

Course-Section: JPNS 102 0101
 Title ELEM JAPANESE II
 Instructor: WALCOTT, YASUKO
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 953
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	1	1	7	9	4.33	788/1504	4.47	4.24	4.27	4.13	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	9	4.28	827/1503	4.29	4.22	4.20	4.16	4.28
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	6	8	4.11	887/1290	4.36	4.32	4.28	4.19	4.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	3	2	3	9	4.06	974/1453	4.18	4.22	4.21	4.11	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	4	9	4.24	563/1421	4.12	4.08	4.00	3.91	4.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	3	2	10	4.31	514/1365	4.11	4.11	4.08	3.96	4.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	4	6	5	3.67	1222/1485	3.87	4.20	4.16	4.13	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1504	4.50	4.68	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	3	7	6	4.00	850/1483	4.19	4.07	4.06	3.97	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	10	4	4.06	1147/1425	4.14	4.41	4.41	4.36	4.06
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	549/1426	4.86	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	3	3	6	5	3.76	1159/1418	3.84	4.29	4.25	4.20	3.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	4	10	4.35	791/1416	4.45	4.34	4.26	4.21	4.35
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	10	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	349/1199	3.86	3.95	3.97	3.82	4.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	337/1312	4.47	4.12	4.00	3.69	4.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	197/1303	4.95	4.39	4.24	3.93	4.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	0	5	5	4.18	841/1299	4.49	4.34	4.25	3.94	4.18
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	1	2	3	1	2	3.11	671/ 758	3.68	4.05	4.01	3.80	3.11
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.07	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	4.12	4.09	4.07	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	4.49	4.40	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.40	4.23	4.01	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	4.22	4.09	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.60	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.54	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	4.32	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.41	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	4.17	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	3.98	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	4.12	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.68	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.32	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.61	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.28	4.53	4.52	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	35	****	4.43	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	36	****	4.38	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	20	****	5.00	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	5.00	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: JPNS 102 0101
 Title ELEM JAPANESE II
 Instructor: WALCOTT, YASUKO
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 953
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	5	C	7	General	3	Under-grad	18	Non-major	2
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: JPNS 102 0201
 Title ELEM JAPANESE II
 Instructor: WALCOTT, YASUKO
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 954
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	2	1	10	4.62	406/1504	4.47	4.24	4.27	4.13	4.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	795/1503	4.29	4.22	4.20	4.16	4.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	400/1290	4.36	4.32	4.28	4.19	4.62
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	8	4.31	718/1453	4.18	4.22	4.21	4.11	4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	745/1421	4.12	4.08	4.00	3.91	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	3	1	6	3.92	890/1365	4.11	4.11	4.08	3.96	3.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	953/1485	3.87	4.20	4.16	4.13	4.08
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	4.00	1411/1504	4.50	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	493/1483	4.19	4.07	4.06	3.97	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	1050/1425	4.14	4.41	4.41	4.36	4.23
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	643/1426	4.86	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	9	2	3.92	1081/1418	3.84	4.29	4.25	4.20	3.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	593/1416	4.45	4.34	4.26	4.21	4.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	1	0	5	3	1	3.30	997/1199	3.86	3.95	3.97	3.82	3.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	465/1312	4.47	4.12	4.00	3.69	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1303	4.95	4.39	4.24	3.93	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	303/1299	4.49	4.34	4.25	3.94	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	304/ 758	3.68	4.05	4.01	3.80	4.25

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	3	Under-grad	13	Non-major	4
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: JPNS 202 0101
 Title INTERMEDIATE JAPANESE
 Instructor: Walcott, Yasuko
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 955
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	0	0	7	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.24	4.27	4.26	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	138/1503	4.86	4.22	4.20	4.18	4.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.32	4.28	4.27	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	222/1453	4.71	4.22	4.21	4.20	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.08	4.00	3.90	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	100/1365	4.86	4.11	4.08	4.00	4.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	240/1485	4.71	4.20	4.16	4.15	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	1255/1504	4.29	4.68	4.69	4.68	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	108/1483	4.83	4.07	4.06	4.02	4.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	255/1425	4.86	4.41	4.41	4.40	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	158/1418	4.86	4.29	4.25	4.22	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.34	4.26	4.24	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	149/1199	4.71	3.95	3.97	3.95	4.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	255/1312	4.67	4.12	4.00	3.98	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.39	4.24	4.23	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.34	4.25	4.21	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	630/ 758	3.33	4.05	4.01	3.89	3.33

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 2			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 2	General 3	Under-grad 7	Non-major 1
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D 1			
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 0		
				? 0			