

Course Section: RUSS 101 0101
 Title: BASIC RUSSIAN I
 Instructor: RUSINKO, ELAINE
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1481
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	2	2	14	4.67	389/1669	4.83	4.33	4.23	4.02	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	359/1666	4.76	4.28	4.19	4.11	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	12	4.56	511/1421	4.66	4.36	4.24	4.11	4.56	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	0	3	12	4.56	434/1617	4.60	4.27	4.15	3.99	4.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	6	9	4.17	644/1555	4.43	4.17	4.00	3.92	4.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	0	4	10	4.53	362/1543	4.73	4.19	4.06	3.86	4.53	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	302/1647	4.64	4.18	4.12	4.06	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	10	7	4.41	1265/1668	4.48	4.60	4.67	4.62	4.41	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	678/1605	4.45	4.13	4.07	3.96	4.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	522/1514	4.80	4.39	4.39	4.32	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	862/1551	4.88	4.72	4.66	4.55	4.76	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	604/1503	4.64	4.31	4.24	4.17	4.47	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	340/1506	4.88	4.40	4.26	4.17	4.76	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	4	5	8	4.24	458/1311	4.34	3.78	3.85	3.68	4.24	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	2	4	6	4.00	849/1490	4.44	4.26	4.05	3.85	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	567/1502	4.79	4.54	4.26	4.06	4.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	1	2	4	6	3.93	1107/1489	4.28	4.43	4.29	4.07	3.93	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	2	2	4	5	3.92	581/1006	3.96	4.14	4.00	3.81	3.92	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.00	4.38	4.04	****	
Field Work															
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	10	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	4	Under-grad	18	Non-major	16
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	2						

Course Section: RUSS 101 0201
 Title: BASIC RUSSIAN I
 Instructor: RUSINKO, ELAINE
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1482
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	13	5.00	1/1669	4.83	4.33	4.23	4.02	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	149/1666	4.76	4.28	4.19	4.11	4.85	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	267/1421	4.66	4.36	4.24	4.11	4.77	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	358/1617	4.60	4.27	4.15	3.99	4.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	207/1555	4.43	4.17	4.00	3.92	4.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	83/1543	4.73	4.19	4.06	3.86	4.92	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	356/1647	4.64	4.18	4.12	4.06	4.62	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	1170/1668	4.48	4.60	4.67	4.62	4.54	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	278/1605	4.45	4.13	4.07	3.96	4.63	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	189/1514	4.80	4.39	4.39	4.32	4.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1551	4.88	4.72	4.66	4.55	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	220/1503	4.64	4.31	4.24	4.17	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1506	4.88	4.40	4.26	4.17	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	305/1311	4.34	3.78	3.85	3.68	4.44	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	162/1490	4.44	4.26	4.05	3.85	4.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1502	4.79	4.54	4.26	4.06	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	574/1489	4.28	4.43	4.29	4.07	4.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	479/1006	3.96	4.14	4.00	3.81	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.00	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.00	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.50	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.00	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.33	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.00	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	5.00	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	4.42	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	4.33	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	5.00	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: RUSS 101 0201
 Title BASIC RUSSIAN I
 Instructor: RUSINKO, ELAINE
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1482
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	1	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	4	Under-grad	12	Non-major	11
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course Section: RUSS 201 0101
 Title BASIC RUSSIAN III
 Instructor: VINOGRADOVA, PO
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1483
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	2	8	4.80	207/1669	4.80	4.33	4.23	4.34	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.28	4.19	4.29	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	151/1421	4.90	4.36	4.24	4.35	4.90	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	288/1617	4.70	4.27	4.15	4.24	4.70	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	340/1555	4.50	4.17	4.00	3.96	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	390/1543	4.50	4.19	4.06	4.10	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	167/1647	4.80	4.18	4.12	4.19	4.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	1	4.10	1477/1668	4.10	4.60	4.67	4.59	4.10	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	448/1605	4.44	4.13	4.07	4.15	4.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	360/1514	4.80	4.39	4.39	4.39	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.72	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	220/1503	4.80	4.31	4.24	4.29	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	286/1506	4.80	4.40	4.26	4.33	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	587/1311	4.00	3.78	3.85	3.96	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	692/1490	4.25	4.26	4.05	4.11	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	522/1502	4.63	4.54	4.26	4.31	4.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	434/1489	4.75	4.43	4.29	4.36	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	178/1006	4.67	4.14	4.00	3.99	4.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.42	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.74	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.71	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.59	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: RUSS 301 0101
 Title CONTINUING RUSSIAN II
 Instructor: BLYUKHER, ALLA
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1484
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	2	5	4.71	318/1669	4.71	4.33	4.23	4.28	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	142/1666	4.86	4.28	4.19	4.20	4.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	184/1421	4.86	4.36	4.24	4.25	4.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	265/1617	4.71	4.27	4.15	4.22	4.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	195/1555	4.71	4.17	4.00	4.03	4.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	325/1543	4.57	4.19	4.06	4.14	4.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	828/1647	4.29	4.18	4.12	4.14	4.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	1017/1668	4.71	4.60	4.67	4.68	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	320/1605	4.57	4.13	4.07	4.09	4.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	274/1514	4.86	4.39	4.39	4.46	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	650/1551	4.86	4.72	4.66	4.70	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	173/1503	4.86	4.31	4.24	4.28	4.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	225/1506	4.86	4.40	4.26	4.30	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	116/1311	4.80	3.78	3.85	3.97	4.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	214/1490	4.80	4.26	4.05	4.11	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.54	4.26	4.28	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.43	4.29	4.35	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	178/1006	4.67	4.14	4.00	4.10	4.67	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 1		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	5
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course Section: RUSS 350 0101
 Title RUSSIAN COMPLEM READIN
 Instructor: RUSINKO, ELAINE
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1485
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	1	2	4.67	389/1669	4.67	4.33	4.23	4.28	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	359/1666	4.67	4.28	4.19	4.20	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.36	4.24	4.25	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	717/1617	4.33	4.27	4.15	4.22	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	225/1555	4.67	4.17	4.00	4.03	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	390/1543	4.50	4.19	4.06	4.14	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1647	5.00	4.18	4.12	4.14	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1329/1668	4.33	4.60	4.67	4.68	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	918/1605	4.00	4.13	4.07	4.09	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.39	4.39	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.72	4.66	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.31	4.24	4.28	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.40	4.26	4.30	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1490	5.00	4.26	4.05	4.11	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.54	4.26	4.28	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.43	4.29	4.35	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	3	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	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	3				
				?	1						

Course Section: RUSS 401 0101
 Title ADVANCED RUSSIAN I
 Instructor: BLYUKHER, ALLA
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1486
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	1/1669	5.00	4.33	4.23	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.28	4.19	4.22	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.36	4.24	4.38	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	496/1617	4.50	4.27	4.15	4.22	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1555	5.00	4.17	4.00	4.08	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1543	5.00	4.19	4.06	4.18	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1474/1647	3.33	4.18	4.12	4.14	3.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1068/1668	4.67	4.60	4.67	4.70	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	373/1605	4.50	4.13	4.07	4.16	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.39	4.39	4.45	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.72	4.66	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.31	4.24	4.27	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.40	4.26	4.29	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	264/1311	4.50	3.78	3.85	3.88	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1490	5.00	4.26	4.05	4.26	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.54	4.26	4.46	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.43	4.29	4.52	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	479/1006	4.00	4.14	4.00	4.21	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 3
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	2
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant