Mean

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Instr	uctor
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank

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

Credits Earned Cum. GPA		•	Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	В	4					_	
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	15
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4	=			
				2	2						

Course-Section: RUSS 202 0101 Universi
Title CONTINUING RUSSIAN I Balti

Instructor: VINOGRADOVA, PO

Enrollment: 15
Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1400 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
----------------	------------	---------------

	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	Λ	0	Λ	Λ	Λ	Λ	10	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.34	4.30	4.35	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	152/1576	4.90	4.32	4.27	4.32	4.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	U	10	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.48	4.32	4.41	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	719/1520	4.38	4.30	4.25	4.26	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	1	6	4.10	798/1465	4.10	4.26	4.12	4.09	4.10
-	0	0	1	0	0	Τ.	9	4.60	323/1434	4.60	4.22	4.14	4.05	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.50	527/1547	4.50	4.12	4.14	4.22	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	Ţ	3	0		1346/1574	4.22	4.12	4.19	4.22	4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	1	6		, -					
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	۷	Τ	U	U	U	Т	О	4.86	138/1554	4.86	4.13	4.10	4.05	4.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	463/1488	4.78	4.39	4.47	4.44	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	607/1493	4.89	4.78	4.73	4.75	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	191/1486	4.89	4.33	4.32	4.29	4.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	217/1489	4.89	4.40	4.32	4.31	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	818/1277	3.88	3.99	4.03	4.01	3.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	312/1279	4.70	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	260/1270	4.90	4.57	4.35	4.30	4.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	535/1269	4.67	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	654/ 878	3.71	4.19	4.05	3.92	3.71
•														

Credits E	arned	d Cum. GPA Expected Grades			Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	2	Under-grad	10	Non-major	5
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	6	_			
				2	1						

Course-Section: RUSS 300A 0101

SPEC PROJ IN RUSSIAN L

Title Instructor:

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 14

YOUNG, STEVEN (Instr. A)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1401 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

- ·				
Student	('011760	Evaluation	()IIAGEIAN	n n n n n

		Questions		NR	NA	Fro	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General															
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	w insights, skills for	om this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	541/1576	4.57	4.34	4.30	4.30	4.57
		tor make clear the		1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	121/1576	4.92	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.92
3. Did th	ne exam qu	estions reflect the	expected goals	1	11	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1342	****	4.48	4.32	4.30	****
4. Did ot	her evalu	ations reflect the e	expected goals	1	7	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	945/1520	4.17	4.30	4.25	4.25	4.17
5. Did as	ssigned re	adings contribute to	what you learned	1	12	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1465	****	4.26	4.12	4.09	****
		signments contribute		1	12	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1434	****	4.22	4.14	4.15	****
		system clearly exp	ained	1	5	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1547		4.12	4.19	4.21	5.00
		was class cancelled		1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	739/1574		4.55	4.64	4.61	4.77
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the overall tea	ching effectiveness	0	4	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	237/1554	4.80	4.13	4.10	4.09	4.80
		Lecture															
		ctor's lectures well	1 1	4	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	248/1488	4.95	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.95
		tor seem interested	_	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1493		4.78	4.73	4.70	4.95
		erial presented and	-	4	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	172/1486		4.33	4.32	4.32	4.89
		es contribute to what		4	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	194/1489		4.40	4.32		4.90
5. Did au	udiovisual	techniques enhance	your understanding	3	4	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	118/1277	4.76	3.99	4.03	4.11	4.76
		Discussion															
		ssions contribute to	_	9	0	1	0	1	1	2		1022/1279		4.30	4.17	4.20	3.60
		its actively encourag		9	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	355/1270		4.57	4.35	4.42	4.80
		tor encourage fair a	and open discussion	10	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	928/1269		4.38	4.35	4.41	4.00
4. Were s	special te	chniques successful		9	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.19	4.05	4.09	5.00
		Seminar															
5. Were c	criteria f	for grading made clea	ar	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.97	4.01	4.12	5.00
		Field Work															
5. Did co	onferences	s help you carry out	field activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.99	4.03	4.23	5.00
- ·- ·	,	Self Paced			0	•	•	0	0	1.0	F 00	1 / 200	F 00	4 00	4 00	4 04	F 00
5. Were t	there enou	igh proctors for all	the students	4	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.99	4.08	4.24	5.00
			Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	les Reasons								Ty	pe			Majors	;
00-27	 2	0.00-0.99 0	A 0		Red	guir	ed f	or Ma	 ior		2	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	В 0			-1 ~ -1 .		10	-)	-	_	01 00000	-	-		_	_
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 2	C 0		Gei	nera	1				7	Under-g	rad 1	.4	Non-	major	12
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 0	D 0								3				3		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0		Ele	ves				2 #### - Means the			here a	re not	enoug	ſh	
	P 13					responses to be signi					ificar	ıt					
I 0						her					1						
? 0																	

Course-Section: RUSS 300A 0101

SPEC PROJ IN RUSSIAN L

Title

Instructor: LIBERMAN, SAVEL (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 14 Spring 2009

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Page 1402 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions					NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General																
1 Did vo	u cain n	ew insights,skill	le from th	is course	0	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	541/1576	4.57	4.34	4.30	4.30	4.57
		ctor make clear t			1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92			4.32	4.27	4.28	4.92
		uestions reflect				11	0	0	0	0	2		****/1342	****	4.48	4.32	4.30	****
		uations reflect t			1	7	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	945/1520	4.17	4.30	4.25	4.25	4.17
		eadings contribut			1	12	0	0	0	1	0		****/1465	****	4.26	4.12	4.09	****
		signments contrib			1	12	0	0	0	1	0		****/1434	***	4.22	4.14	4.15	****
		g system clearly		2	1	5	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.12	4.19	4.21	5.00
8. How ma	ny times	was class cancel	lled		1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	739/1574	4.77	4.55	4.64	4.61	4.77
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overal	l teaching	effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	116/1554	4.80	4.13	4.10	4.09	4.80
		Lecture																
		uctor's lectures			4	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1488	4.95	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.95
2. Did th	e instru	ctor seem interes	sted in the	e subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	557/1493	4.95	4.78	4.73	4.70	4.95
		terial presented		5	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	191/1486	4.89	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.89	
4. Did th			4	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	194/1489	4.90	4.40	4.32	4.34	4.90		
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques enha	understanding	4	4	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	215/1277	4.76	3.99	4.03	4.11	4.76	
		Discuss																
		ussions contribut		-	9	0	1	0	1	1	2		1022/1279	3.60	4.30	4.17	4.20	3.60
		nts actively enco			9	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	355/1270	4.80	4.57	4.35	4.42	4.80
		ctor encourage fa		en discussion	10	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	928/1269	4.00	4.38	4.35	4.41	4.00
4. Were s	pecial t	echniques success	sful		9	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.19	4.05	4.09	5.00
F		Seminar	2		2	0	•	0	0	0		F 00	1 / 285	F 00	4 00	4 01	4 10	F 00
5. Were c	riteria	for grading made	clear		3	0	0	0	0	U	11	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.97	4.01	4.12	5.00
F 744		Field Wo s help you carry			4	0	0	0	0	0	1.0	5.00	1 / 226	5.00	4 00	4 02	4 00	F 00
5. DIG CO	niterence	s help you carry	out lield	activities	4	U	U	U	U	U	10	5.00	1/ 320	5.00	4.99	4.03	4.23	5.00
5. Were t	here eno	Self Paugh proctors for		tudents	4	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.99	4.08	4.24	5.00
									_				_, _,					
	Frequ	iency	/ DIS	crib	ut10.	[]												
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	E:	xpected Grades		Reasons							Туј	pe 			Majors	;
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 0		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s	2	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В 0				_				_		_				
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C 0		Ge	nera	Τ				7	Under-g	rad 1	. 4	Non-	major	12
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D 0											,			,
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives					2 #### - Means there are not responses to be significant			_	ın				
P 13					0-	h					1	respons	es to k	e sign	ıırıcar	1T		
I 0					Ut.	her					1							
? 0																		

Course-Section: RUSS 302 0101 University of Maryland CONTINUING RUSSIAN III Baltimore County

Title Instructor: YOUNG, STEVEN Spring 2009

Enrollment: 3 Questionnaires: 3

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1403

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

	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	3	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.34	4.30	4.30	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.32	4.27	4.28	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.48	4.32	4.30	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.30	4.25	4.25	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.26	4.12	4.09	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.22	4.14	4.15	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	339/1547	4.67	4.12	4.19	4.21	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1459/1574	4.00	4.55	4.64	4.61	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	623/1554	4.33	4.13	4.10	4.09	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.39	4.47	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.78	4.73	4.70	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1486		4.33	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.40	4.32	4.34	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1020/1277	3.50	3.99		4.11	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	445/1279	4.50	4.30	4.17	4.20	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	636/1270	4.50	4.57	4.35	4.42	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	644/1269	4.50	4.38	4.35	4.41	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	709/ 878	3.50	4.19	4.05	4.09	3.50
	_	٠	•	_	Ū	J	_	3.50	. 02, 010	3.30		1.00	2.00	3.33
From	Diat	rib	1+ i or	_										

