University of Maryland Page 987
Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008
Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: JDST 310 0101

23

MODERN ISRAEL LUKACS, YEHUDA

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 12

			Frequencies				Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
a1															
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	1	2	4	2	3 64	1498/1670	3 64	3.98	4.31	4.24	3.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1		2	1	5	3	0		1635/1666	2.82	3.41	4.27	4.18	2.82	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1		1	3	5	2	0		1390/1406		3.42	4.32	4.22	2.73	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1		2	2	4	1	2		1587/1615	2.91	3.42	4.24	4.18	2.91	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	-	3	1	3	1	3		1478/1566	3.00	3.81	4.07		3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learn			1	1	1	1	1		1447/1528	3.00	3.63	4.12	4.07	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	4	1	3	2	0	2.30	1631/1650	2.30	3.15	4.22	4.12	2.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	1127/1667	4.55	4.74	4.67	4.67	4.55	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivene	ss 2	0	2	1	3	4	0	2.90	1561/1626	2.90	3.49	4.11	4.06	2.90	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	5	3	4 00	1280/1559	4.00	4.36	4.46	4.40	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1		0	0	1	0	10	4.82		4.82	4.88	4.72		4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly			0	1	2	4	3		1237/1549	3.90	4.24	4.31		3.90	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2		0	1	3	3	3		1273/1546		4.22	4.32		3.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandin			0	2	1	3	4		820/1323			4.00		3.90	
•	_														
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4		1	3	0	3			1260/1384		3.56	4.10	4.12	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate			1	1	2	2	3		1174/1378	3.56	3.93	4.29	4.30	3.56	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussio			4	1	1	2	1		1353/1378	2.44		4.31		2.44	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	6	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	820/ 904	3.00	3.14	4.03	4.03	3.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.04	***	
2. Were you provided with adequate background informati	on 11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	3.99	***	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activitie	s 11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.25	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance			0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.11	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	3.93	***	
Fr	equenc	y Di:	strik	outio	n										
	-	-													
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad	es	Reasons								ype 		Majors		;	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 1		Re	equir	ed f	or Ma	jor	s s	4	Graduate	e	0	Majo	or	0	
28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 6			-												
56-83 1 2.00-2.99 0 C 0		G	enera	al				1	Under-g	rad 1	.2	Non-	-major	12	
84-150 4 3.00-3.49 2 D 1												J			
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0		E	lecti	ves				2	#### - Means there a			re not	re not enough		
P 1									responses to be signif.				ıt		
I 0		Other						1							
? 0															

Course-Section: JDST 340 0101

ORIGINS ANTI-SEMITISM

Title Instructor: HOCHBERG, SEVER

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 18

Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 988 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

			Frequencies			Inst	tructor	Course Dept		UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	6	9	4.33	902/1670	4.33	3.98	4.31	4.24	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	5	7	4.00	1199/1666	4.00	3.41	4.27	4.18	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	1	3	10	4.12	988/1406	4.12	3.42	4.32	4.22	4.12
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	5	2	6	3.93	1203/1615	3.93	3.42	4.24	4.18	3.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	331/1566	4.61	3.81	4.07	4.04	4.61
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	697/1528	4.27	3.63	4.12	4.07	4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	1	2	5	7	4.00	1135/1650	4.00	3.15	4.22	4.12	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	405/1667	4.94	4.74	4.67	4.67	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	910/1626	4.08	3.49	4.11	4.06	4.08
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	572/1559	4.72	4.36	4.46	4.40	4.72
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	358/1560	4.94	4.88	4.72	4.67	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	586/1549	4.59	4.24	4.31	4.25	4.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	545/1546	4.65	4.22	4.32	4.24	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	3	0	3	3	3		1125/1323		3.58	4.00	3.99	3.25
5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding		5	3	U	3	3	3	3.23	1125/1323	3.23	3.30	4.00	3.99	3.23
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	2	4	8	4.13	777/1384	4.13	3.56	4.10	4.12	4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	3	2	10	4.31	819/1378	4.31	3.93	4.29	4.30	4.31
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	2	2	6	6	4.00	977/1378	4.00	3.22	4.31	4.33	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	9	2	0	1	2	2	3.29	790/ 904	3.29	3.14	4.03	4.03	3.29
- 1														
Laboratory	1.0	0	_	-		_	_	0 00	****	****	****	4 10	4 0 4	****
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 232	****		4.19	4.04	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	3.99	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 230			4.44	4.25	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.11	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 218	****	***	4.18	3.93	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	3.68	****
Field Work	1 77	^				-	_	4 00		التناسيات	ناد ناد باسیاس	4 = 0	4 4 4	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41		****	4.50	4.44	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.68	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	2.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****

Course-Section: JDST 340 0101 Title

ORIGINS ANTI-SEMITISM

Instructor: HOCHBERG, SEVER

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 988 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned Cum.				Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	4	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						