

Course-Section: JPNS 102 01
 Title Elem Japanese II
 Instructor: Walcott, Yasuko
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 888
 JUN 28, 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	0	9	5.00	1/1447	4.63	4.31	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	228/1447	4.53	4.34	4.27	4.30	4.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	159/1241	4.54	4.48	4.33	4.25	4.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	358/1402	4.35	4.36	4.24	4.15	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	0	6	4.22	635/1358	3.90	4.26	4.11	4.03	4.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	166/1316	4.33	4.27	4.14	3.99	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	398/1427	4.28	4.21	4.19	4.24	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1447	4.92	4.66	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	491/1434	4.06	4.12	4.10	4.10	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	727/1387	4.28	4.45	4.46	4.46	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	579/1387	4.86	4.78	4.73	4.71	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	290/1386	4.35	4.35	4.32	4.32	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	181/1380	4.49	4.43	4.32	4.31	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1193	3.25	4.02	4.02	3.99	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	218/1172	4.25	4.26	4.15	3.95	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	470/1182	4.52	4.56	4.35	4.18	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	275/1170	4.56	4.41	4.38	4.17	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	423/ 800	3.79	4.17	4.06	3.95	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 1	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B 4			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 2	General 3	Under-grad 9	Non-major 8
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 3		
				? 1			

Course-Section: JPNS 102 03
 Title Elem Japanese II
 Instructor: Walcott, Yasuko
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 889
 JUN 28, 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	2	1	1	8	4.25	869/1447	4.63	4.31	4.31	4.18	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	834/1447	4.53	4.34	4.27	4.30	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	1	6	4.18	833/1241	4.54	4.48	4.33	4.25	4.18
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	1	7	4.08	923/1402	4.35	4.36	4.24	4.15	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	5	1	4	3.58	1134/1358	3.90	4.26	4.11	4.03	3.58
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	0	7	3.92	900/1316	4.33	4.27	4.14	3.99	3.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	3	5	4.00	971/1427	4.28	4.21	4.19	4.24	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	673/1447	4.92	4.66	4.69	4.68	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	2	0	3	1	6	3.75	1088/1434	4.06	4.12	4.10	4.10	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	4	1	6	4.00	1176/1387	4.28	4.45	4.46	4.46	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	707/1387	4.86	4.78	4.73	4.71	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	4	2	5	3.92	1119/1386	4.35	4.35	4.32	4.32	3.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	1	7	4.08	1003/1380	4.49	4.43	4.32	4.31	4.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1041/1193	3.25	4.02	4.02	3.99	3.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	2	0	7	3.75	881/1172	4.25	4.26	4.15	3.95	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	1	2	8	4.42	629/1182	4.52	4.56	4.35	4.18	4.42
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	751/1170	4.56	4.41	4.38	4.17	4.27
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	1	5	4	2	3.58	635/ 800	3.79	4.17	4.06	3.95	3.58

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 2	General 5	Under-grad 12	Non-major 12
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 1			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 2		
				? 1			

Course-Section: JPNS 201 01
 Title Elem Japanese III
 Instructor: Walcott, Yasuko
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 890
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5							

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	839/1447	4.29	4.31	4.31	4.31	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	457/1447	4.57	4.34	4.27	4.23	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	634/1241	4.43	4.48	4.33	4.35	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	976/1402	4.00	4.36	4.24	4.24	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	581/1358	4.29	4.26	4.11	4.12	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	476/1316	4.43	4.27	4.14	4.08	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	1110/1427	3.86	4.21	4.19	4.14	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	901/1447	4.71	4.66	4.69	4.70	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	849/1434	4.00	4.12	4.10	3.97	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	1015/1387	4.29	4.45	4.46	4.42	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	1081/1387	4.57	4.78	4.73	4.71	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	855/1386	4.29	4.35	4.32	4.24	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	582/1380	4.57	4.43	4.32	4.30	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	1087/1193	3.00	4.02	4.02	4.04	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	3	2	3.83	841/1172	3.83	4.26	4.15	4.12	3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	691/1182	4.33	4.56	4.35	4.30	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	816/1170	4.17	4.41	4.38	4.32	4.17
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	630/ 800	3.60	4.17	4.06	4.01	3.60
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 189	****	3.00	4.34	4.47	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 192	****	4.00	4.34	4.38	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 187	****	3.67	4.33	4.46	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 168	****	3.67	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 62	****	4.90	4.56	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	4.80	4.41	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 65	****	4.55	4.42	4.36	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 64	****	4.45	4.09	3.70	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.49	2.25	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 36	****	4.70	4.25	3.25	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 30	****	4.00	4.30	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.64	****	****

Course-Section: JPNS 201 01
 Title Elem Japanese III
 Instructor: Walcott, Yasuko
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 890
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	5	Under-grad	7	Non-major	7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						