

Course-Section: HEBR 101 1
 Title Elem Hebrew I
 Instructor: Cohen,Michelle
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 868
 MAR 22, 2010
 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	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	800/1509	4.33	4.42	4.31	4.18	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	1	4.00	1086/1509	4.00	4.39	4.26	4.25	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	359/1287	4.67	4.48	4.30	4.24	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.32	4.22	4.11	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	332/1406	4.50	4.19	4.09	4.02	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	734/1384	4.13	4.17	4.11	3.98	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	906/1489	4.11	4.07	4.17	4.20	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.55	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1314/1463	3.33	4.16	4.09	4.02	3.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	1001/1438	4.33	4.48	4.46	4.44	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	846/1421	4.78	4.75	4.73	4.66	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	1153/1411	3.89	4.39	4.31	4.27	3.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	994/1405	4.11	4.45	4.32	4.27	4.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	4	1	2	3.50	984/1236	3.50	3.92	4.00	3.87	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	1	6	4.22	645/1260	4.22	4.32	4.14	3.95	4.22
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	803/1255	4.22	4.53	4.33	4.15	4.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	584/1258	4.56	4.46	4.38	4.18	4.56
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	570/ 873	3.83	4.14	4.03	3.89	3.83

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A 5	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 4	Under-grad 9	Non-major 9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 1			
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			

Course-Section: HEBR 201 1
 Title Intermediate Hebrew I
 Instructor: Moses, Yael
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 869
 MAR 22, 2010
 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	1	6	4.86	201/1509	4.86	4.42	4.31	4.34	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	459/1509	4.57	4.39	4.26	4.32	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	304/1287	4.71	4.48	4.30	4.35	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	378/1459	4.57	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	551/1406	4.29	4.19	4.09	4.09	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	299/1384	4.57	4.17	4.11	4.09	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	2	2	0	1	2.67	1450/1489	2.67	4.07	4.17	4.19	2.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.55	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	325/1463	4.50	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	514/1438	4.71	4.48	4.46	4.48	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.75	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	858/1411	4.29	4.39	4.31	4.37	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	733/1405	4.43	4.45	4.32	4.39	4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	936/1236	3.60	3.92	4.00	4.11	3.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	558/1260	4.33	4.32	4.14	4.19	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.53	4.33	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1102/1258	3.67	4.46	4.38	4.44	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	754/ 873	3.33	4.14	4.03	4.04	3.33

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		7
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	Non-major
			P 0		7
			I 0		
			? 0		
				Other	
					0

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant