University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: JPNS 102 0101

11

ELEM JAPANESE II

WALCOTT, YASUKO

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 4

Spring 2008

Frequencies

Instructor

Page 989 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Ctudant	Course	Fralustion	Ouestionnaire
bludelil	COULDE	E varuation	Oucocidinatic

					L T 4	Frequencies		>		TIID	LIUCLUI	Course	Debr	UMBC	пелет	Sect		
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did you	u gain ne	w insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1670	4.64	4.36	4.31	4.23	5.00
2. Did the	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	312/1666	4.34	4.31	4.27	4.30	4.75				
3. Did the	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	597/1406	4.25	4.48	4.32	4.31	4.50				
4. Did oth	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	290/1615	4.38	4.34	4.24	4.17	4.75				
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned							0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1566	4.29	4.26	4.07	4.03	5.00
6. Did wri	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1528	4.41	4.23	4.12	4.00	5.00
7. Was the	e grading	system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	903/1650	3.98	4.16	4.22	4.28	4.25
8. How mar	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1667	4.93	4.47	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How wou	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	207/1626	4.28	4.08	4.11	4.07	4.75
		Lectur	۵															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared							0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1559	4.52	4.38	4.46	4.47	5.00
		tor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1560		4.75	4.72		5.00
				xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1549			4.31		5.00
		es contribute t			0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1546			4.32		5.00
				our understanding	1	1	0	0	1	1			1040/1323					
		1																
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	820/1384	3.88	4.29	4.10	3.92	4.00
2. Were al	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1378	4.88	4.56	4.29	4.09	5.00
3. Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1378	4.38	4.45	4.31	4.08	5.00
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succe	ssful		2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 904	4.00	4.11	4.03	3.94	5.00
				Freq	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
a 11. =	,	a ana		1 . 1				_					_					
Credits Ea	arned 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	5 			Ту:	pe 			Majors 	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 0		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	3	2	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 2		_ -												
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		General					1	Under-g	rad	4	Non-	-major	4	
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		El	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1				_	ſh
				P 2									responses to be significant					
				I 0		Other						0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: JPNS 102 0201

