

Course-Section: JPNS 101 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY JAPANESE I
 Instructor: MURAKAMI, YUMIK
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1024
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	24	4.79	284/1649	4.75	4.34	4.28	4.11	4.79	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	21	4.62	414/1648	4.36	4.31	4.23	4.16	4.62	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	20	4.62	443/1375	4.48	4.42	4.27	4.10	4.62	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	2	3	10	12	4.19	903/1595	4.28	4.29	4.20	4.03	4.19	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	5	19	4.50	366/1533	4.47	4.16	4.04	3.87	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	2	4	21	4.57	331/1512	4.53	4.19	4.10	3.86	4.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	5	11	11	4.07	999/1623	4.14	4.08	4.16	4.08	4.07	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	24	4.83	799/1646	4.92	4.59	4.69	4.67	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	3	12	11	4.22	720/1621	4.15	4.14	4.06	3.96	4.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	6	21	4.71	554/1568	4.41	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	26	4.93	473/1572	4.79	4.79	4.70	4.64	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	9	16	4.46	702/1564	4.31	4.28	4.28	4.20	4.46	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	2	24	4.75	390/1559	4.68	4.43	4.29	4.20	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	2	4	6	11	4.13	607/1352	3.70	3.97	3.98	3.86	4.13	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	795/1384	3.93	4.28	4.08	3.86	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	425/1382	4.44	4.57	4.29	4.03	4.73	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	5	0	6	4.09	922/1368	4.35	4.42	4.30	4.01	4.09	
4. Were special techniques successful	18	0	0	2	1	3	5	4.00	431/ 948	4.50	4.10	3.95	3.75	4.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 555	****	2.56	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 288	****	2.95	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 312	****	2.48	3.68	3.51	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	6	General	5	Under-grad	29	Non-major	29
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	1	Electives	6	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	2						

Course-Section: JPNS 101 0201
 Title ELEMENTARY JAPANESE I
 Instructor: WALCOTT, YASUKO
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1025
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	13	4.93	149/1649	4.75	4.34	4.28	4.11	4.93	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	388/1648	4.36	4.31	4.23	4.16	4.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	422/1375	4.48	4.42	4.27	4.10	4.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	342/1595	4.28	4.29	4.20	4.03	4.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	241/1533	4.47	4.16	4.04	3.87	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	4	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	179/1512	4.53	4.19	4.10	3.86	4.78	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	469/1623	4.14	4.08	4.16	4.08	4.54	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1646	4.92	4.59	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	261/1621	4.15	4.14	4.06	3.96	4.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	667/1568	4.41	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	715/1572	4.79	4.79	4.70	4.64	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	498/1564	4.31	4.28	4.28	4.20	4.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	164/1559	4.68	4.43	4.29	4.20	4.93	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	3	0	4	2	5	3.43	1090/1352	3.70	3.97	3.98	3.86	3.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	376/1384	3.93	4.28	4.08	3.86	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1382	4.44	4.57	4.29	4.03	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	579/1368	4.35	4.42	4.30	4.01	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 948	4.50	4.10	3.95	3.75	5.00	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 243	****	4.69	4.12	4.08	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	1	1	2	0	0	0	1.67	****/ 555	****	2.56	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.20	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 81	****	4.23	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.32	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/ 288	****	2.95	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.67	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.67	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/ 312	****	2.48	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 110	****	4.13	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: JPNS 101 0201
 Title ELEMENTARY JAPANESE I
 Instructor: WALCOTT, YASUKO
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1025
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	3	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	6	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
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				
				?	0						

Course-Section: JPNS 101 0301
 Title ELEMENTARY JAPANESE I
 Instructor: MURAKAMI, YUMIK
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1026
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	0	4	12	4.53	617/1649	4.75	4.34	4.28	4.11	4.53	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	2	8	5	3.82	1296/1648	4.36	4.31	4.23	4.16	3.82	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	6	8	4.18	868/1375	4.48	4.42	4.27	4.10	4.18	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	4	8	4.00	1067/1595	4.28	4.29	4.20	4.03	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	2	4	9	4.25	624/1533	4.47	4.16	4.04	3.87	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	2	10	4.24	711/1512	4.53	4.19	4.10	3.86	4.24	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	1	7	6	3.82	1228/1623	4.14	4.08	4.16	4.08	3.82	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	398/1646	4.92	4.59	4.69	4.67	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	8	4	4	3.59	1310/1621	4.15	4.14	4.06	3.96	3.59	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	6	4	6	3.88	1354/1568	4.41	4.39	4.43	4.39	3.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	4	12	4.59	1165/1572	4.79	4.79	4.70	4.64	4.59	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	3	7	5	3.82	1262/1564	4.31	4.28	4.28	4.20	3.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	3	10	4.38	861/1559	4.68	4.43	4.29	4.20	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	1	0	4	7	1	3.54	1034/1352	3.70	3.97	3.98	3.86	3.54	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	1209/1384	3.93	4.28	4.08	3.86	3.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1175/1382	4.44	4.57	4.29	4.03	3.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/1368	4.35	4.42	4.30	4.01	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	2	0	0	2	0	2.50	****/ 948	4.50	4.10	3.95	3.75	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 555	****	2.56	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	1	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	****/ 288	****	2.95	3.68	3.54	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	5	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	2						

Course-Section: JPNS 201 0101
 Title ELEM JAPANESE III
 Instructor: WALCOTT, YASUKO
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1027
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	408/1649	4.69	4.34	4.28	4.29	4.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	658/1648	4.44	4.31	4.23	4.25	4.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	6	4.25	806/1375	4.25	4.42	4.27	4.37	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	8	6	4.19	903/1595	4.19	4.29	4.20	4.22	4.19	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	614/1533	4.27	4.16	4.04	4.04	4.27	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	338/1512	4.56	4.19	4.10	4.14	4.56	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	4	8	4.13	957/1623	4.13	4.08	4.16	4.21	4.13	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	8	4.50	1193/1646	4.50	4.59	4.69	4.63	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	8	4	4.23	709/1621	4.23	4.14	4.06	4.01	4.23	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	983/1568	4.40	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	473/1572	4.93	4.79	4.70	4.73	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	4	4	6	4.14	1046/1564	4.14	4.28	4.28	4.27	4.14	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	347/1559	4.79	4.43	4.29	4.33	4.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	10	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1352	****	3.97	3.98	4.07	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	737/1384	4.14	4.28	4.08	3.99	4.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	562/1382	4.57	4.57	4.29	4.19	4.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	601/1368	4.57	4.42	4.30	4.21	4.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	4	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 948	****	4.10	3.95	3.89	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 221	****	4.38	4.16	4.45	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	2	1	1	0	0	1.75	534/ 555	1.75	2.56	4.29	4.33	1.75	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	2.95	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	2.48	3.68	3.59	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 110	****	4.13	3.99	3.72	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	6	General	3	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						