

Course-Section: RUSS 102 01
 Title Basic Russian II
 Instructor: Zhdanovych,Vira
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1274
 JUN 28, 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	22	4.96	74/1447	4.96	4.31	4.31	4.18	4.96
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	100/1447	4.91	4.34	4.27	4.30	4.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	20	4.83	213/1241	4.83	4.48	4.33	4.25	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	107/1402	4.88	4.36	4.24	4.15	4.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	151/1358	4.78	4.26	4.11	4.03	4.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	117/1316	4.82	4.27	4.14	3.99	4.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	140/1427	4.83	4.21	4.19	4.24	4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	14	8	4.36	1182/1447	4.36	4.66	4.69	4.68	4.36
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	0	0	1	7	11	4.53	328/1434	4.53	4.12	4.10	4.10	4.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	120/1387	4.95	4.45	4.46	4.46	4.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.78	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	136/1386	4.90	4.35	4.32	4.32	4.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	159/1380	4.90	4.43	4.32	4.31	4.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	1	4	2	11	4.28	463/1193	4.28	4.02	4.02	3.99	4.28
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	1	3	2	12	4.05	691/1172	4.05	4.26	4.15	3.95	4.05
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	0	1	4	13	4.30	714/1182	4.30	4.56	4.35	4.18	4.30
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	1	2	15	4.58	538/1170	4.58	4.41	4.38	4.17	4.58
4. Were special techniques successful	3	12	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	103/ 800	4.75	4.17	4.06	3.95	4.75
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 36	****	4.70	4.25	4.26	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	4.50	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 12	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0	Major 5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 5			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 3	General 8	Under-grad 23	Non-major 18
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 0			

Course-Section: RUSS 202 01
 Title Continuing Russian I
 Instructor: Zhdanovych,Vira
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1275
 JUN 28, 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	3	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.31	4.31	4.31	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.34	4.27	4.23	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	380/1241	4.67	4.48	4.33	4.35	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	314/1402	4.67	4.36	4.24	4.24	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1358	5.00	4.26	4.11	4.12	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	392/1316	4.50	4.27	4.14	4.08	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	283/1427	4.67	4.21	4.19	4.14	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.66	4.69	4.70	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.12	4.10	3.97	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	566/1387	4.67	4.45	4.46	4.42	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.78	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1386	5.00	4.35	4.32	4.24	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	463/1380	4.67	4.43	4.32	4.30	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1193	5.00	4.02	4.02	4.04	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.26	4.15	4.12	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.56	4.35	4.30	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.41	4.38	4.32	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	423/ 800	4.00	4.17	4.06	4.01	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: RUSS 302 01
 Title Continuing Russian III
 Instructor: Zhdanovych,Vira
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1276
 JUN 28, 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	6	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.31	4.31	4.32	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	352/1447	4.67	4.34	4.27	4.23	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	204/1241	4.83	4.48	4.33	4.33	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	314/1402	4.67	4.36	4.24	4.24	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	122/1358	4.83	4.26	4.11	4.10	4.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	112/1316	4.83	4.27	4.14	4.13	4.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	133/1427	4.83	4.21	4.19	4.15	4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	1079/1447	4.50	4.66	4.69	4.65	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	278/1434	4.60	4.12	4.10	4.09	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	429/1387	4.75	4.45	4.46	4.44	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.78	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	316/1386	4.75	4.35	4.32	4.30	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	339/1380	4.75	4.43	4.32	4.32	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1193	****	4.02	4.02	4.05	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1172	****	4.26	4.15	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1182	****	4.56	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1170	****	4.41	4.38	4.49	****
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 800	****	4.17	4.06	4.12	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: RUSS 304 01
 Title Intermed Russian Conv
 Instructor: Zhdanovych,Vira
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1277
 JUN 28, 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	2	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.31	4.31	4.32	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.34	4.27	4.23	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.48	4.33	4.33	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1402	5.00	4.36	4.24	4.24	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1358	5.00	4.26	4.11	4.10	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1316	5.00	4.27	4.14	4.13	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1427	5.00	4.21	4.19	4.15	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1361/1447	4.00	4.66	4.69	4.65	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.12	4.10	4.09	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.45	4.46	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.78	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1386	5.00	4.35	4.32	4.30	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.43	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1193	5.00	4.02	4.02	4.05	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	2	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						

Course-Section: RUSS 332 01
 Title Structure Of Russian
 Instructor: Young, Steven R
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1278
 JUN 28, 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	4	4.43	695/1447	4.43	4.31	4.31	4.32	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	824/1447	4.29	4.34	4.27	4.23	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	451/1241	4.60	4.48	4.33	4.33	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	414/1402	4.57	4.36	4.24	4.24	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	345/1358	4.50	4.26	4.11	4.10	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	196/1316	4.71	4.27	4.14	4.13	4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	971/1427	4.00	4.21	4.19	4.15	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	1139/1447	4.43	4.66	4.69	4.65	4.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	540/1434	4.33	4.12	4.10	4.09	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	276/1387	4.86	4.45	4.46	4.44	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.78	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	719/1386	4.43	4.35	4.32	4.30	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	392/1380	4.71	4.43	4.32	4.32	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	358/1193	4.43	4.02	4.02	4.05	4.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	218/1172	4.75	4.26	4.15	4.24	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.56	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.41	4.38	4.49	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	423/ 800	4.00	4.17	4.06	4.12	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

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

Course-Section: RUSS 350 01
 Title Russian Complem Readin
 Instructor: Young,Steven R
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1279
 JUN 28, 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	2	3	4.60	474/1447	4.60	4.31	4.31	4.32	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	196/1447	4.80	4.34	4.27	4.23	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1241	****	4.48	4.33	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	165/1402	4.80	4.36	4.24	4.24	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1358	5.00	4.26	4.11	4.10	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	128/1316	4.80	4.27	4.14	4.13	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1427	5.00	4.21	4.19	4.15	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	1155/1447	4.40	4.66	4.69	4.65	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.12	4.10	4.09	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.45	4.46	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1387	****	4.78	4.73	4.71	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1386	****	4.35	4.32	4.30	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1380	****	4.43	4.32	4.32	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1172	****	4.26	4.15	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1182	****	4.56	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1170	****	4.41	4.38	4.49	****

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 3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1	General 0	Under-grad 5	Non-major 2
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0			
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0			
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: RUSS 402 01
 Title Advanced Russian II
 Instructor: Young, Steven R
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1280
 JUN 28, 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	3	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.31	4.31	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.34	4.27	4.31	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.48	4.33	4.41	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1402	5.00	4.36	4.24	4.34	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	529/1358	4.33	4.26	4.11	4.15	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1316	5.00	4.27	4.14	4.27	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1427	5.00	4.21	4.19	4.20	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	958/1447	4.67	4.66	4.69	4.72	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	230/1434	4.67	4.12	4.10	4.17	4.67

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.45	4.46	4.48	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.78	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1386	5.00	4.35	4.32	4.34	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.43	4.32	4.34	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	652/1193	4.00	4.02	4.02	4.00	4.00

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 0	Under-grad 3	Non-major 3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			