19

ELEM JAPANESE II

WALCOTT, YASUKO

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 15

Spring 2008

Page 990

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Company Comp			Ouestions				NA		Frequencies 1 2 3 4 5				Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean	UMBC Level Mean Mean		Sect Mean
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course				- 															
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 1 1 1 1 4 8 4.13 1103/1666 4.34 4.31 4.27 4.30 4.13 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 1 1 8 5 4.13 972/1406 4.25 4.48 4.32 4.31 4.17 4.00 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 4 0 1 1 2 2 7 4.06 1083/1615 4.38 4.34 4.24 4.17 4.00 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 2 1 1 1 1 1 9 4.23 724/1528 4.41 4.33 4.12 4.00 4.23 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 1 5 3 6 3.93 1235/1650 3.98 4.16 4.22 4.28 3.93 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 3 12 4.80 861/1667 4.93 4.07 4.67 4.61 4.80 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 4 0 1 2 2 3 3 3.88 1152/1626 4.28 4.08 4.11 4.07 3.88																			
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 1 1 8 8 5 4.13 972/1406 4.25 4.48 4.32 4.31 4.13 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 1 1 2 4 7 4.00 1083/1615 4.38 4.34 4.24 4.17 4.00 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 4 0 1 1 2 7 4.36 530/1566 4.29 4.26 4.07 4.03 4.36 Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2 1 1 1 1 9 4.23 724/1528 4.41 4.23 4.12 4.00 4.23 7.88 How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 1 5 3 6 3.93 1257/1650 3.98 4.16 4.22 4.28 3.93 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 12 4.80 861/1667 4.93 4.47 4.67 4.61 4.80 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 4 0 1 2 2 3 3.88 152/1626 4.28 4.08 4.11 4.07 3.88 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 4 0 0 0 0 1 3 7 4.55 846/1559 4.52 4.38 4.46 4.47 4.55 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 4 0 0 0 0 1 4 6 4.45 749/1549 4.53 4.34 4.31 4.32 4.45 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10	1. Did you	0	0	0	2	0	1	12	4.53	632/1670	4.64	4.36	4.31	4.23	4.53				
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 1 1 1 2 4 7 4.00 1083/1615 4.38 4.34 4.24 4.17 4.00 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 4 0 1 1 1 2 7 4.36 530/1566 4.29 4.26 4.07 4.03 4.36 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2 1 1 1 1 1 9 4.23 724/1528 4.14 4.23 4.12 4.00 4.23 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 1 5 3 6 3.93 1235/1650 3.98 4.16 4.22 4.28 3.93 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 3 6 3.93 1235/1650 3.98 4.16 4.22 4.28 3.93 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4 8.08 661/1667 4.39 4.47 4.67 4.61 4.80 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 4 0 1 2 2 2 3 3.88 1152/1626 4.28 4.08 4.11 4.07 3.88	2. Did the									1	4	8	4.13	1103/1666	4.34	4.31	4.27	4.30	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 4 0 1 1 2 7 4.36 530/1566 4.29 4.26 4.07 4.03 4.36 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2 1 1 1 1 9 4.23 724/1528 4.41 4.23 4.12 4.00 4.23 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 1 5 3 6 3.93 1235/1650 3.98 4.16 4.22 4.28 3.93 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 12 4.80 861/1667 4.93 4.47 4.67 4.61 4.80 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 4 0 1 2 2 3 3.88 1152/1626 4.28 4.08 4.11 4.07 3.88	3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflect	t the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	1	1	8	5	4.13	972/1406	4.25	4.48	4.32	4.31	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 1 1 5 3 6 3.93 1235/1650 3.98 4.16 4.22 4.28 3.93 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 1 5 3 6 3.93 1235/1650 3.98 4.16 4.22 4.28 3.93 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 2 3 3.88 1152/1626 4.28 4.08 4.17 4.67 4.61 4.80 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 4 0 1 2 2 2 3 3.88 1152/1626 4.28 4.08 4.11 4.07 3.88 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 4 0 0 0 0 1 3 7 4.55 846/1559 4.52 4.38 4.46 4.47 4.55 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 4 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 4.91 596/1560 4.97 4.75 4.72 4.68 4.91 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4 0 0 0 1 1 4 6 4.45 749/1549 4.53 4.34 4.31 4.32 4.45 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 1 0 2 8 4.55 667/1546 4.68 4.04 3.32 4.32 4.55 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 3 2 1 1 1 3 3 3.25 1125/1323 3.33 3.96 4.00 3.91 3.25 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1378 4.88 4.29 4.10 3.92 **** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1378 4.88 4.59 4.29 4.09 **** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1378 4.88 4.56 4.29 4.09 **** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1378 4.88 4.56 4.29 4.09 **** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1378 4.88 4.56 4.29 4.08 **** 4. Were special techniques successful Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA	4. Did oth	her evalu	ations reflect	the exp	ected goals	0	0	1	1	2	4	7	4.00	1083/1615	4.38	4.34	4.24	4.17	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 1 5 3 6 3.93 1235/1650 3.98 4.16 4.22 4.28 3.93 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 12 4.80 861/1667 4.93 4.47 4.67 4.61 4.80 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 4 0 1 2 2 3 3.88 1152/1626 4.28 4.08 4.11 4.07 3.88 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 4 0 0 0 0 1 3 7 4.55 846/1559 4.52 4.38 4.46 4.47 4.55 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 4 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 4.91 596/1560 4.97 4.75 4.72 4.68 4.91 4.55 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 4 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 4.91 596/1560 4.97 4.75 4.72 4.68 4.91 4.55 4.01 4.91 4.91 4.91 4.91 4.91 4.91 4.91 4.9	5. Did ass	signed re	adings contrib	ate to v	what you learned	0	4	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	530/1566	4.29	4.26	4.07	4.03	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 3 12 4.80 861/1667 4.93 4.47 4.67 4.61 4.80 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 4 0 1 2 2 3 3.88 1152/1626 4.28 4.08 4.11 4.07 3.88 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 4 0 0 0 0 1 3 7 4.55 846/1559 4.52 4.38 4.46 4.47 4.55 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 4 0 0 0 0 1 10 4.91 596/1560 4.97 4.75 4.72 4.68 4.91 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4 0 0 0 1 1 0 4.91 596/1560 4.97 4.75 4.72 4.68 4.91 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 0 1 0 2 8 4.55 667/1546 4.68 4.40 4.32 4.32 4.55 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 3 2 1 1 1 3 3 3.25 1125/1323 3.33 3.96 4.00 3.91 3.25 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1378 4.88 4.56 4.29 4.09 **** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1378 4.88 4.56 4.29 4.09 **** 4.80 4.80 4.80 4.90 4.00 4.11 4.03 3.94 **** 4.80 4.80 4.90 4.00 4.11 4.03 3.94 **** 4.80 4.80 4.80 4.80 4.80 4.80 4.80 4.80	6. Did wri	itten ass	ignments contr	ibute to	what you learned	. 0	2	1	1	1	1	9	4.23	724/1528	4.41	4.23	4.12	4.00	4.23
Lecture Lect	7. Was the	e grading	system clearly	y explai	ned	0	0	0	1	5	3	6	3.93	1235/1650	3.98	4.16	4.22	4.28	3.93
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. 0 0 0 0 1 1 10 4.91 596/1560 4.97 4.75 4.72 4.68 4.91 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. 0 0 0 0 1 4 6 4.45 749/1549 4.53 4.34 4.31 4.32 4.45 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 4. 0 0 1 0 2 8 4.55 667/1546 4.68 4.40 4.32 4.35 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4. 3 2 1 1 1 3 3 3.25 1125/1323 3.33 3.96 4.00 3.91 3.25 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13. 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1378 4.88 4.56 4.29 4.09 **** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13. 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1378 4.84 4.56 4.29 4.09 **** 4. Were special techniques successful 13. 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1378 4.84 4.56 4.29 4.09 **** 4. Were special techniques successful 13. 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	8. How mar	ny times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	861/1667	4.93	4.47	4.67	4.61	4.80
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 4 0 0 0 1 3 7 4.55 846/1559 4.52 4.38 4.46 4.47 4.55 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 4 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 4.91 596/1560 4.97 4.75 4.72 4.68 4.91 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4 0 0 0 1 4 6 4.45 749/1549 4.53 4.34 4.31 4.32 4.45 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 1 0 2 8 4.55 667/1546 4.68 4.40 4.32 4.35 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 3 2 1 1 1 3 3 3.25 1125/1323 3.33 3.96 4.00 3.91 3.25 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1384 3.88 4.29 4.10 3.92 **** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1378 4.88 4.56 4.29 4.09 **** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1378 4.88 4.56 4.29 4.09 **** 4. Were special techniques successful 13 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/904 4.00 4.11 4.03 3.94 **** 4. Were special techniques successful 13 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/904 4.00 4.11 4.03 3.94 **** 4. Were special techniques successful 13 Required for Majors 7 Graduate 0 Major 2 2. See 5 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 6 General 6 Under-grad 15 Non-major 13 8.4-150 1 3.00-3.49 2 D 1 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant 10 Other 1	9. How wou	uld you g	rade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	3	4	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1152/1626	4.28	4.08	4.11	4.07	3.88
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 4 0 0 0 1 3 7 4.55 846/1559 4.52 4.38 4.46 4.47 4.55 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 4 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 4.91 596/1560 4.97 4.75 4.72 4.68 4.91 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4 0 0 0 1 4 6 4.45 749/1549 4.53 4.34 4.31 4.32 4.45 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 1 0 2 8 4.55 667/1546 4.68 4.40 4.32 4.35 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 3 2 1 1 1 3 3 3.25 1125/1323 3.33 3.96 4.00 3.91 3.25 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1384 3.88 4.29 4.10 3.92 **** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1378 4.88 4.56 4.29 4.09 **** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1378 4.88 4.56 4.29 4.09 **** 4. Were special techniques successful 13 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/904 4.00 4.11 4.03 3.94 **** 4. Were special techniques successful 13 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/904 4.00 4.11 4.03 3.94 **** 4. Were special techniques successful 13 Required for Majors 7 Graduate 0 Major 2 2. See 5 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 6 General 6 Under-grad 15 Non-major 13 8.4-150 1 3.00-3.49 2 D 1 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant 10 Other 1																			
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject			Lecture																
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4 0 0 0 1 4 6 4.45 749/1549 4.53 4.34 4.31 4.32 4.45 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 1 0 2 8 4.55 667/1546 4.68 4.40 4.32 4.35 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 3 2 1 1 1 3 3.25 1125/1323 3.33 3.96 4.00 3.91 3.25 Discussion	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared							0	0	1	3	7	4.55	846/1559	4.52	4.38	4.46	4.47	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 1 0 2 8 4.55 667/1546 4.68 4.40 4.32 4.32 4.55 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 3 2 1 1 1 1 3 3.25 1125/1323 3.33 3.96 4.00 3.91 3.25 Discussion	2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject								-	-	1	10	4.91			4.75		4.68	4.91
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1384 3.88 4.29 4.10 3.92 **** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1378 4.88 4.56 4.29 4.09 **** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1378 4.38 4.45 4.31 4.08 **** 4. Were special techniques successful 13 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/904 4.00 4.11 4.03 3.94 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors								-	-	_		-							
Discussion Discussion Discussions Discussions contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1384 3.88 4.29 4.10 3.92 **** Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1378 4.88 4.56 4.29 4.09 **** Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1378 4.38 4.45 4.31 4.08 **** Were special techniques successful 13 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 904 4.00 4.11 4.03 3.94 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors O0-27 3 0.00-0.99 0 A 1 Required for Majors 7 Graduate 0 Major 2 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 6 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 0 C 6 General 6 Under-grad 15 Non-major 13 84-150 1 3.00-3.49 2 D 1 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant I 0 Other 1							-	•	1	0	2	8						4.32	4.55
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1384 3.88 4.29 4.10 3.92 **** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1378 4.88 4.56 4.29 4.09 **** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1378 4.38 4.45 4.31 4.08 **** 4. Were special techniques successful 13 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1378 4.38 4.45 4.31 4.08 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors O0-27 3 0.00-0.99 0 A 1 Required for Majors 7 Graduate 0 Major 2 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 6 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 0 C 6 General 6 Under-grad 15 Non-major 13 84-150 1 3.00-3.49 2 D 1 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant I 0 Other 1	5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques enl	nance yo	our understanding	4	3	2	1	1	1	3	3.25	1125/1323	3.33	3.96	4.00	3.91	3.25
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1384 3.88 4.29 4.10 3.92 **** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1378 4.88 4.56 4.29 4.09 **** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1378 4.38 4.45 4.31 4.08 **** 4. Were special techniques successful 13 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1378 4.38 4.45 4.31 4.08 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors O0-27 3 0.00-0.99 0 A 1 Required for Majors 7 Graduate 0 Major 2 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 6 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 0 C 6 General 6 Under-grad 15 Non-major 13 84-150 1 3.00-3.49 2 D 1 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant I 0 Other 1																			
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1378 4.88 4.56 4.29 4.09 **** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1378 4.38 4.45 4.31 4.08 **** 4. Were special techniques successful 13 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 904 4.00 4.11 4.03 3.94 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors																			
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1378 4.38 4.45 4.31 4.08 **** 4. Were special techniques successful 13 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 904 4.00 4.11 4.03 3.94 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 3 0.00-0.99 0 A 1 Required for Majors 7 Graduate 0 Major 2 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 6 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 0 C 6 General 6 Under-grad 15 Non-major 13 84-150 1 3.00-3.49 2 D 1 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant I 0 Other 1					-		-	-		-		2		,					
4. Were special techniques successful 13 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 904 4.00 4.11 4.03 3.94 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 3 0.00-0.99 0 A 1 Required for Majors 7 Graduate 0 Major 2 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 6 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 0 C 6 General 6 Under-grad 15 Non-major 13 84-150 1 3.00-3.49 2 D 1 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 responses to be significant			_	_			-					2		,					
Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 3 0.00-0.99 0 A 1 Required for Majors 7 Graduate 0 Major 2 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 6 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 0 C 6 General 6 Under-grad 15 Non-major 13 84-150 1 3.00-3.49 2 D 1 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant I 0 Other 1			_		d open discussion					-	-	_		,					
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 3 0.00-0.99 0 A 1 Required for Majors 7 Graduate 0 Major 2 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 6 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 0 C 6 General 6 Under-grad 15 Non-major 13 84-150 1 3.00-3.49 2 D 1 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant P 0 Temporal Type Majors 1 0 Other 1	4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succe	ssful		13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 904	4.00	4.11	4.03	3.94	****
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 3 0.00-0.99 0 A 1 Required for Majors 7 Graduate 0 Major 2 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 6 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 0 C 6 General 6 Under-grad 15 Non-major 13 84-150 1 3.00-3.49 2 D 1 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant P 0 Temporal Type Majors 1 0 Other 1																			
00-27 3 0.00-0.99 0 A 1 Required for Majors 7 Graduate 0 Major 2 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 6 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 0 C 6 General 6 Under-grad 15 Non-major 13 84-150 1 3.00-3.49 2 D 1 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant I 0 Other 1					Freq	uency	7 Dis	trib	utio	n									
28-55	Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	
28-55	00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 1		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	 ន	7	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r •	2
84-150 1 3.00-3.49 2 D 1 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 1	28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 6			-			,								
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 1	56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 6		Ge	nera	1				6	Under-g	rad 1	.5	Non-	major	13
P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 1	84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D 1									3				-	
I 0 Other 1	Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		El	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	rh
					P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
? 1					I 0		Ot	her					1	-					
					? 1														

