

Course-Section: RUSS 102 0101
 Title BASIC RUSSIAN II
 Instructor: RUSINKO, ELAINE
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2004

Page 1306
 JUN 14, 2004
 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	1	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	164/1470	4.83	4.22	4.29	4.13	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	0	23	4.92	75/1470	4.92	4.19	4.23	4.17	4.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	2	21	4.79	159/1252	4.79	4.29	4.27	4.21	4.79	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	163/1413	4.79	4.19	4.24	4.12	4.79	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	1	7	14	4.48	309/1391	4.48	4.09	4.02	3.96	4.48	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	0	2	1	12	4.67	190/1347	4.67	4.05	4.10	4.01	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	6	16	4.58	346/1455	4.58	4.10	4.16	4.16	4.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	327/1469	4.96	4.63	4.70	4.65	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	10	10	4.43	426/1451	4.43	4.00	4.08	3.99	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	19	4.78	352/1407	4.78	4.38	4.43	4.40	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	231/1404	4.96	4.68	4.70	4.62	4.96	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	1	21	4.87	148/1401	4.87	4.24	4.28	4.22	4.87	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	19	4.78	255/1398	4.78	4.27	4.27	4.21	4.78	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	149/1176	4.70	3.80	3.96	3.84	4.70	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	4	4	11	4.25	572/1276	4.25	4.10	4.06	3.81	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	1	19	4.86	253/1277	4.86	4.42	4.30	4.02	4.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	337/1271	4.75	4.31	4.28	4.02	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	1	0	8	10	4.42	229/ 763	4.42	3.98	4.06	3.92	4.42	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 13	Required for Majors 8	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 0	C 4	General 7	Under-grad 25 Non-major 12
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 9	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 8	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 1		
			I 0	Other 4	
			? 0		

Course-Section: RUSS 302 0101
 Title CONTINUING RUSSIAN III
 Instructor: YOUNG, STEVEN
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2004

Page 1307
 JUN 14, 2004
 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	3	2	2	3.86	1202/1470	3.86	4.22	4.29	4.31	3.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	927/1470	4.14	4.19	4.23	4.22	4.14	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	566/1252	4.43	4.29	4.27	4.27	4.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	256/1413	4.67	4.19	4.24	4.27	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	736/1391	4.00	4.09	4.02	4.00	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	533/1347	4.29	4.05	4.10	4.11	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1220/1455	3.67	4.10	4.16	4.12	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	4.00	1380/1469	4.00	4.63	4.70	4.67	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	6	0	4.00	845/1451	4.00	4.00	4.08	4.07	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	641/1407	4.60	4.38	4.43	4.41	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1404	5.00	4.68	4.70	4.69	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	448/1401	4.60	4.24	4.28	4.27	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	894/1398	4.20	4.27	4.27	4.25	4.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1125/1176	2.50	3.80	3.96	3.97	2.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	572/1276	4.25	4.10	4.06	4.10	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	901/1277	4.00	4.42	4.30	4.34	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	569/1271	4.50	4.31	4.28	4.33	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 763	****	3.98	4.06	4.07	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: RUSS 304 0101
 Title INTERMED RUSSIAN CONV
 Instructor: BLYUKHER, ALLA
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2004

Page 1308
 JUN 14, 2004
 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	2	5.00	1/1470	5.00	4.22	4.29	4.31	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	470/1470	4.50	4.19	4.23	4.22	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	473/1252	4.50	4.29	4.27	4.27	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1413	5.00	4.19	4.24	4.27	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.09	4.02	4.00	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1347	5.00	4.05	4.10	4.11	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1455	5.00	4.10	4.16	4.12	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1469	5.00	4.63	4.70	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1432/1451	2.50	4.00	4.08	4.07	2.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.38	4.43	4.41	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1404	5.00	4.68	4.70	4.69	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1401	5.00	4.24	4.28	4.27	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.27	4.27	4.25	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1176	5.00	3.80	3.96	3.97	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1276	5.00	4.10	4.06	4.10	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.42	4.30	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1271	5.00	4.31	4.28	4.33	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	421/ 763	4.00	3.98	4.06	4.07	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	0
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	2
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
					Other
					2

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: RUSS 315 0101
 Title STUDIES IN RUSSIAN FIL
 Instructor: STERN, GALA
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2004

Page 1309
 JUN 14, 2004
 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	4	4.67	359/1470	4.67	4.22	4.29	4.31	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	124/1470	4.83	4.19	4.23	4.22	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	292/1252	4.67	4.29	4.27	4.27	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	657/1413	4.33	4.19	4.24	4.27	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	191/1391	4.67	4.09	4.02	4.00	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	421/1347	4.40	4.05	4.10	4.11	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	260/1455	4.67	4.10	4.16	4.12	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	779/1469	4.83	4.63	4.70	4.67	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	139/1451	4.75	4.00	4.08	4.07	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	753/1407	4.50	4.38	4.43	4.41	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	623/1404	4.83	4.68	4.70	4.69	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	553/1401	4.50	4.24	4.28	4.27	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	426/1398	4.67	4.27	4.27	4.25	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1176	5.00	3.80	3.96	3.97	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	290/1276	4.60	4.10	4.06	4.10	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	292/1277	4.80	4.42	4.30	4.34	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	489/1271	4.60	4.31	4.28	4.33	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	653/ 763	3.33	3.98	4.06	4.07	3.33	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	6
			P 0		Non-major
			I 0		1
			? 0		
				Other	5

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2004

Page 1310
 JUN 14, 2004
 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	164/1470	4.83	4.22	4.29	4.31	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	300/1470	4.67	4.19	4.23	4.22	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	369/1252	4.60	4.29	4.27	4.27	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	423/1413	4.50	4.19	4.24	4.27	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	191/1391	4.67	4.09	4.02	4.00	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	313/1347	4.50	4.05	4.10	4.11	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	843/1455	4.17	4.10	4.16	4.12	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1469	5.00	4.63	4.70	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1146/1451	3.67	4.00	4.08	4.07	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.38	4.43	4.41	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1404	5.00	4.68	4.70	4.69	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1401	5.00	4.24	4.28	4.27	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.27	4.27	4.25	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1034/1176	3.00	3.80	3.96	3.97	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1276	5.00	4.10	4.06	4.10	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.42	4.30	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1271	5.00	4.31	4.28	4.33	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 763	****	3.98	4.06	4.07	****	

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	0	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	6
			P 0		Non-major
			I 0		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: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2004

Page 1311
 JUN 14, 2004
 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	2	3	4.33	771/1470	4.33	4.22	4.29	4.36	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1020/1470	4.00	4.19	4.23	4.25	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	818/1252	4.17	4.29	4.27	4.30	4.17	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	766/1413	4.25	4.19	4.24	4.27	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	450/1391	4.33	4.09	4.02	4.04	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	486/1347	4.33	4.05	4.10	4.15	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	843/1455	4.17	4.10	4.16	4.15	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	779/1469	4.83	4.63	4.70	4.74	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	332/1451	4.50	4.00	4.08	4.17	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	558/1407	4.67	4.38	4.43	4.47	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1404	5.00	4.68	4.70	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	780/1401	4.33	4.24	4.28	4.32	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	426/1398	4.67	4.27	4.27	4.33	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	398/1176	4.33	3.80	3.96	4.05	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1276	5.00	4.10	4.06	4.19	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.42	4.30	4.46	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1271	5.00	4.31	4.28	4.41	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	177/ 763	4.50	3.98	4.06	4.22	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: RUSS 419 0101
 Title THEORY/PRAC TRANSLATIO
 Instructor: YOUNG, STEVEN
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2004

Page 1312
 JUN 14, 2004
 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	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1470	5.00	4.22	4.29	4.36	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	243/1470	4.71	4.19	4.23	4.25	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1252	5.00	4.29	4.27	4.30	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1413	5.00	4.19	4.24	4.27	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	102/1391	4.83	4.09	4.02	4.04	4.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	81/1347	4.86	4.05	4.10	4.15	4.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	357/1455	4.57	4.10	4.16	4.15	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	779/1469	4.83	4.63	4.70	4.74	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	723/1451	4.17	4.00	4.08	4.17	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.38	4.43	4.47	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1404	5.00	4.68	4.70	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	193/1401	4.80	4.24	4.28	4.32	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	226/1398	4.80	4.27	4.27	4.33	4.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1276	5.00	4.10	4.06	4.19	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.42	4.30	4.46	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1271	5.00	4.31	4.28	4.41	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 763	****	3.98	4.06	4.22	****	

Frequency Distribution

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