

Course-Section: HEBR 101 0101  
 Title ELEM HEBREW I  
 Instructor: MOSES, YAEL  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 957  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	2	4.67	433/1649	4.67	4.34	4.28	4.11	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.31	4.23	4.16	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	401/1375	4.67	4.42	4.27	4.10	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	321/1595	4.67	4.29	4.20	4.03	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.16	4.04	3.87	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	263/1512	4.67	4.19	4.10	3.86	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1462/1623	3.33	4.08	4.16	4.08	3.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1037/1646	4.67	4.59	4.69	4.67	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	234/1621	4.67	4.14	4.06	3.96	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	852/1568	4.50	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.79	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1388/1564	3.50	4.28	4.28	4.20	3.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1121/1559	4.00	4.43	4.29	4.20	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	303/1352	4.50	3.97	3.98	3.86	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.28	4.08	3.86	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.57	4.29	4.03	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	796/1368	4.33	4.42	4.30	4.01	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	203/ 948	4.50	4.10	3.95	3.75	4.50	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	2.56	4.29	4.14	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 288	5.00	2.95	3.68	3.54	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: HEBR 101C 0101  
 Title ELEM HEBREW I CONVERST  
 Instructor: MOSES, YAEL  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 958  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	203/1649	4.89	4.34	4.28	4.11	4.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	244/1648	4.78	4.31	4.23	4.16	4.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.42	4.27	4.10	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.29	4.20	4.03	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	8	4.56	327/1533	4.56	4.16	4.04	3.87	4.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	595/1512	4.33	4.19	4.10	3.86	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	3	3	3.78	1258/1623	3.78	4.08	4.16	4.08	3.78	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	4	1	4	4.00	1544/1646	4.00	4.59	4.69	4.67	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	313/1621	4.57	4.14	4.06	3.96	4.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	273/1568	4.89	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.79	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	310/1564	4.78	4.28	4.28	4.20	4.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	361/1559	4.78	4.43	4.29	4.20	4.78	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	123/1352	4.83	3.97	3.98	3.86	4.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.28	4.08	3.86	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.57	4.29	4.03	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.42	4.30	4.01	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	645/ 948	3.67	4.10	3.95	3.75	3.67	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	2.56	4.29	4.14	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	****	2.95	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	2.48	3.68	3.51	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: HEBR 201 0101  
 Title INTERMEDIATE HEBREW I  
 Instructor: MOSES, Yael  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 959  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	212/1649	4.88	4.34	4.28	4.29	4.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	263/1648	4.75	4.31	4.23	4.25	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	186/1375	4.88	4.42	4.27	4.37	4.88	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	362/1595	4.63	4.29	4.20	4.22	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	272/1533	4.63	4.16	4.04	4.04	4.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	294/1512	4.63	4.19	4.10	4.14	4.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	3	1	1	3.00	1533/1623	3.00	4.08	4.16	4.21	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	1081/1646	4.63	4.59	4.69	4.63	4.63	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	313/1621	4.57	4.14	4.06	4.01	4.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	480/1568	4.75	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	665/1572	4.88	4.79	4.70	4.73	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	651/1564	4.50	4.28	4.28	4.27	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	561/1559	4.63	4.43	4.29	4.33	4.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	582/1352	4.17	3.97	3.98	4.07	4.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	726/1384	4.17	4.28	4.08	3.99	4.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	774/1382	4.33	4.57	4.29	4.19	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	2	0	1	1	2	3.17	1272/1368	3.17	4.42	4.30	4.21	3.17	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	431/ 948	4.00	4.10	3.95	3.89	4.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	2.56	4.29	4.33	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	28/ 312	4.50	2.48	3.68	3.59	4.50	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	17/ 110	4.50	4.13	3.99	3.72	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	8	Non-major	8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	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	2				
				?	0						