

Course-Section: JPNS 101 0101  
 Title ELEMENTARY JAPANESE I  
 Instructor: MURAKAMI, YUMIK  
 Enrollment: 28  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1001  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	1	1	3	12	4.53	593/1639	4.39	4.22	4.27	4.08	4.53	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	5	6	4.00	1090/1639	3.98	4.15	4.22	4.17	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	7	4.24	813/1397	3.95	4.37	4.28	4.18	4.24	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	3	10	4.35	669/1583	3.90	4.18	4.19	4.01	4.35	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	488/1532	4.28	4.10	4.01	3.88	4.36	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	321/1504	4.08	4.04	4.05	3.78	4.56	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	4	4	7	3.94	1122/1612	3.48	4.02	4.16	4.10	3.94	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	397/1635	4.54	4.38	4.65	4.56	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	1	3	7	3	3.86	1094/1579	3.82	4.00	4.08	3.95	3.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	2	8	3	3.93	1301/1518	4.05	4.23	4.43	4.38	3.93	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	437/1520	4.56	4.67	4.70	4.61	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	2	1	5	6	4.07	1042/1517	3.84	4.15	4.27	4.20	4.07	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	2	4	7	4.14	991/1550	3.99	4.27	4.22	4.17	4.14	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	0	1	2	5	1	3.67	894/1295	3.54	3.77	3.94	3.84	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	511/1398	4.07	4.18	4.07	3.85	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	332/1391	4.48	4.51	4.30	4.07	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	872/1388	3.88	4.35	4.28	4.01	4.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	3	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 958	3.69	4.02	3.93	3.71	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 7		Graduate 1
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 6	General	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 16
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	3
			? 0		

Course-Section: JPNS 101 0201  
 Title ELEMENTARY JAPANESE I  
 Instructor: WALCOTT, YASUKO  
 Enrollment: 28  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1002  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	1	0	1	3	14	4.53	593/1639	4.39	4.22	4.27	4.08	4.53	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	3	6	8	3.95	1193/1639	3.98	4.15	4.22	4.17	3.95	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	2	7	7	4.00	973/1397	3.95	4.37	4.28	4.18	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	2	6	9	4.22	822/1583	3.90	4.18	4.19	4.01	4.22	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	3	1	12	4.22	607/1532	4.28	4.10	4.01	3.88	4.22	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	2	2	11	4.24	629/1504	4.08	4.04	4.05	3.78	4.24	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	3	2	3	9	3.74	1289/1612	3.48	4.02	4.16	4.10	3.74	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	15	3	4.05	1475/1635	4.54	4.38	4.65	4.56	4.05	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	2	8	4	4.00	889/1579	3.82	4.00	4.08	3.95	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	1	5	9	4.24	1110/1518	4.05	4.23	4.43	4.38	4.24	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	872/1520	4.56	4.67	4.70	4.61	4.76	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	2	5	8	4.19	956/1517	3.84	4.15	4.27	4.20	4.19	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	3	0	12	4.24	912/1550	3.99	4.27	4.22	4.17	4.24	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	6	1	0	3	3	2	3.56	953/1295	3.54	3.77	3.94	3.84	3.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	3	2	4	3.80	929/1398	4.07	4.18	4.07	3.85	3.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	1	1	7	4.30	778/1391	4.48	4.51	4.30	4.07	4.30	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	2	1	6	4.10	918/1388	3.88	4.35	4.28	4.01	4.10	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	2	1	1	0	4	3.38	776/ 958	3.69	4.02	3.93	3.71	3.38	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 224	****	4.00	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	4.75	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 85	****	4.67	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 82	****	4.60	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 78	****	4.80	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 80	****	4.20	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 82	****	3.00	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 32	****	4.33	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: JPNS 101 0201  
 Title ELEMENTARY JAPANESE I  
 Instructor: WALCOTT, YASUKO  
 Enrollment: 28  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1002  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	8	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	3						

Course-Section: JPNS 101 0301  
 Title ELEMENTARY JAPANESE I  
 Instructor: WALCOTT, YASUKO  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1003  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	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	1	1	2	4	4.13	1042/1639	4.39	4.22	4.27	4.08	4.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	1090/1639	3.98	4.15	4.22	4.17	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	1	3	3.63	1238/1397	3.95	4.37	4.28	4.18	3.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	2	1	2	3.13	1515/1583	3.90	4.18	4.19	4.01	3.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	0	6	4.25	580/1532	4.28	4.10	4.01	3.88	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	1249/1504	4.08	4.04	4.05	3.78	3.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	2	0	0	3	2.75	1564/1612	3.48	4.02	4.16	4.10	2.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	1045/1635	4.54	4.38	4.65	4.56	4.63	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1270/1579	3.82	4.00	4.08	3.95	3.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	1237/1518	4.05	4.23	4.43	4.38	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	1414/1520	4.56	4.67	4.70	4.61	4.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	1424/1517	3.84	4.15	4.27	4.20	3.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	0	0	3	3.60	1297/1550	3.99	4.27	4.22	4.17	3.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	1035/1295	3.54	3.77	3.94	3.84	3.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	770/1398	4.07	4.18	4.07	3.85	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	752/1391	4.48	4.51	4.30	4.07	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1248/1388	3.88	4.35	4.28	4.01	3.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	456/ 958	3.69	4.02	3.93	3.71	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	4.00	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.75	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.67	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.60	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.80	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.20	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	3.00	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.33	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: JPNS 101 0301  
 Title ELEMENTARY JAPANESE I  
 Instructor: WALCOTT, YASUKO  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1003  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: JPNS 201 0101  
 Title ELEM JAPANESE III  
 Instructor: WALCOTT, YASUKO  
 Enrollment: 28  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1004  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	1	5	17	4.70	391/1639	4.70	4.22	4.27	4.35	4.70	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	8	11	4.36	735/1639	4.36	4.15	4.22	4.27	4.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	5	8	8	3.91	1074/1397	3.91	4.37	4.28	4.39	3.91	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	4	15	4.43	560/1583	4.43	4.18	4.19	4.28	4.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	3	1	5	10	4.16	663/1532	4.16	4.10	4.01	4.09	4.16	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	3	1	15	4.50	367/1504	4.50	4.04	4.05	4.09	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	4	7	1	11	3.83	1237/1612	3.83	4.02	4.16	4.21	3.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	20	3	4.13	1434/1635	4.13	4.38	4.65	4.63	4.13	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	2	7	9	4.39	517/1579	4.39	4.00	4.08	4.14	4.39	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	5	5	12	4.22	1126/1518	4.22	4.23	4.43	4.48	4.22	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	648/1520	4.87	4.67	4.70	4.78	4.87	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	4	9	9	4.13	999/1517	4.13	4.15	4.27	4.34	4.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	4	15	4.43	729/1550	4.43	4.27	4.22	4.33	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	1	1	5	1	7	3.80	806/1295	3.80	3.77	3.94	4.07	3.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	560/1398	4.33	4.18	4.07	4.14	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	489/1391	4.67	4.51	4.30	4.35	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	647/1388	4.50	4.35	4.28	4.37	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	1	0	2	4	3	3.80	577/ 958	3.80	4.02	3.93	4.00	3.80	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 2	Required for Majors 15	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 2	C 13	General 2	Under-grad 23 Non-major 23
84-150	8	3.00-3.49 10	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 5	
			? 0		