

Course-Section: RUSS 101 0101
 Title BASIC RUSSIAN I
 Instructor: YOUNG, STEVEN
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 1386
 JAN 19, 2005
 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	0	2	16	4.74	278/1556	4.82	4.23	4.25	4.06	4.74
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	14	4.63	344/1557	4.63	4.23	4.21	4.13	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	195/1335	4.67	4.32	4.24	4.13	4.79
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	398/1510	4.59	4.18	4.19	4.07	4.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	1	8	7	4.24	542/1479	4.27	4.08	3.97	3.90	4.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	1	7	8	4.24	620/1424	4.27	4.08	4.08	3.91	4.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	9	9	4.42	588/1537	4.44	4.18	4.15	4.12	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	408/1553	4.97	4.69	4.69	4.66	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	7	5	4.21	706/1536	4.23	4.05	4.07	3.91	4.21
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	467/1487	4.72	4.41	4.44	4.37	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1491	4.95	4.71	4.70	4.61	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	6	11	4.42	712/1489	4.56	4.28	4.27	4.18	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	462/1481	4.54	4.30	4.28	4.18	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	6	4	8	4.11	556/1246	4.21	3.87	3.93	3.78	4.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	8	5	4.20	629/1411	4.02	4.13	4.00	3.78	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	378/1413	4.87	4.38	4.23	3.96	4.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	4	1	9	4.20	868/1408	4.27	4.37	4.27	4.03	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	4	5	0	0	4	4	2	3.80	542/ 856	3.53	3.96	4.00	3.87	3.80
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 244	****	3.90	4.07	3.82	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 258	****	4.22	4.10	3.94	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 236	****	4.50	4.36	4.31	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 238	****	4.16	4.26	4.00	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 214	****	4.27	4.08	4.02	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 102	****	4.57	4.50	3.92	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	4.45	4.39	4.03	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 90	****	4.29	4.36	3.72	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.06	4.03	3.92	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	4.23	3.84	4.09	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	****	4.35	4.01	4.21	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 32	****	4.15	4.18	4.51	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 16	****	4.50	4.36	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 16	****	4.45	4.51	4.57	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors

Grade	Count	0.00-0.99	1.00-1.99	2.00-2.99	3.00-3.49	3.50-4.00	Category	Count	Under-grad	Major	Non-major
00-27	3	0	0	0	0	0	A	7	1	0	0
28-55	2	0	0	0	0	0	B	5	0	0	0
56-83	2	0	0	0	0	0	C	2	18	0	13
84-150	0	0	0	0	0	0	D	0	0	0	0
Grad.	1	0	0	0	0	3	F	1	0	0	0
							P	1	0	0	0
							I	0	0	0	0
							?	1	0	0	0
									#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		

Course-Section: RUSS 101 0201
 Title BASIC RUSSIAN I
 Instructor: VINOGRADOVA, PO
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 1387
 JAN 19, 2005
 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	10	4.91	144/1556	4.82	4.23	4.25	4.06	4.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	344/1557	4.63	4.23	4.21	4.13	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	438/1335	4.67	4.32	4.24	4.13	4.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	313/1510	4.59	4.18	4.19	4.07	4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	481/1479	4.27	4.08	3.97	3.90	4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	553/1424	4.27	4.08	4.08	3.91	4.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	546/1537	4.44	4.18	4.15	4.12	4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1553	4.97	4.69	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	659/1536	4.23	4.05	4.07	3.91	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	543/1487	4.72	4.41	4.44	4.37	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	513/1491	4.95	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	350/1489	4.56	4.28	4.27	4.18	4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	719/1481	4.54	4.30	4.28	4.18	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	416/1246	4.21	3.87	3.93	3.78	4.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	886/1411	4.02	4.13	4.00	3.78	3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1413	4.87	4.38	4.23	3.96	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	763/1408	4.27	4.37	4.27	4.03	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	728/ 856	3.53	3.96	4.00	3.87	3.25

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: RUSS 201 0101
 Title BASIC RUSSIAN III
 Instructor: BLYUKHER, ALLA
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 1388
 JAN 19, 2005
 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	16	4.94	86/1556	4.94	4.23	4.25	4.33	4.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1557	5.00	4.23	4.21	4.30	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	77/1335	4.94	4.32	4.24	4.37	4.94
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	287/1510	4.67	4.18	4.19	4.23	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	176/1479	4.71	4.08	3.97	3.88	4.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	100/1424	4.87	4.08	4.08	4.04	4.87
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	259/1537	4.69	4.18	4.15	4.17	4.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	712/1553	4.88	4.69	4.69	4.69	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	234/1536	4.64	4.05	4.07	4.13	4.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	301/1487	4.82	4.41	4.44	4.47	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1491	5.00	4.71	4.70	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	210/1489	4.82	4.28	4.27	4.32	4.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	97/1481	4.94	4.30	4.28	4.37	4.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	12	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/1246	****	3.87	3.93	4.02	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	2	0	2	7	4.27	572/1411	4.27	4.13	4.00	4.05	4.27
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	280/1413	4.82	4.38	4.23	4.28	4.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	395/1408	4.73	4.37	4.27	4.31	4.73
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	328/ 856	4.27	3.96	4.00	3.92	4.27

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	5	Under-grad	17	Non-major	7
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: RUSS 301 0101
 Title CONTINUING RUSSIAN II
 Instructor: YOUNG, STEVEN
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 1389
 JAN 19, 2005
 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	6	4.56	476/1556	4.56	4.23	4.25	4.27	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	994/1557	4.11	4.23	4.21	4.21	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	2	4.11	909/1335	4.11	4.32	4.24	4.21	4.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	778/1510	4.22	4.18	4.19	4.20	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	878/1479	3.89	4.08	3.97	3.95	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	234/1424	4.63	4.08	4.08	4.08	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	560/1537	4.44	4.18	4.15	4.13	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	1085/1553	4.56	4.69	4.69	4.67	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	796/1536	4.11	4.05	4.07	4.07	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	758/1487	4.56	4.41	4.44	4.43	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	563/1491	4.89	4.71	4.70	4.69	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	683/1489	4.44	4.28	4.27	4.27	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	569/1481	4.56	4.30	4.28	4.25	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1054/1246	3.25	3.87	3.93	3.98	3.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	207/1411	4.75	4.13	4.00	3.98	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	353/1413	4.75	4.38	4.23	4.23	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	584/1408	4.50	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	336/ 856	4.25	3.96	4.00	3.99	4.25

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C 3	General 3	Under-grad 9	Non-major 1
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	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 4		
				? 1			

Course-Section: RUSS 303 0101
 Title CONTINUING RUSS CONV I
 Instructor: BLYUKHER, ALLA
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 1390
 JAN 19, 2005
 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	1	4.50	537/1556	4.50	4.23	4.25	4.27	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1065/1557	4.00	4.23	4.21	4.21	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	958/1335	4.00	4.32	4.24	4.21	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1510	5.00	4.18	4.19	4.20	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1479	5.00	4.08	3.97	3.95	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.08	4.08	4.08	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1444/1537	3.00	4.18	4.15	4.13	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1553	5.00	4.69	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1536	5.00	4.05	4.07	4.07	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1487	5.00	4.41	4.44	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1491	5.00	4.71	4.70	4.69	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1090/1489	4.00	4.28	4.27	4.27	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	638/1481	4.50	4.30	4.28	4.25	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1246	5.00	3.87	3.93	3.98	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.13	4.00	3.98	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1413	5.00	4.38	4.23	4.23	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1408	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.28	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	768/ 856	3.00	3.96	4.00	3.99	3.00

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	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	2	Non-major	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: RUSS 401 0101
 Title ADVANCED RUSSIAN I
 Instructor: BLYUKHER, ALLA
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 1391
 JAN 19, 2005
 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	1	0	1	3	4.20	955/1556	4.20	4.23	4.25	4.39	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	170/1557	4.80	4.23	4.21	4.27	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	369/1335	4.60	4.32	4.24	4.31	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	340/1510	4.60	4.18	4.19	4.26	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	239/1479	4.60	4.08	3.97	4.05	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	250/1424	4.60	4.08	4.08	4.18	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	843/1537	4.20	4.18	4.15	4.22	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1553	5.00	4.69	4.69	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1536	5.00	4.05	4.07	4.20	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1487	5.00	4.41	4.44	4.52	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1491	5.00	4.71	4.70	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.28	4.27	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.30	4.28	4.38	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1246	5.00	3.87	3.93	3.99	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	527/1411	4.33	4.13	4.00	4.14	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1413	5.00	4.38	4.23	4.43	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1408	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.41	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 856	5.00	3.96	4.00	4.20	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	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	5	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						