

Course-Section: HEBR 101 0101
 Title ELEM HEBREW I
 Instructor: MOSES, YAEL
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 935
 FEB 13, 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	7	4.88	196/1639	4.88	4.22	4.27	4.08	4.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	722/1639	4.38	4.15	4.22	4.17	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	282/1397	4.75	4.37	4.28	4.18	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	572/1583	4.43	4.18	4.19	4.01	4.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	293/1532	4.57	4.10	4.01	3.88	4.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	130/1504	4.86	4.04	4.05	3.78	4.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1198/1612	3.88	4.02	4.16	4.10	3.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	1135/1635	4.50	4.38	4.65	4.56	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.00	4.08	3.95	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	286/1518	4.86	4.23	4.43	4.38	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.67	4.70	4.61	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.15	4.27	4.20	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.27	4.22	4.17	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	185/1295	4.67	3.77	3.94	3.84	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.18	4.07	3.85	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.51	4.30	4.07	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	944/1388	4.00	4.35	4.28	4.01	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	201/ 958	4.50	4.02	3.93	3.71	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	2
			? 1		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: HEBR 201 0101
 Title INTERMEDIATE HEBREW I
 Instructor: MOSES, YAEL
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 936
 FEB 13, 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	1	1	0	1	8	4.27	870/1639	4.27	4.22	4.27	4.35	4.27	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	0	1	7	4.00	1090/1639	4.00	4.15	4.22	4.27	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	392/1397	4.64	4.37	4.28	4.39	4.64		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	371/1583	4.60	4.18	4.19	4.28	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	1	0	7	4.00	774/1532	4.00	4.10	4.01	4.09	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	1	0	7	4.10	770/1504	4.10	4.04	4.05	4.09	4.10	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	976/1612	4.10	4.02	4.16	4.21	4.10	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	662/1635	4.90	4.38	4.65	4.63	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	569/1579	4.33	4.00	4.08	4.14	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	0	3	6	4.30	1053/1518	4.30	4.23	4.43	4.48	4.30	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.67	4.70	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	2	0	7	4.20	947/1517	4.20	4.15	4.27	4.34	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	196/1550	4.89	4.27	4.22	4.33	4.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	894/1295	3.67	3.77	3.94	4.07	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.18	4.07	4.14	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.51	4.30	4.35	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.35	4.28	4.37	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 958	****	4.02	3.93	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	1
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 201 0101
 Title INTERMEDIATE HEBREW I
 Instructor: MOSES, YAEL
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 936
 FEB 13, 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	1	1	0	1	8	4.27	870/1639	4.27	4.22	4.27	4.35	4.27	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	0	1	7	4.00	1090/1639	4.00	4.15	4.22	4.27	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	392/1397	4.64	4.37	4.28	4.39	4.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	371/1583	4.60	4.18	4.19	4.28	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	1	0	7	4.00	774/1532	4.00	4.10	4.01	4.09	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	1	0	7	4.10	770/1504	4.10	4.04	4.05	4.09	4.10	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	976/1612	4.10	4.02	4.16	4.21	4.10	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	662/1635	4.90	4.38	4.65	4.63	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	569/1579	4.33	4.00	4.08	4.14	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	0	3	6	4.30	1053/1518	4.30	4.23	4.43	4.48	4.30	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.67	4.70	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	2	0	7	4.20	947/1517	4.20	4.15	4.27	4.34	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	196/1550	4.89	4.27	4.22	4.33	4.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	894/1295	3.67	3.77	3.94	4.07	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.18	4.07	4.14	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.51	4.30	4.35	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.35	4.28	4.37	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 958	****	4.02	3.93	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	1
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		