

Course-Section: CHIN 102 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY CHINESE II
 Instructor: BROWN, WILLIAM
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 405
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	765/1670	4.47	4.36	4.31	4.23	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	390/1666	4.43	4.31	4.27	4.30	4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	535/1406	4.57	4.48	4.32	4.31	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	434/1615	4.58	4.34	4.24	4.17	4.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	258/1566	4.71	4.26	4.07	4.03	4.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	3	9	4.31	651/1528	4.20	4.23	4.12	4.00	4.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	5	8	4.31	831/1650	4.20	4.16	4.22	4.28	4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	8	4.50	1157/1667	4.65	4.47	4.67	4.61	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	467/1626	4.23	4.08	4.11	4.07	4.47
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	4	10	4.53	858/1559	4.60	4.38	4.46	4.47	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	699/1560	4.85	4.75	4.72	4.68	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	294/1549	4.57	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	595/1546	4.55	4.40	4.32	4.32	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	0	4	5	1	3.70	941/1323	3.98	3.96	4.00	3.91	3.70
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	758/1384	4.37	4.29	4.10	3.92	4.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	295/1378	4.73	4.56	4.29	4.09	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	608/1378	4.19	4.45	4.31	4.08	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	9	4	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 904	4.00	4.11	4.03	3.94	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 1			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C 1	General 7	Under-grad 16	Non-major 16
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 1			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 1			

Course-Section: CHIN 102 0201
 Title ELEMENTARY CHINESE II
 Instructor: WANG, JIEYU
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 406
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	1	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	665/1670	4.47	4.36	4.31	4.23	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	1070/1666	4.43	4.31	4.27	4.30	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	515/1406	4.57	4.48	4.32	4.31	4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	509/1615	4.58	4.34	4.24	4.17	4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	273/1566	4.71	4.26	4.07	4.03	4.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	853/1528	4.20	4.23	4.12	4.00	4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	1	3	6	4.08	1090/1650	4.20	4.16	4.22	4.28	4.08
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	2	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	861/1667	4.65	4.47	4.67	4.61	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	7	2	4.00	953/1626	4.23	4.08	4.11	4.07	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	673/1559	4.60	4.38	4.46	4.47	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	777/1560	4.85	4.75	4.72	4.68	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	900/1549	4.57	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	715/1546	4.55	4.40	4.32	4.32	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	545/1323	3.98	3.96	4.00	3.91	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	372/1384	4.37	4.29	4.10	3.92	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	525/1378	4.73	4.56	4.29	4.09	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1086/1378	4.19	4.45	4.31	4.08	3.80
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	461/ 904	4.00	4.11	4.03	3.94	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	1	Under-grad	13	Non-major	12
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 1						

Course-Section: CHIN 202 0101
 Title INTERMEDIATE CHINESE I
 Instructor: WANG, JIEYU
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 407
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	2	5	4.71	414/1670	4.71	4.36	4.31	4.32	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.31	4.27	4.27	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	226/1406	4.86	4.48	4.32	4.39	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	660/1615	4.43	4.34	4.24	4.29	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	170/1566	4.83	4.26	4.07	4.00	4.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	368/1528	4.57	4.23	4.12	4.11	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	194/1650	4.86	4.16	4.22	4.20	4.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	805/1667	4.83	4.47	4.67	4.64	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	953/1626	4.00	4.08	4.11	4.06	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	673/1559	4.67	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.75	4.72	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	683/1549	4.50	4.34	4.31	4.25	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	520/1546	4.67	4.40	4.32	4.30	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	423/1323	4.40	3.96	4.00	4.08	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.29	4.10	4.07	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.56	4.29	4.25	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.45	4.31	4.26	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	4.11	4.03	4.01	5.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.33	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.61	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	4.25	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.63	4.64	4.75	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	5.00	4.57	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.88	4.45	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.13	3.97	4.30	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	2.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	2.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: CHIN 202 0101
 Title INTERMEDIATE CHINESE I
 Instructor: WANG, JIEYU
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 407
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	3	Under-grad	7	Non-major	7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHIN 302 0101
 Title ADVANCED CHINESE II
 Instructor: BROWN, WILLIAM
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 408
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	751/1670	4.44	4.36	4.31	4.24	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	415/1666	4.67	4.31	4.27	4.18	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	423/1406	4.67	4.48	4.32	4.22	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	552/1615	4.50	4.34	4.24	4.18	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	520/1566	4.38	4.26	4.07	4.04	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	706/1528	4.25	4.23	4.12	4.07	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	938/1650	4.22	4.16	4.22	4.12	4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	1119/1667	4.56	4.47	4.67	4.67	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	637/1626	4.33	4.08	4.11	4.06	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	739/1559	4.63	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	948/1560	4.75	4.75	4.72	4.67	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	537/1549	4.63	4.34	4.31	4.25	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	0	6	4.38	879/1546	4.38	4.40	4.32	4.24	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	590/1323	4.20	3.96	4.00	3.99	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	519/1384	4.43	4.29	4.10	4.12	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	915/1378	4.14	4.56	4.29	4.30	4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	481/1378	4.71	4.45	4.31	4.33	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	373/ 904	4.25	4.11	4.03	4.03	4.25

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	505/1670	4.65	4.36	4.31	4.24	4.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	440/1666	4.65	4.31	4.27	4.18	4.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	459/1406	4.64	4.48	4.32	4.22	4.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	2	11	4.35	750/1615	4.35	4.34	4.24	4.18	4.35
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	3	11	4.29	599/1566	4.29	4.26	4.07	4.04	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	1	3	10	4.12	832/1528	4.12	4.23	4.12	4.07	4.12
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	3	3	9	4.25	903/1650	4.25	4.16	4.22	4.12	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	1097/1667	4.59	4.47	4.67	4.67	4.59
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	116/1626	4.90	4.08	4.11	4.06	4.90
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	193/1559	4.94	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	417/1560	4.94	4.75	4.72	4.67	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	229/1549	4.88	4.34	4.31	4.25	4.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	0	14	4.75	407/1546	4.75	4.40	4.32	4.24	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	205/1323	4.71	3.96	4.00	3.99	4.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	135/1384	4.92	4.29	4.10	4.12	4.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	194/1378	4.92	4.56	4.29	4.30	4.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	344/1378	4.85	4.45	4.31	4.33	4.85
4. Were special techniques successful	4	6	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	120/ 904	4.86	4.11	4.03	4.03	4.86
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.04	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	3.99	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.25	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.11	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.63	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	5.00	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.88	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.13	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	2.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: CHIN 319 0101
 Title CHINESE TRANSLATION
 Instructor: BROWN, WILLIAM
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 409
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	9	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	17	Non-major	16
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						