

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| Course-Section: | HEBR 101 01 |
| Title: | Elem Hebrew I |
| Instructor: | Gazit-Rosenthal |

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 17 |
| Questionnaires: | 11 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|----|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 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 | 8 | 4.64 | 439/1520 | 4.64 | 4.44 | 4.31 | 4.14 | 4.64 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 4.64 | 401/1520 | 4.64 | 4.42 | 4.27 | 4.20 | 4.64 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 4.73 | 325/1291 | 4.73 | 4.56 | 4.33 | 4.24 | 4.73 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 4.36 | 680/1483 | 4.36 | 4.45 | 4.23 | 4.09 | 4.36 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 4.36 | 511/1417 | 4.36 | 4.33 | 4.08 | 4.02 | 4.36 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 4.40 | 506/1405 | 4.40 | 4.38 | 4.12 | 3.96 | 4.40 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 4.27 | 726/1504 | 4.27 | 4.28 | 4.16 | 4.13 | 4.27 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 4.73 | 887/1519 | 4.73 | 4.70 | 4.70 | 4.71 | 4.73 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 4.20 | 718/1495 | 4.20 | 4.21 | 4.11 | 4.01 | 4.20 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 4.82 | 356/1459 | 4.82 | 4.55 | 4.47 | 4.40 | 4.82 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 4.91 | 544/1460 | 4.91 | 4.83 | 4.74 | 4.68 | 4.91 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 4.27 | 903/1455 | 4.27 | 4.43 | 4.32 | 4.26 | 4.27 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 4.64 | 541/1456 | 4.64 | 4.55 | 4.34 | 4.26 | 4.64 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3.67 | 987/1316 | 3.67 | 4.16 | 4.03 | 3.91 | 3.67 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 4.45 | 460/1243 | 4.45 | 4.37 | 4.17 | 3.98 | 4.45 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 4.82 | 262/1241 | 4.82 | 4.58 | 4.33 | 4.14 | 4.82 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 4.55 | 615/1236 | 4.55 | 4.51 | 4.40 | 4.19 | 4.55 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 4.30 | 309/889 | 4.30 | 4.20 | 4.02 | 3.89 | 4.30 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| Course-Section: | HEBR 101 01 |
| Title: | Elem Hebrew I |
| Instructor: | Gazit-Rosenthal |

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 17 |
| Questionnaires: | 11 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/165 | **** | 5.00 | 4.19 | 4.31 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.36 | 4.08 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/31 | **** | **** | 4.15 | 3.67 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/23 | **** | **** | 4.48 | **** | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/27 | **** | **** | 4.23 | 5.00 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/20 | **** | **** | 4.23 | **** | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/24 | **** | 5.00 | 4.17 | 4.37 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/15 | **** | 5.00 | 4.17 | 4.22 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/22 | **** | 4.00 | 4.07 | 3.99 | **** |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/15 | **** | 5.00 | 4.06 | 4.14 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| Course-Section: | HEBR 101 01 |
| Title: | Elem Hebrew I |
| Instructor: | Gazit-Rosenthal |

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 17 |
| Questionnaires: | 11 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/12 | **** | **** | 4.16 | 3.92 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|---|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 4 | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 3 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 6 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C | 1 | General | 9 | Under-grad | 11 | Non-major | 11 |
| 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 | 1 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | HEBR 201 01 |
| Title: | Intermediate Hebrew I |
| Instructor: | Gazit-Rosenthal |

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|----------|
| Enrollment: | 8 |
| Questionnaires: | 8 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 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 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 4.38 | 790/1520 | 4.38 | 4.44 | 4.31 | 4.36 | 4.38 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 4.50 | 584/1520 | 4.50 | 4.42 | 4.27 | 4.34 | 4.50 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 4.50 | 546/1291 | 4.50 | 4.56 | 4.33 | 4.44 | 4.50 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 4.63 | 374/1483 | 4.63 | 4.45 | 4.23 | 4.28 | 4.63 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 4.63 | 264/1417 | 4.63 | 4.33 | 4.08 | 4.14 | 4.63 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 4.88 | 103/1405 | 4.88 | 4.38 | 4.12 | 4.13 | 4.88 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 4.38 | 606/1504 | 4.38 | 4.28 | 4.16 | 4.15 | 4.38 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5.00 | 1/1519 | 5.00 | 4.70 | 4.70 | 4.64 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.60 | 262/1495 | 4.60 | 4.21 | 4.11 | 4.16 | 4.60 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 4.50 | 833/1459 | 4.50 | 4.55 | 4.47 | 4.52 | 4.50 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 4.88 | 622/1460 | 4.88 | 4.83 | 4.74 | 4.80 | 4.88 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 4.25 | 920/1455 | 4.25 | 4.43 | 4.32 | 4.39 | 4.25 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 4.50 | 683/1456 | 4.50 | 4.55 | 4.34 | 4.46 | 4.50 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.50 | 1057/1316 | 3.50 | 4.16 | 4.03 | 4.18 | 3.50 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 4.25 | 624/1243 | 4.25 | 4.37 | 4.17 | 4.22 | 4.25 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 4.75 | 324/1241 | 4.75 | 4.58 | 4.33 | 4.38 | 4.75 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 4.88 | 252/1236 | 4.88 | 4.51 | 4.40 | 4.45 | 4.88 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | HEBR 201 01 |
| Title: | Intermediate Hebrew I |
| Instructor: | Gazit-Rosenthal |

Term - Fall 2011

| | |
|------------------------|----------|
| Enrollment: | 8 |
| Questionnaires: | 8 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---------------------------------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.00 | 456/889 | 4.00 | 4.20 | 4.02 | 3.99 | 4.00 |

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 | 3 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 3 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C | 1 | General | 4 | Under-grad | 8 | Non-major | 8 |
| 84-150 | 1 | 3.00-3.49 | 1 | D | 1 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 2 | F | 0 | Electives | 1 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |