

Course-Section: HEBR 102 0101  
 Title ELEM. HEBREW II  
 Instructor: LITOV, SAMUEL  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 854  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	3	2	9	4.43	652/1481	4.43	4.26	4.29	4.14	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	481/1481	4.53	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	334/1249	4.67	4.37	4.27	4.14	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	896/1424	4.11	4.27	4.21	4.06	4.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	6	7	4.20	554/1396	4.20	4.07	3.98	3.89	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	638/1342	4.15	4.12	4.07	3.88	4.15	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	1	2	6	4	3.79	1136/1459	3.79	4.19	4.16	4.17	3.79	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	1029/1480	4.53	4.64	4.68	4.64	4.53	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	1	1	5	7	4.29	599/1450	4.29	4.10	4.09	3.97	4.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	762/1409	4.50	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.57	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	491/1399	4.57	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	0	3	9	4.29	844/1400	4.29	4.35	4.27	4.19	4.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	590/1179	4.00	3.94	3.96	3.85	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	0	2	7	4.27	556/1262	4.27	4.18	4.05	3.77	4.27	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	211/1259	4.91	4.40	4.29	4.06	4.91	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	394/1256	4.73	4.34	4.30	4.08	4.73	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	5	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	506/ 788	3.83	4.03	4.00	3.80	3.83	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	4.26	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	4.08	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	4.45	4.40	4.33	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.37	4.20	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.42	4.04	4.02	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.26	4.53	4.18	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	5	Under-grad	15	Non-major	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	2						

Course-Section: HEBR 323 0101  
 Title SELECTED HEBREW AUTHOR  
 Instructor: LITOV, SAMUEL  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 855  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	2	3	4.60	461/1481	4.60	4.26	4.29	4.29	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	183/1481	4.80	4.26	4.23	4.23	4.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1249	****	4.37	4.27	4.28	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	178/1424	4.80	4.27	4.21	4.27	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1396	5.00	4.07	3.98	4.00	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	112/1342	4.80	4.12	4.07	4.12	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	961/1459	4.00	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	880/1480	4.75	4.64	4.68	4.65	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	217/1450	4.67	4.10	4.09	4.10	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	334/1409	4.80	4.46	4.42	4.43	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.30	4.26	4.27	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.35	4.27	4.28	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1179	****	3.94	3.96	4.02	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	167/1262	4.80	4.18	4.05	4.14	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.40	4.29	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.34	4.30	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	671/ 788	3.33	4.03	4.00	4.07	3.33	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	3.90	4.55	4.88	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.42	4.65	4.88	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.83	4.67	****	

Frequency Distribution

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