Course-Section: JPNS 102 0301 University of Maryland Page 991 AUG 6, 2008 ELEM JAPANESE II Baltimore County MURAKAMI, YUMIK Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Frequencies

Instructor

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Enrollment:	13	
Questionnaires:	8	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

I 0

? 1

Title

Instructor:

							FIE	eque.	пстег	5	Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level							Sect
		Questions			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1. Did you	u qain ne	w insights,skil	ls fro	m this course	0	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	849/1670	4.64	4.36	4.31	4.23	4.38
2. Did the	2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals								1	2	4	4.13	1114/1666	4.34	4.31	4.27	4.30	4.13
3. Did the	0	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	980/1406	4.25	4.48	4.32	4.31	4.13				
4. Did oth	her evalua	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	724/1615	4.38	4.34	4.24	4.17	4.38
5. Did ass	signed rea	adings contribu	te to	what you learned	0	0	2	0	2	0	4	3.50	1285/1566	4.29	4.26	4.07	4.03	3.50
6. Did wri	itten ass:	ignments contri	bute t	o what you learned	0	2	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	899/1528	4.41	4.23	4.12	4.00	4.00
7. Was the	e grading	system clearly	expla	ined	0	0	0	2	1	2	3	3.75	1359/1650	3.98	4.16	4.22	4.28	3.75
8. How mar	ny times v	was class cance	lled		0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1667	4.93	4.47	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How wou	uld you g	rade the overal	1 teac	hing effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	797/1626	4.28	4.08	4.11	4.07	4.20
		Lecture																
1 Were th	he instru	ctor's lectures		nrenared	0	0	0	0	2	4	2	4 00	1280/1559	4.52	4.38	4.46	4.47	4.00
					0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1560			4.72		5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly							0	0	1	5	-		1087/1549		4.34	4.31		4.13
		s contribute to			0	0	0	1	0	1			715/1546		4.40	4.32		
				our understanding	0	4	0	1	2	0			1125/1323			4.00	3.91	
J. Dia auc	aiovibaai	ccciniiques cin	ance y	our understanding	Ü	-	O	_		O	_	3.23	1125/1525	3.33	3.50	1.00	3.71	3.23
		Discuss	ion															
1. Did cla	ass discus	ssions contribu	te to	what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	996/1384	3.88	4.29	4.10	3.92	3.75
2. Were al	ll student	ts actively end	ourage	d to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	400/1378	4.88	4.56	4.29	4.09	4.75
3. Did the	e instruct	tor encourage f	air an	d open discussion	4	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1110/1378	4.38	4.45	4.31	4.08	3.75
4. Were sp	pecial ted	chniques succes	sful	_	4	1	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	820/ 904	4.00	4.11	4.03	3.94	3.00
				Frequ	iency	Dis	tribu	utio	n									
								_					_					
Credits Ea	arned 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	5 			Ту:	pe 			Majors 	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 0		Re	quire	ed f	or Ma	jors	S	4	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 3														
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 3		Ge:	neral	L				1	Under-g	rad	8	Non-	-major	8
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D 1														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		El	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				2	#### - 1				_	ſh
		P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ignificant				
								_										

