

Course-Section: HEBR 102 0101
 Title ELEM. HEBREW II
 Instructor: MOSES, YAEL
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 926
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions | Frequencies | | | | | | | Instructor | | Course Mean | Dept Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|---|---|------------|-----------|-------------|-----------|-----------|------------|-----------|
| | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | | | | | |
| ----- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 4.63 | 531/1670 | 4.63 | 4.36 | 4.31 | 4.23 | 4.63 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.38 | 821/1666 | 4.38 | 4.31 | 4.27 | 4.30 | 4.38 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 4.75 | 318/1406 | 4.75 | 4.48 | 4.32 | 4.31 | 4.75 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 4.38 | 724/1615 | 4.38 | 4.34 | 4.24 | 4.17 | 4.38 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.50 | 389/1566 | 4.50 | 4.26 | 4.07 | 4.03 | 4.50 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 4.25 | 706/1528 | 4.25 | 4.23 | 4.12 | 4.00 | 4.25 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3.50 | 1460/1650 | 3.50 | 4.16 | 4.22 | 4.28 | 3.50 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 4.75 | 922/1667 | 4.75 | 4.47 | 4.67 | 4.61 | 4.75 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 4.25 | 728/1626 | 4.25 | 4.08 | 4.11 | 4.07 | 4.25 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.86 | 355/1559 | 4.86 | 4.38 | 4.46 | 4.47 | 4.86 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.86 | 725/1560 | 4.86 | 4.75 | 4.72 | 4.68 | 4.86 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 4.71 | 424/1549 | 4.71 | 4.34 | 4.31 | 4.32 | 4.71 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1546 | 5.00 | 4.40 | 4.32 | 4.32 | 5.00 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4.50 | 326/1323 | 4.50 | 3.96 | 4.00 | 3.91 | 4.50 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4.20 | 712/1384 | 4.20 | 4.29 | 4.10 | 3.92 | 4.20 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1378 | 5.00 | 4.56 | 4.29 | 4.09 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 4.60 | 590/1378 | 4.60 | 4.45 | 4.31 | 4.08 | 4.60 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 179/ 904 | 4.67 | 4.11 | 4.03 | 3.94 | 4.67 |

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: HEBR 102C 0101
 Title ELEM HEBREW II CONVERS
 Instructor: MOSES, YAEL
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 927
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course Mean | Dept Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|-----------|-------------|-----------|-----------|------------|-----------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | | | | | |
| ----- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1670 | 5.00 | 4.36 | 4.31 | 4.23 | 5.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1666 | 5.00 | 4.31 | 4.27 | 4.30 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | 597/1406 | 4.50 | 4.48 | 4.32 | 4.31 | 4.50 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | 552/1615 | 4.50 | 4.34 | 4.24 | 4.17 | 4.50 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | 389/1566 | 4.50 | 4.26 | 4.07 | 4.03 | 4.50 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1528 | 5.00 | 4.23 | 4.12 | 4.00 | 5.00 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.50 | 1460/1650 | 3.50 | 4.16 | 4.22 | 4.28 | 3.50 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1667 | 5.00 | 4.47 | 4.67 | 4.61 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | 403/1626 | 4.50 | 4.08 | 4.11 | 4.07 | 4.50 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1559 | 5.00 | 4.38 | 4.46 | 4.47 | 5.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1560 | 5.00 | 4.75 | 4.72 | 4.68 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | 683/1549 | 4.50 | 4.34 | 4.31 | 4.32 | 4.50 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4.00 | 1139/1546 | 4.00 | 4.40 | 4.32 | 4.32 | 4.00 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | 1318/1323 | 1.00 | 3.96 | 4.00 | 3.91 | 1.00 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.50 | 1103/1384 | 3.50 | 4.29 | 4.10 | 3.92 | 3.50 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1378 | 5.00 | 4.56 | 4.29 | 4.09 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4.00 | 977/1378 | 4.00 | 4.45 | 4.31 | 4.08 | 4.00 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | 820/ 904 | 3.00 | 4.11 | 4.03 | 3.94 | 3.00 |

Frequency Distribution

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