

Course-Section: RUSS 102 0101
 Title BASIC RUSSIAN II
 Instructor: RUSINKO, ELAINE
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1327
 JUN 26, 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	3	13	4.61	482/1522	4.61	4.36	4.30	4.14	4.61	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	9	4.33	787/1522	4.33	4.33	4.26	4.18	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	478/1285	4.56	4.45	4.30	4.22	4.56	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	781/1476	4.27	4.33	4.22	4.09	4.27	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	1	3	11	4.35	475/1412	4.35	4.26	4.06	4.01	4.35	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	5	10	4.41	423/1381	4.41	4.19	4.08	3.93	4.41	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	2	13	4.59	406/1500	4.59	4.14	4.18	4.16	4.59	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	1	0	7	8	4.38	1185/1517	4.38	4.56	4.65	4.62	4.38	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	6	5	4.14	782/1497	4.14	4.21	4.11	4.02	4.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	4	12	4.59	705/1440	4.59	4.45	4.45	4.40	4.59	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	840/1448	4.76	4.79	4.71	4.63	4.76	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	708/1436	4.41	4.39	4.29	4.24	4.41	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	267/1432	4.82	4.47	4.29	4.23	4.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	4	2	9	4.33	408/1221	4.33	3.91	3.93	3.86	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	499/1280	4.38	4.28	4.10	3.92	4.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	0	1	14	4.75	375/1277	4.75	4.60	4.34	4.13	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	816/1269	4.20	4.47	4.31	4.04	4.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	1	1	2	4	6	3.93	505/ 854	3.93	4.16	4.02	3.87	3.93	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	4.50	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 217	****	4.50	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 205	****	5.00	4.23	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 65	****	5.00	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 78	****	4.83	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.83	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	3.60	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	4.00	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	3.00	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	3.00	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 34	****	2.75	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	4.33	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	4.11	****	

Course-Section: RUSS 102 0101
 Title BASIC RUSSIAN II
 Instructor: RUSINKO, ELAINE
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1327
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	1	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	17	Non-major	15
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	2						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: RUSS 202 0101
 Title CONTINUING RUSSIAN I
 Instructor: VINOGRADOVA, PO
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1328
 JUN 26, 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	1	0	3	7	4.45	669/1522	4.45	4.36	4.30	4.34	4.45	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	750/1522	4.36	4.33	4.26	4.29	4.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	817/1285	4.18	4.45	4.30	4.36	4.18	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	703/1476	4.33	4.33	4.22	4.20	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	5	4	4.09	703/1412	4.09	4.26	4.06	4.00	4.09	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	663/1381	4.20	4.19	4.08	3.97	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	1	4	4	3.73	1204/1500	3.73	4.14	4.18	4.20	3.73	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.56	4.65	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	654/1497	4.25	4.21	4.11	4.11	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	798/1440	4.50	4.45	4.45	4.42	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	548/1448	4.89	4.79	4.71	4.78	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	539/1436	4.56	4.39	4.29	4.29	4.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	454/1432	4.67	4.47	4.29	4.31	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	540/1221	4.14	3.91	3.93	4.02	4.14	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	834/1280	3.89	4.28	4.10	4.08	3.89	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	652/1277	4.44	4.60	4.34	4.33	4.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	637/1269	4.44	4.47	4.31	4.33	4.44	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	330/ 854	4.25	4.16	4.02	4.00	4.25	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.62	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 228	****	4.50	4.35	4.56	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 217	****	4.50	4.51	4.57	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.72	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 205	****	5.00	4.23	4.37	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.58	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 65	****	5.00	4.49	5.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 78	****	4.83	4.45	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.83	4.11	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	3.60	4.41	4.83	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	4.00	4.30	4.58	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	3.00	4.40	4.75	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	3.00	4.31	4.75	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	2.75	4.30	4.17	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 37	****	4.33	4.63	****	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	****	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	****	****	

Course-Section: RUSS 202 0101
 Title CONTINUING RUSSIAN I
 Instructor: VINOGRADOVA, PO
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1328
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	11	Non-major	7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	2						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: RUSS 302 0101
 Title CONTINUING RUSSIAN III
 Instructor: BLYUKHER, ALLA
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1329
 JUN 26, 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	1/1522	5.00	4.36	4.30	4.34	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.33	4.26	4.25	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.45	4.30	4.30	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	316/1476	4.67	4.33	4.22	4.26	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	339/1412	4.50	4.26	4.06	4.03	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	806/1381	4.00	4.19	4.08	4.13	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	988/1500	4.00	4.14	4.18	4.13	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.56	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1497	5.00	4.21	4.11	4.13	5.00	

Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.45	4.45	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.79	4.71	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.39	4.29	4.30	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.47	4.29	4.29	5.00	

Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1280	5.00	4.28	4.10	4.14	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.60	4.34	4.38	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.47	4.31	4.39	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	426/ 854	4.00	4.16	4.02	4.00	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: RUSS 315 0101
 Title STUDIES IN RUSSIAN FIL
 Instructor: STERN, GALA
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1330
 JUN 26, 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	3	4.60	492/1522	4.60	4.36	4.30	4.34	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	201/1522	4.80	4.33	4.26	4.25	4.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	425/1285	4.60	4.45	4.30	4.30	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	473/1476	4.50	4.33	4.22	4.26	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1412	5.00	4.26	4.06	4.03	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1381	5.00	4.19	4.08	4.13	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	160/1500	4.80	4.14	4.18	4.13	4.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	714/1517	4.80	4.56	4.65	4.62	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	264/1497	4.67	4.21	4.11	4.13	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	452/1440	4.75	4.45	4.45	4.46	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.79	4.71	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	295/1436	4.75	4.39	4.29	4.30	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.47	4.29	4.29	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1221	5.00	3.91	3.93	3.94	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	184/1280	4.80	4.28	4.10	4.14	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.60	4.34	4.38	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	332/1269	4.80	4.47	4.31	4.39	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 854	5.00	4.16	4.02	4.00	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	5	Non-major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	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	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: RUSS 332 0101
 Title STRUCTURE OF RUSSIAN
 Instructor: YOUNG, STEVEN
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1331
 JUN 26, 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	4	4.80	246/1522	4.80	4.36	4.30	4.34	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	432/1522	4.60	4.33	4.26	4.25	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	425/1285	4.60	4.45	4.30	4.30	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	473/1476	4.50	4.33	4.22	4.26	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	430/1412	4.40	4.26	4.06	4.03	4.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	519/1381	4.33	4.19	4.08	4.13	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	630/1500	4.40	4.14	4.18	4.13	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	714/1517	4.80	4.56	4.65	4.62	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	718/1497	4.20	4.21	4.11	4.13	4.20	

Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	353/1440	4.80	4.45	4.45	4.46	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.79	4.71	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	478/1436	4.60	4.39	4.29	4.30	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	294/1432	4.80	4.47	4.29	4.29	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1221	****	3.91	3.93	3.94	****	

Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1280	****	4.28	4.10	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1277	****	4.60	4.34	4.38	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1269	****	4.47	4.31	4.39	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: RUSS 350 0101
 Title RUSSIAN COMPLEM READIN
 Instructor: YOUNG, STEVEN
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1332
 JUN 26, 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	1	1	3	4.40	733/1522	4.40	4.36	4.30	4.34	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	432/1522	4.60	4.33	4.26	4.25	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	425/1285	4.60	4.45	4.30	4.30	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	792/1476	4.25	4.33	4.22	4.26	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	283/1412	4.60	4.26	4.06	4.03	4.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	604/1381	4.25	4.19	4.08	4.13	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	839/1500	4.20	4.14	4.18	4.13	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	994/1517	4.60	4.56	4.65	4.62	4.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	654/1497	4.25	4.21	4.11	4.13	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	682/1440	4.60	4.45	4.45	4.46	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.79	4.71	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	478/1436	4.60	4.39	4.29	4.30	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	294/1432	4.80	4.47	4.29	4.29	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1221	****	3.91	3.93	3.94	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	390/1280	4.50	4.28	4.10	4.14	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	594/1277	4.50	4.60	4.34	4.38	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	586/1269	4.50	4.47	4.31	4.39	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	5
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Major 0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
				Other	5

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: RUSS 402 0101
 Title ADVANCED RUSSIAN II
 Instructor: BLYUKHER, ALLA
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1333
 JUN 26, 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	1	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.36	4.30	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.33	4.26	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.45	4.30	4.42	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1476	5.00	4.33	4.22	4.31	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1412	5.00	4.26	4.06	4.11	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1381	5.00	4.19	4.08	4.21	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1500	5.00	4.14	4.18	4.25	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.56	4.65	4.71	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.45	4.45	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.79	4.71	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.39	4.29	4.32	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.47	4.29	4.34	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1221	5.00	3.91	3.93	4.04	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1280	5.00	4.28	4.10	4.28	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.60	4.34	4.50	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.47	4.31	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 854	5.00	4.16	4.02	4.31	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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