

Course-Section: JPNS 101 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY JAPANESE I
 Instructor: WALCOTT, YASUKO
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1088
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	1	17	4.84	205/1674	4.71	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.84	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	495/1674	4.42	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.58	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	13	4.58	493/1423	4.69	4.36	4.27	4.16	4.58	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	3	3	11	4.47	536/1609	4.36	4.23	4.22	4.05	4.47	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	283/1585	4.43	4.04	3.96	3.88	4.58	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	328/1535	4.56	4.08	4.08	3.89	4.56	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	3	6	9	4.16	977/1651	4.08	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.16	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	814/1673	4.84	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.84	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	1	6	7	4.27	706/1656	4.24	4.06	4.07	3.96	4.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	5	10	4.41	989/1586	4.34	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.41	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	340/1585	4.91	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	380/1582	4.44	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	440/1575	4.59	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	1	3	4	6	4.07	635/1380	3.89	3.94	3.94	3.78	4.07	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	512/1520	4.23	4.14	4.01	3.76	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	759/1515	4.45	4.37	4.24	3.97	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	602/1511	4.34	4.37	4.27	4.00	4.56	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	445/ 994	3.92	3.97	3.94	3.73	4.10	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	14
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	B 7		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 19
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	0
			? 0		

Course-Section: JPNS 101 0201
 Title ELEMENTARY JAPANESE I
 Instructor: WALCOTT, YASUKO
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1089
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	8	15	4.58	509/1674	4.71	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.58	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	10	10	4.26	919/1674	4.42	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.26	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	20	4.79	214/1423	4.69	4.36	4.27	4.16	4.79	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	9	11	4.25	852/1609	4.36	4.23	4.22	4.05	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	3	6	11	4.29	530/1585	4.43	4.04	3.96	3.88	4.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	5	16	4.57	319/1535	4.56	4.08	4.08	3.89	4.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	2	11	8	4.00	1097/1651	4.08	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	832/1673	4.84	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	4	7	8	4.21	770/1656	4.24	4.06	4.07	3.96	4.21	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	13	8	4.26	1136/1586	4.34	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.26	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	664/1585	4.91	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.87	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	11	8	4.17	1016/1582	4.44	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	6	14	4.48	730/1575	4.59	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.48	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	4	2	6	7	3.70	938/1380	3.89	3.94	3.94	3.78	3.70	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	5	5	6	4.06	790/1520	4.23	4.14	4.01	3.76	4.06	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	629/1515	4.45	4.37	4.24	3.97	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	2	6	7	4.13	1004/1511	4.34	4.37	4.27	4.00	4.13	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	6	7	2	3.73	647/ 994	3.92	3.97	3.94	3.73	3.73	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors 13	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 4	C 4	General 6	Under-grad 24 Non-major 2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 3	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 2	
			? 0		

Course-Section: JPNS 201 0101
 Title ELEM JAPANESE III
 Instructor: WALCOTT, YASUKO
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1090
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	11	4.59	509/1674	4.59	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.59	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	10	4.35	803/1674	4.35	4.26	4.23	4.26	4.35	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	10	4.35	750/1423	4.35	4.36	4.27	4.36	4.35	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	629/1609	4.41	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.41	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	4	5	7	4.19	622/1585	4.19	4.04	3.96	3.91	4.19	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	12	4.53	355/1535	4.53	4.08	4.08	4.03	4.53	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	8	7	4.24	889/1651	4.24	4.20	4.18	4.20	4.24	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	744/1656	4.23	4.06	4.07	4.10	4.23	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	837/1586	4.53	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.53	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	615/1585	4.88	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	1	7	8	4.24	956/1582	4.24	4.30	4.26	4.35	4.24	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	2	11	4.41	806/1575	4.41	4.32	4.27	4.39	4.41	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	1	1	1	1	4	3.75	902/1380	3.75	3.94	3.94	4.03	3.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	316/1520	4.64	4.14	4.01	4.03	4.64	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	313/1515	4.82	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.82	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	962/1511	4.18	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.18	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	474/ 994	4.00	3.97	3.94	3.98	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.34	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.42	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.48	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.07	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.45	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.63	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 10
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 7	
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C 4	General 2
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	7	D 0	Under-grad 17
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Non-major 4
				P 1	
				I 0	Electives 3
				? 1	Other 2

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant