

Course Section: JPNS 101 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY JAPANESE I
 Instructor: WALCOTT, YASUKO
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1061
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	2	17	4.89	135/1669	4.82	4.33	4.23	4.02	4.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	206/1666	4.68	4.28	4.19	4.11	4.79	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	255/1421	4.65	4.36	4.24	4.11	4.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	146/1617	4.51	4.27	4.15	3.99	4.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	277/1555	4.49	4.17	4.00	3.92	4.59	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	130/1543	4.67	4.19	4.06	3.86	4.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	10	8	4.37	713/1647	4.12	4.18	4.12	4.06	4.37	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	991/1668	4.67	4.60	4.67	4.62	4.74	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	288/1605	4.57	4.13	4.07	3.96	4.61	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	616/1514	4.54	4.39	4.39	4.32	4.65	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1551	4.93	4.72	4.66	4.55	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	412/1503	4.32	4.31	4.24	4.17	4.65	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	98/1506	4.80	4.40	4.26	4.17	4.94	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	291/1311	4.27	3.78	3.85	3.68	4.46	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	340/1490	4.49	4.26	4.05	3.85	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	256/1502	4.79	4.54	4.26	4.06	4.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	865/1489	4.36	4.43	4.29	4.07	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	235/1006	4.38	4.14	4.00	3.81	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.00	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.00	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.50	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.00	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.33	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.00	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	5.00	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	4.42	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	4.33	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	5.00	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: JPNS 101 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY JAPANESE I
 Instructor: WALCOTT, YASUKO
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1061
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	5	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	3	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course Section: JPNS 101 0201
 Title ELEMENTARY JAPANESE I
 Instructor: WALCOTT, YASUKO
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1062
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	0	3	19	4.74	293/1669	4.82	4.33	4.23	4.02	4.74	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	14	4.57	483/1666	4.68	4.28	4.19	4.11	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	5	16	4.52	538/1421	4.65	4.36	4.24	4.11	4.52	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	4	6	11	4.18	875/1617	4.51	4.27	4.15	3.99	4.18	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	6	13	4.39	445/1555	4.49	4.17	4.00	3.92	4.39	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	4	15	4.50	390/1543	4.67	4.19	4.06	3.86	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	4	5	4	10	3.87	1196/1647	4.12	4.18	4.12	4.06	3.87	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	5	17	4.61	1125/1668	4.67	4.60	4.67	4.62	4.61	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	10	11	4.52	358/1605	4.57	4.13	4.07	3.96	4.52	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	9	12	4.43	908/1514	4.54	4.39	4.39	4.32	4.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	622/1551	4.93	4.72	4.66	4.55	4.87	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	1	15	5	4.00	1066/1503	4.32	4.31	4.24	4.17	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	16	4.65	484/1506	4.80	4.40	4.26	4.17	4.65	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	0	0	4	4	5	4.08	552/1311	4.27	3.78	3.85	3.68	4.08	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	650/1490	4.49	4.26	4.05	3.85	4.31	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	459/1502	4.79	4.54	4.26	4.06	4.69	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	0	4	8	4.38	818/1489	4.36	4.43	4.29	4.07	4.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	381/1006	4.38	4.14	4.00	3.81	4.25	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors 10	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	8	1.00-1.99 0	B 11		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 1	C 1	General 9	Under-grad 23 Non-major 22
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 10	D 0		
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 1	
			? 0		

Course Section: JPNS 201 0101
 Title: ELEM JAPANESE III
 Instructor: WALCOTT, YASUKO
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1063
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	3	6	17	4.41	734/1669	4.41	4.33	4.23	4.34	4.41	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	4	9	11	4.04	1076/1666	4.04	4.28	4.19	4.29	4.04	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	9	5	11	3.93	1042/1421	3.93	4.36	4.24	4.35	3.93	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	6	5	12	4.17	899/1617	4.17	4.27	4.15	4.24	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	1	3	7	8	4.16	655/1555	4.16	4.17	4.00	3.96	4.16	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	5	7	11	3.96	944/1543	3.96	4.19	4.06	4.10	3.96	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	5	1	10	10	3.85	1205/1647	3.85	4.18	4.12	4.19	3.85	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	20	4.74	978/1668	4.74	4.60	4.67	4.59	4.74	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	2	4	12	7	3.96	987/1605	3.96	4.13	4.07	4.15	3.96	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	6	8	11	4.20	1118/1514	4.20	4.39	4.39	4.39	4.20	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	567/1551	4.88	4.72	4.66	4.72	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	4	3	7	11	4.00	1066/1503	4.00	4.31	4.24	4.29	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	4	7	12	4.16	980/1506	4.16	4.40	4.26	4.33	4.16	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	11	2	1	0	6	4	3.69	825/1311	3.69	3.78	3.85	3.96	3.69	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	558/1490	4.40	4.26	4.05	4.11	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	326/1502	4.82	4.54	4.26	4.31	4.82	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	1	0	2	2	5	4.00	1038/1489	4.00	4.43	4.29	4.36	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	2	0	0	4	1	3	3.88	617/1006	3.88	4.14	4.00	3.99	3.88	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	6	C	8	General	3	Under-grad	27	Non-major	27
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	8	D	5						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0						
				?	1						

Course Section: JPNS 300 0101
 Title SPEC PROJ IN JAPANESE
 Instructor: WALCOTT, YASUKO
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1064
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	389/1669	4.67	4.33	4.23	4.28	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1527/1666	3.33	4.28	4.19	4.20	3.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1617	5.00	4.27	4.15	4.22	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1043/1647	4.00	4.18	4.12	4.14	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.60	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1605	5.00	4.13	4.07	4.09	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1199/1514	4.00	4.39	4.39	4.46	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.72	4.66	4.70	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1069/1506	4.00	4.40	4.26	4.30	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	587/1311	4.00	3.78	3.85	3.97	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	849/1490	4.00	4.26	4.05	4.11	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	632/1502	4.50	4.54	4.26	4.28	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	684/1489	4.50	4.43	4.29	4.35	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	997/1006	2.00	4.14	4.00	4.10	2.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	98/ 112	3.00	4.00	4.38	4.53	3.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	97/ 97	1.00	3.00	4.36	4.12	1.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	77/ 92	3.00	3.50	4.22	4.47	3.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	72/ 105	4.00	4.00	4.20	4.45	4.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	75/ 98	3.50	4.00	3.95	4.15	3.50	

Frequency Distribution

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