Other

1

Course-Section: JPNS 202 0101 University of Maryland INTERMEDIATE JAPANESE Title Baltimore County Spring 2008

WALCOTT, YASUKO Instructor: 7

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 7

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies

Instructor

Page 992

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

							rrequencies			•		TIID	LIUCCOL	Course	Debr	UMDC	телет	Sect		
Questions				NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean			
		General	 L																	
1. Did you	u qain ne	w insights,skil	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	253/1670	4.86	4.36	4.31	4.32	4.86		
2. Did the	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	751/1666	4.43	4.31	4.27	4.27	4.43						
3. Did the	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	691/1406	4.43	4.48	4.32	4.39	4.43						
4. Did oth	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	477/1615	4.57	4.34	4.24	4.29	4.57						
5. Did ass	signed re	adings contribu	ite to	what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	295/1566	4.67	4.26	4.07	4.00	4.67		
6. Did wri	itten ass	ignments contri	bute t	o what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	157/1528	4.83	4.23	4.12	4.11	4.83		
7. Was the	e grading	system clearly	/ expla	ined	0	0	0	1	2	4	0	3.43	1494/1650	3.43	4.16	4.22	4.20	3.43		
8. How mar	ny times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1104/1667	4.57	4.47	4.67	4.64	4.57		
9. How wou	uld you g	rade the overal	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	953/1626	4.00	4.08	4.11	4.06	4.00		
Lecture																				
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared							0	0	2	3	2	4 00	1280/1559	4.00	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.00		
		tor seem intere			0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.75	4.72		5.00		
				xplained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	2			952/1549	4.29	4.34	4.31	4.25	4.29		
		s contribute to			0	0	0	0	0	2			457/1546		4.40	4.32		4.71		
				our understanding	0	5	0	1	0	1			1179/1323			4.00		3.00		
3. 21a aa	410110441	ocomizques em	101100 7	our unacroduraring	Ü		Ü	_	Ü	_	Ū	3.00	11.7, 1323	3.00	3.70	1.00	1.00	3.00		
		Discuss	sion																	
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contribu	ite to	what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.29	4.10	4.07	5.00		
2. Were al	ll studen	ts actively end	courage	d to participate	2	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	525/1378	4.60	4.56	4.29	4.25	4.60		
3. Did the	e instruc	tor encourage f	air an	d open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	751/1378	4.40	4.45	4.31	4.26	4.40		
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succes	ssful		2	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	289/ 904	4.40	4.11	4.03	4.01	4.40		
				Frequ	ıency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n											
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	\$			Ty	pe			Majors			
														- 						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Re	quire	ed f	or Ma	ijors	3	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0		
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3		~						_	1	,	-			-		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 2		Ge	nera:	L				6	Under-g	rad	7	Non-	-major	7		
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	0	D 0								0			1			1-		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		ET	ectiv	ves				0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant					n		
				1 0		0.	1					0	respons	es to b	e sign	significant				
				Ι 0		Other						0								

? 0