Credits Ea	redits Earned Cum. GPA			Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	3	Non-major	2
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	ī
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3	_			
				2	0						

Course-Section: RUSS 304 0101 University of Maryland Title INTERMED RUSSIAN CONV Baltimore County Instructor: ZHDANOVYCH, VIR

Spring 2009

Page 1404 JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	4						
Questionnaires:	3	Student	Course	Eva:	luation	Questionnaire	

? 0

						Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	cructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1														,	
1. Did v	ou gain n	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.34	4.30	4.30	5.00
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	392/1576	4.67	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.67
		uestions reflec		-	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.48	4.32	4.30	5.00
	_	uations reflect		_	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.30	4.25	4.25	5.00
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	264/1465	4.67	4.26	4.12	4.09	4.67
	_	-		o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.22	4.14	4.15	5.00
		g system clearl		-	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.12	4.19	4.21	5.00
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1459/1574	4.00	4.55	4.64	4.61	4.00
	-			hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1554	5.00		4.10	4.09	5.00
		Lectur	۵															
1 Were	the instr	Λ	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.39	4.47	4.47	5.00			
	 Were the instructor's lectures well prepared Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 						0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.78	4.73	4.70	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly					0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.33	4.32	4.32	5.00
		es contribute t			n	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.40	4.32	4.34	5.00
				our understanding	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	692/1277	4.00	3.99	4.03	4.11	4.00
		_	_															
		Discus																
				what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.30	4.17	4.20	5.00
				d to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1270	5.00	4.57	4.35	4.42	5.00
		_		d open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1269	5.00	4.38	4.35	4.41	5.00
4. Were	special t	echniques succe	ssful		2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	799/ 878	3.00	4.19	4.05	4.09	3.00
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	oe			Majors	3
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 3						Re	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	3	0	Graduat	9	0	Majo	r	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 0														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ge	nera	l				0	Under-g	rad	3	Non-	-major	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0															
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0						Electives 0 #### - Means there are n						_	βh					
P 0					-				es to be significant									
				Ι 0		Other						2						

Course-Section: RUSS 350 0101 University of Maryland RUSSIAN COMPLEM READIN Baltimore County

Title Spring 2009 Instructor: ZHDANOVYCH, VIR

Page 1405

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	2	
Questionnaires:	2	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ouestions					NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	5 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course	_		Level Mean	
		Genera	1															
1. Did y	you qain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1539/1576	3.00	4.34	4.30	4.30	3.00
2. Did t	the instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1523/1576	3.00	4.32	4.27	4.28	3.00
		uestions reflec			0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1341/1342	2.00	4.48	4.32	4.30	2.00
4. Did	other eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1512/1520	2.50	4.30	4.25	4.25	2.50
5. Did a	assigned r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1386/1465	3.00	4.26	4.12	4.09	3.00
6. Did v	written as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1380/1434	3.00	4.22	4.14	4.15	3.00
7. Was t	7. Was the grading system clearly explained							1	0	0	0	2.00	1538/1547	2.00	4.12	4.19	4.21	2.00
8. How r	many times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1079/1574	4.50	4.55	4.64	4.61	4.50
9. How v	would you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1448/1554	3.00	4.13	4.10	4.09	3.00
1. Were	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared							0	2	0	0	3.00	1452/1488	3.00	4.39	4.47	4.47	3.00
2. Did t	2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject							0	1	1	0	3.50	1473/1493	3.50	4.78	4.73	4.70	3.50
3. Was	lecture ma	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1330/1486	3.50	4.33	4.32	4.32	3.50
4. Did t	the lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1313/1489	3.50	4.40	4.32	4.34	3.50
5. Did a	audiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1267/1277	2.00	3.99	4.03	4.11	2.00
		Discus	sion															
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1064/1279	3.50	4.30	4.17	4.20	3.50
				d to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	928/1270	4.00	4.57	4.35	4.42	4.00
				d open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1116/1269	3.50	4.38	4.35	4.41	3.50
4. Were	special t	echniques succe	ssful		0	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	799/ 878	3.00	4.19	4.05	4.09	3.00
				Frequ	lency	7 Dis	tribu	ution	ı									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	}
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 1		Re	guire	ed fo	or Ma	ajors		0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r)r	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 1			-			-						3		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	L				0	Under-g	rad	2	Non-	-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0													-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	ŗh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
				I 0		Ot]	her					1	-					
? 0																		

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

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1406

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	4	_	
Questionnaires:	4	Student Course Eval	luation Questionnaire

							equer		5			tructor	Course	_		Level	Sect	
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 I															
1. Did voi	u gain ne	w insights,skil	=	this course	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1539/1576	3.00	4.34	4.30	4.46	3.00
		tor make clear			0	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1523/1576	3.00	4.32	4.27	4.35	3.00
		estions reflect			0	0	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	1323/1342	2.75	4.48	4.32	4.46	2.75
		ations reflect			0	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1362/1520	3.50	4.30	4.25	4.38	3.50
5. Did ass	signed re	adings contribu	ıte to w	hat you learned	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1102/1465	3.75	4.26	4.12	4.22	3.75
6. Did wr:	itten ass	ignments contri	ibute to	what you learned	l 0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	878/1434	4.00	4.22	4.14	4.30	4.00
7. Was the	e grading	system clearly	z explai	ned	0	0	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	1459/1547	3.00	4.12	4.19	4.24	3.00
8. How man	ny times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1459/1574	4.00	4.55	4.64	4.69	4.00
9. How wor	uld you g	rade the overal	ll teach	ing effectiveness	: 1	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	1448/1554	3.00	4.13	4.10	4.24	3.00
1 Wome +1	ho inatan	Lecture ctor's lectures		ronarad	0	0	0	2	0	1	1	2 25	1428/1488	3.25	4.39	4.47	4.55	3.25
					0	0	0	1	2	0	1		1484/1493	3.25	4.78	4.47	4.80	3.25
	 Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 					0	0	2	1	0	1		1404/1493		4.78	4.73	4.41	3.25
	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	1	1	0	1	1		1415/1489	3.00	4.33	4.32	4.41	3.00
				our understanding	0	1	3	0	0	0	0		1274/1277		3.99	4.03		1.00
5. Did au	alovisual	teciniiques em	iance yc	di diderstanding	U	_	3	U	U	U	U	1.00	12/4/12//	1.00	3.33	4.03	4.04	1.00
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contribu	ite to w	hat you learned	0	0	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	1186/1279	3.00	4.30	4.17	4.31	3.00
2. Were a	ll studen	ts actively end	couraged	to participate	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1054/1270	3.75	4.57	4.35	4.53	3.75
3. Did the	e instruc	tor encourage i	air and	open discussion	0	0	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	1210/1269	3.00	4.38	4.35	4.55	3.00
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succes	ssful	_	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	862/ 878	2.00	4.19	4.05	4.33	2.00
				Freq	quency	7 Dis	trib	ution	ı									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades	3			Rea	asons	S			Ty	pe			Majors	;
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 1						quire	ed fo	or Ma	aiors	 3	0	Graduat	 е	0	Majo	 or	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 3			1									3		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ge	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad	4	Non-	-major	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0		General							J				-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Electives					0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	ıh	
				P 0								respons						
				I 0		Ot:	her					4	-					
? 0																		

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Spring 2009

Title POLITICAL RUSSIAN Instructor: YOUNG, STEVEN

Course-Section: RUSS 415 0101

Enrollment: 5 Ouestionnaires: 5

Page 1407 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 5 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire														
			Fr	eque:	ncies	S		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	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	787/1576	4.40	4.34	4.30	4.46	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	476/1576	4.60	4.32	4.27	4.35	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.48	4.32	4.46	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.30	4.25	4.38	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	175/1465	4.80	4.26	4.12	4.22	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.22	4.14	4.30	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.12	4.19	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	1537/1574	3.80	4.55	4.64	4.69	3.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.13	4.10	4.24	5.00
Logturo														

	Lecture														
1.	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.39	4.47	4.55	5.00
2.	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.78	4.73	4.80	5.00
3.	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.33	4.32	4.41	5.00
4.	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.40	4.32	4.38	5.00
5.	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1149/1277	3.00	3.99	4.03	4.04	3.00
	Discussion														
1.	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	381/1279	4.60	4.30	4.17	4.31	4.60
2.	Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	559/1270	4.60	4.57	4.35	4.53	4.60
3.	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	386/1269	4.80	4.38	4.35	4.55	4.80
4.	Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	464/ 878	4.00	4.19	4.05	4.33	4.00
	Cominan														

Seminar													
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/ 375	****	4.97	4.01	3.90	****
Field Work													

5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 326 **** 4.99 4.03 3.97 ****

Self Paced 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 4 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 382 **** 4.99 4.08 3.88 ****

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	4	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	5	Non-major	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	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	gnificant	
				I	0	Other		-			
				?	0						