

Course Section: HEBR 101 0101
 Title ELEM HEBREW I
 Instructor: MOSES, YAEL
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1001
 JAN 18, 2007
 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 | 0 | 11 | 5.00 | 1/1669 | 5.00 | 4.33 | 4.23 | 4.02 | 5.00 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 4.73 | 281/1666 | 4.73 | 4.28 | 4.19 | 4.11 | 4.73 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 4.91 | 151/1421 | 4.91 | 4.36 | 4.24 | 4.11 | 4.91 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 4.91 | 114/1617 | 4.91 | 4.27 | 4.15 | 3.99 | 4.91 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 4.73 | 189/1555 | 4.73 | 4.17 | 4.00 | 3.92 | 4.73 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 5.00 | 1/1543 | 5.00 | 4.19 | 4.06 | 3.86 | 5.00 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 3.82 | 1241/1647 | 3.82 | 4.18 | 4.12 | 4.06 | 3.82 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 5.00 | 1/1668 | 5.00 | 4.60 | 4.67 | 4.62 | 5.00 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5.00 | 1/1605 | 5.00 | 4.13 | 4.07 | 3.96 | 5.00 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 4.91 | 189/1514 | 4.91 | 4.39 | 4.39 | 4.32 | 4.91 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 4.91 | 512/1551 | 4.91 | 4.72 | 4.66 | 4.55 | 4.91 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 4.64 | 425/1503 | 4.64 | 4.31 | 4.24 | 4.17 | 4.64 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 4.91 | 164/1506 | 4.91 | 4.40 | 4.26 | 4.17 | 4.91 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 4.57 | 232/1311 | 4.57 | 3.78 | 3.85 | 3.68 | 4.57 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 4.73 | 289/1490 | 4.73 | 4.26 | 4.05 | 3.85 | 4.73 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 5.00 | 1/1502 | 5.00 | 4.54 | 4.26 | 4.06 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 4.55 | 648/1489 | 4.55 | 4.43 | 4.29 | 4.07 | 4.55 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 4.50 | 235/1006 | 4.50 | 4.14 | 4.00 | 3.81 | 4.50 | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|-----------------------|---|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 0 | A 5 | Required for Majors 7 | Graduate 0 Major 0 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 0 | B 5 | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 1 | C 0 | General 0 | Under-grad 12 Non-major 12 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 0 | D 0 | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 1 | F 0 | Electives 1 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |
| | | | P 0 | | |
| | | | I 0 | Other 3 | |
| | | | ? 1 | | |

Course Section: HEBR 201 0101
 Title INTERMEDIATE HEBREW I
 Instructor: MOSES, YAEL
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1002
 JAN 18, 2007
 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 | 151/1669 | 4.88 | 4.33 | 4.23 | 4.34 | 4.88 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3.75 | 1334/1666 | 3.75 | 4.28 | 4.19 | 4.29 | 3.75 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4.25 | 814/1421 | 4.25 | 4.36 | 4.24 | 4.35 | 4.25 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4.25 | 801/1617 | 4.25 | 4.27 | 4.15 | 4.24 | 4.25 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4.50 | 340/1555 | 4.50 | 4.17 | 4.00 | 3.96 | 4.50 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3.75 | 1138/1543 | 3.75 | 4.19 | 4.06 | 4.10 | 3.75 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2.86 | 1552/1647 | 2.86 | 4.18 | 4.12 | 4.19 | 2.86 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5.00 | 1/1668 | 5.00 | 4.60 | 4.67 | 4.59 | 5.00 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 4.25 | 690/1605 | 4.25 | 4.13 | 4.07 | 4.15 | 4.25 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4.50 | 799/1514 | 4.50 | 4.39 | 4.39 | 4.39 | 4.50 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1551 | 5.00 | 4.72 | 4.66 | 4.72 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 4.29 | 852/1503 | 4.29 | 4.31 | 4.24 | 4.29 | 4.29 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.86 | 225/1506 | 4.86 | 4.40 | 4.26 | 4.33 | 4.86 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/1311 | **** | 3.78 | 3.85 | 3.96 | **** | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 4.29 | 667/1490 | 4.29 | 4.26 | 4.05 | 4.11 | 4.29 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 4.00 | 1013/1502 | 4.00 | 4.54 | 4.26 | 4.31 | 4.00 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 4.14 | 986/1489 | 4.14 | 4.43 | 4.29 | 4.36 | 4.14 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3.67 | 694/1006 | 3.67 | 4.14 | 4.00 | 3.99 | 3.67 | |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 233 | **** | **** | 4.19 | 4.36 | **** | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|--|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | A 3 | Required for Majors | 7 |
| 28-55 | 2 | 1.00-1.99 | B 3 | | Graduate |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | C 1 | General | 0 |
| 84-150 | 1 | 3.00-3.49 | D 0 | | 8 |
| 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 |
| | | | ? 1 | | |