

Course-Section: HEBR 101 0101
 Title ELEM HEBREW I
 Instructor: LITOV, SAMUEL
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 957
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	3	7	4.70	367/1674	4.70	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.70	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	870/1674	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	803/1423	4.30	4.36	4.27	4.16	4.30	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	645/1609	4.40	4.23	4.22	4.05	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	512/1585	4.30	4.04	3.96	3.88	4.30	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	283/1535	4.60	4.08	4.08	3.89	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	1097/1651	4.00	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	2	3	4	1	3.40	1654/1673	3.40	4.65	4.69	4.67	3.40	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	6	2	4.00	955/1656	4.00	4.06	4.07	3.96	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	1144/1586	4.25	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	1448/1585	4.13	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.13	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	935/1582	4.25	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	958/1575	4.25	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	902/1380	3.75	3.94	3.94	3.78	3.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	355/1520	4.57	4.14	4.01	3.76	4.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	733/1515	4.43	4.37	4.24	3.97	4.43	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	1050/1511	4.00	4.37	4.27	4.00	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	420/ 994	4.14	3.97	3.94	3.73	4.14	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	6
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 11
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: HEBR 101C 0101
 Title ELEM HEBREW I CONVERST
 Instructor: LITOV, SAMUEL
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 958
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	2	0	3	9	4.36	829/1674	4.36	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.36	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	9	3	3.93	1246/1674	3.93	4.26	4.23	4.16	3.93	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	1	4	7	4.00	1016/1423	4.00	4.36	4.27	4.16	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	4	7	4.14	985/1609	4.14	4.23	4.22	4.05	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	0	6	5	3.86	956/1585	3.86	4.04	3.96	3.88	3.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	3	9	4.29	631/1535	4.29	4.08	4.08	3.89	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	0	3	6	2	3.46	1459/1651	3.46	4.20	4.18	4.10	3.46	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	1	0	3	7	2	3.69	1646/1673	3.69	4.65	4.69	4.67	3.69	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	9	3	4.07	912/1656	4.07	4.06	4.07	3.96	4.07	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	1	4	5	4.09	1255/1586	4.09	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.09	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	1	6	4	4.08	1458/1585	4.08	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.08	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	1	4	5	4.09	1084/1582	4.09	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.09	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	915/1575	4.30	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.30	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	1	1	0	3	1	3.33	1127/1380	3.33	3.94	3.94	3.78	3.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	0	2	6	4.10	777/1520	4.10	4.14	4.01	3.76	4.10	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	1	1	7	4.30	857/1515	4.30	4.37	4.24	3.97	4.30	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	1018/1511	4.10	4.37	4.27	4.00	4.10	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	360/ 994	4.25	3.97	3.94	3.73	4.25	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	8
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	3
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 14
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	0
			? 1		

Course-Section: HEBR 201 0101
 Title INTERMEDIATE HEBREW I
 Instructor: LITOV, SAMUEL
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 959
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	1	1	0	7	3	3.83	1366/1674	3.83	4.23	4.27	4.32	3.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	5	5	4.00	1146/1674	4.00	4.26	4.23	4.26	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	915/1423	4.17	4.36	4.27	4.36	4.17	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	4	4.08	1042/1609	4.08	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.08	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	4	4	2	3.55	1199/1585	3.55	4.04	3.96	3.91	3.55	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	4	4	3.92	1006/1535	3.92	4.08	4.08	4.03	3.92	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	5	3	3.75	1324/1651	3.75	4.20	4.18	4.20	3.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	1	1	8	1	3.58	1649/1673	3.58	4.65	4.69	4.67	3.58	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	2	4	2	3.67	1297/1656	3.67	4.06	4.07	4.10	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	5	5	4.27	1128/1586	4.27	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.27	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	1387/1585	4.27	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.27	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	1	4	4	3.82	1266/1582	3.82	4.30	4.26	4.35	3.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	1	4	3	3.45	1384/1575	3.45	4.32	4.27	4.39	3.45	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	666/1380	4.00	3.94	3.94	4.03	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1027/1520	3.75	4.14	4.01	4.03	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1024/1515	4.00	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	896/1511	4.25	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	811/ 994	3.33	3.97	3.94	3.98	3.33	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	1
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 12
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	3
			? 0		

Course-Section: HEBR 201C 0101
 Title INTERM HEBREW I CONVST
 Instructor: LITOV, SAMUEL
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 960
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	1563/1674	3.33	4.23	4.27	4.32	3.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	1340/1674	3.80	4.26	4.23	4.26	3.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	845/1423	4.25	4.36	4.27	4.36	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1094/1609	4.00	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	326/1585	4.50	4.04	3.96	3.91	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	1240/1535	3.60	4.08	4.08	4.03	3.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	1	3	0	3.20	1537/1651	3.20	4.20	4.18	4.20	3.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	1566/1673	4.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	955/1656	4.00	4.06	4.07	4.10	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	1300/1586	4.00	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1397/1585	4.25	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.25	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1302/1582	3.75	4.30	4.26	4.35	3.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	1367/1575	3.50	4.32	4.27	4.39	3.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1380	****	3.94	3.94	4.03	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1520	****	4.14	4.01	4.03	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1515	****	4.37	4.24	4.28	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1511	****	4.37	4.27	4.28	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 994	****	3.97	3.94	3.98	****	

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	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	1
			? 0		