

Course-Section: CHIN 102 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY CHINESE II
 Instructor: BROWN, WILLIAM
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 402
 JUL 2, 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	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	373/1576	4.46	4.34	4.30	4.11	4.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	194/1576	4.48	4.32	4.27	4.18	4.85	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	215/1342	4.48	4.48	4.32	4.19	4.85	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	1041/1520	3.78	4.30	4.25	4.09	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	97/1465	4.46	4.26	4.12	4.02	4.92	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	398/1434	4.25	4.22	4.14	3.94	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	5	7	4.38	708/1547	4.32	4.12	4.19	4.10	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1574	4.94	4.55	4.64	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	363/1554	4.27	4.13	4.10	4.01	4.55	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	339/1488	4.67	4.39	4.47	4.41	4.85	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1493	4.88	4.78	4.73	4.65	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	545/1486	4.43	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.62	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	263/1489	4.74	4.40	4.32	4.22	4.85	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	2	0	1	2	2	3.29	1099/1277	3.79	3.99	4.03	3.91	3.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	926/1279	4.32	4.30	4.17	3.96	3.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	871/1270	4.48	4.57	4.35	4.09	4.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1067/1269	4.23	4.38	4.35	4.09	3.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	2	0	1	2	3.60	688/ 878	4.10	4.19	4.05	3.91	3.60	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 375	5.00	4.97	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	5.00	4.99	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 382	5.00	4.99	4.08	3.86	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	8
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	4
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 13
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	1
			? 1		

Course-Section: CHIN 102 0201
 Title ELEMENTARY CHINESE II
 Instructor: HUANG, HUICHIH
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 403
 JUL 2, 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	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	988/1576	4.46	4.34	4.30	4.11	4.22	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	1067/1576	4.48	4.32	4.27	4.18	4.11	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	931/1342	4.48	4.48	4.32	4.19	4.11	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	2	3	3.56	1346/1520	3.78	4.30	4.25	4.09	3.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	850/1465	4.46	4.26	4.12	4.02	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	1	4	4.00	878/1434	4.25	4.22	4.14	3.94	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	838/1547	4.32	4.12	4.19	4.10	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	508/1574	4.94	4.55	4.64	4.59	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	924/1554	4.27	4.13	4.10	4.01	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	870/1488	4.67	4.39	4.47	4.41	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	908/1493	4.88	4.78	4.73	4.65	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	959/1486	4.43	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	552/1489	4.74	4.40	4.32	4.22	4.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	506/1277	3.79	3.99	4.03	3.91	4.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	219/1279	4.32	4.30	4.17	3.96	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	355/1270	4.48	4.57	4.35	4.09	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	386/1269	4.23	4.38	4.35	4.09	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	187/ 878	4.10	4.19	4.05	3.91	4.60	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.97	4.01	3.78	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.99	4.03	3.64	5.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.99	4.08	3.86	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	2	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
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	2				
				?	3						

Course-Section: CHIN 202 0101
 Title INTERMEDIATE CHINESE I
 Instructor: WANG, JIEYU
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 404
 JUL 2, 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	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	347/1576	4.71	4.34	4.30	4.35	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	420/1576	4.64	4.32	4.27	4.32	4.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	143/1342	4.93	4.48	4.32	4.41	4.93	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	476/1520	4.54	4.30	4.25	4.26	4.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	347/1465	4.54	4.26	4.12	4.09	4.54	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	574/1434	4.36	4.22	4.14	4.06	4.36	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	445/1547	4.57	4.12	4.19	4.22	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.55	4.64	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	7	3	4.30	662/1554	4.30	4.13	4.10	4.05	4.30	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	442/1488	4.79	4.39	4.47	4.44	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	683/1493	4.86	4.78	4.73	4.75	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	678/1486	4.50	4.33	4.32	4.29	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	614/1489	4.57	4.40	4.32	4.31	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	1	5	7	4.29	506/1277	4.29	3.99	4.03	4.01	4.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	358/1279	4.64	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.64	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	345/1270	4.82	4.57	4.35	4.30	4.82	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	375/1269	4.82	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.82	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	383/ 878	4.22	4.19	4.05	3.92	4.22	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	5.00	4.23	4.44	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.35	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	5.00	4.51	4.65	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.29	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	5.00	4.20	4.29	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.67	4.72	4.78	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.69	4.72	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.83	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.61	4.80	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.97	4.01	4.21	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.99	4.03	4.43	5.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.99	4.08	4.39	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3	Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 6
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D 0	Under-grad 14
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Non-major 13
				P 0	Electives 2

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

I	0	Other	1
?	1		