

Course-Section: RUSS 102 0101  
 Title BASIC RUSSIAN II  
 Instructor: RUSINKO, ELAINE  
 Enrollment: 38  
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1469  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from 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 instructor make clear the expected 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 exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	3	24	4.72	352/1406	4.72	4.48	4.32	4.31	4.72
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	5	0	2	0	4	16	4.55	509/1615	4.55	4.34	4.24	4.17	4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute 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 written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	10	0	1	1	4	13	4.53	406/1528	4.53	4.23	4.12	4.00	4.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	4	5	19	4.41	705/1650	4.41	4.16	4.22	4.28	4.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	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 effectiveness	6	0	0	2	1	6	15	4.42	547/1626	4.42	4.08	4.11	4.07	4.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	1	22	4.88	323/1559	4.88	4.38	4.46	4.47	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	777/1560	4.83	4.75	4.72	4.68	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	2	5	16	4.61	562/1549	4.61	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.61
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	1	1	21	4.75	407/1546	4.75	4.40	4.32	4.32	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	1	2	1	4	6	10	3.91	807/1323	3.91	3.96	4.00	3.91	3.91
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute 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 all students actively encouraged 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 instructor encourage fair and 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 special techniques successful	17	2	2	0	5	1	3	3.27	791/ 904	3.27	4.11	4.03	3.94	3.27

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors 16	Graduate 0 Major 6
28-55	6	1.00-1.99 1	B 11		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 3	C 5	General 2	Under-grad 30 Non-major 24
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 12	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 8	
			? 1		

Course-Section: RUSS 202 0101  
 Title CONTINUING RUSSIAN I  
 Instructor: VINOGRADOVA, PO  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1470  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	5	4.83	271/1670	4.83	4.36	4.31	4.32	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected 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 exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.48	4.32	4.39	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1615	****	4.34	4.24	4.29	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute 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 written assignments contribute to 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 grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.16	4.22	4.20	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	1022/1667	4.67	4.47	4.67	4.64	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	953/1626	4.00	4.08	4.11	4.06	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures 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 instructor seem interested in 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 lecture material presented and explained 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 lectures contribute to 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 audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	235/1323	4.67	3.96	4.00	4.08	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute 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	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.56	4.29	4.25	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.45	4.31	4.26	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	328/ 904	4.33	4.11	4.03	4.01	4.33	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: RUSS 302 0101  
 Title CONTINUING RUSSIAN III  
 Instructor: YOUNG, STEVEN  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1471  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	7	4.88	234/1670	4.88	4.36	4.31	4.24	4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	198/1666	4.88	4.31	4.27	4.18	4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	212/1406	4.88	4.48	4.32	4.22	4.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	196/1615	4.88	4.34	4.24	4.18	4.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute 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 written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	221/1528	4.75	4.23	4.12	4.07	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	406/1650	4.63	4.16	4.22	4.12	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	1157/1667	4.50	4.47	4.67	4.67	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	531/1626	4.43	4.08	4.11	4.06	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	521/1559	4.75	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.75	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	366/1549	4.75	4.34	4.31	4.25	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	265/1546	4.88	4.40	4.32	4.24	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	144/1323	4.83	3.96	4.00	3.99	4.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	257/1384	4.75	4.29	4.10	4.12	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.56	4.29	4.30	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.45	4.31	4.33	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	4.11	4.03	4.03	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	1 Graduate 1 Major 5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 2		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1 Under-grad 7 Non-major 3
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	6
			? 0		

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: RUSS 304 0101  
 Title INTERMED RUSSIAN CONV  
 Instructor: ZHDANOVYCH, VIR  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1472  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	4	1	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	0	1	5	4.83	233/1666	4.83	4.31	4.27	4.18	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.48	4.32	4.22	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	245/1615	4.80	4.34	4.24	4.18	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute 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 written assignments contribute to 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 grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	229/1650	4.80	4.16	4.22	4.12	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.47	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	637/1626	4.33	4.08	4.11	4.06	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	387/1559	4.83	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.75	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	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	1	5	4.83	310/1546	4.83	4.40	4.32	4.24	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	235/1323	4.67	3.96	4.00	3.99	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	221/1384	4.80	4.29	4.10	4.12	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.56	4.29	4.30	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.45	4.31	4.33	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	4.11	4.03	4.03	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: RUSS 350 0101  
 Title RUSSIAN COMPLEM READIN  
 Instructor: YOUNG, STEVEN  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1473  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	0	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	4.40	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	5.00	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	446/1615	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	4.80	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	4.40	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	4.75	4.16	4.22	4.12	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	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	4.50	403/1626	4.50	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
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	324/1384	4.67	4.29	4.10	4.12	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.56	4.29	4.30	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.45	4.31	4.33	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	328/ 904	4.33	4.11	4.03	4.03	4.33

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	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	5
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
					Other
					4

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: RUSS 402 0101  
 Title ADVANCED RUSSIAN II  
 Instructor: ZHDANOVYCH, VIR  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1474  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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		
-----														
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. 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	4.33	328/ 904	4.33	4.11	4.03	4.22	4.33

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors					
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 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 responses to be significant			
				P 0						
				I 0	Other	2				
				? 0						

Course-Section: RUSS 419 0101  
 Title THEORY/PRAC TRANSLATIO  
 Instructor: YOUNG, STEVEN  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1475  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	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	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	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	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	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	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	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	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	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	403/1626	4.50	4.08	4.11	4.28	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	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	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	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	0	2	3	4.60	595/1546	4.60	4.40	4.32	4.43	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	4.10	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	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	2	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	2	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	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	4.11	4.03	4.22	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	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	5
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
					Other
					4

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant