Enrollment: 21
Questionnaires: 16   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| | | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
Questions	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	2	2	11	4.60	474/1447	4.25	4.31	4.31	4.18	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	1	12	4.56	468/1447	4.23	4.34	4.27	4.30	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	13	4.69	357/1241	4.54	4.48	4.33	4.25	4.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	2	2	9	4.20	827/1402	4.10	4.36	4.24	4.15	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	325/1358	4.48	4.26	4.11	4.03	4.54
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	312/1316	4.13	4.27	4.14	3.99	4.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	4	8	4.25	775/1427	3.98	4.21	4.19	4.24	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	5	4.31	1216/1447	4.66	4.66	4.69	4.68	4.31
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	442/1434	4.07	4.12	4.10	4.10	4.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	641/1387	4.42	4.45	4.46	4.46	4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	422/1387	4.79	4.78	4.73	4.71	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	0	2	10	4.62	496/1386	4.36	4.35	4.32	4.32	4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	534/1380	4.42	4.43	4.32	4.31	4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	1	0	4	3	2	3.50	960/1193	3.64	4.02	4.02	3.99	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1172	4.00	4.26	4.15	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	347/1182	4.63	4.56	4.35	4.18	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	576/1170	4.50	4.41	4.38	4.17	4.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	16	Non-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	1			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: CHIN 102  02                  University of Maryland                                 Page  370
Title      Elementary Chinese II                  Baltimore County                                   JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:   Huang,Hui Chih                        Spring 2010                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    21
Questionnaires:  11                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                       Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                       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  3  5  2  3.90 1159/1447  4.25  4.31  4.31  4.18  3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   1   0  0  0  3  5  2  3.90 1141/1447  4.23  4.34  4.27  4.30  3.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  1   0  0  0  2  2  6  4.40  658/1241  4.54  4.48  4.33  4.25  4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   2   0  0  0  2  5  2  4.00  976/1402  4.10  4.36  4.24  4.15  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  3  0  0  1  2  4  4.43  430/1358  4.48  4.26  4.11  4.03  4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 1 0 1  3  3  2  3.67 1050/1316  4.13  4.27  4.14  3.99  3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           1   0  0  1  3  4  2  3.70 1184/1427  3.98  4.21  4.19  4.24  3.70
8. How many times was class cancelled                 1   0  0  0  0  0 10  5.00    1/1447  4.66  4.66  4.69  4.68  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 0 0  3  3  1  3.71 1117/1434  4.07  4.12  4.10  4.10  3.71


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       2   0  0  0  3  1  5  4.22 1063/1387  4.42  4.45  4.46  4.46  4.22
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  2   0  0  0  1  1  7  4.67  982/1387  4.79  4.78  4.73  4.71  4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 0 0  2  4  3  4.11  997/1386  4.36  4.35  4.32  4.32  4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    2   0  0  0  1  5  3  4.22  915/1380  4.42  4.43  4.32  4.31  4.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0 0 0  5  1  3  3.78  831/1193  3.64  4.02  4.02  3.99  3.78


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0  1  2  1  4.00  710/1172  4.00  4.26  4.15  3.95  4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 0 0  1  0  3  4.50  553/1182  4.63  4.56  4.35  4.18  4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 0 0  1  0  3  4.50  576/1170  4.50  4.41  4.38  4.17  4.50
4. Were special techniques successful                 7   2  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/ 800  ****  4.17  4.06  3.95  ****
```

```
                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                Type                   Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      0      0.00-0.99    0       A   5       Required for Majors   2    Graduate      0       Major       0
28-55      1      1.00-1.99    0       B   3
56-83      0      2.00-2.99    1       C   0       General               4    Under-grad   11       Non-major  11
84-150     0      3.00-3.49    0       D   0
Grad.      0      3.50-4.00    2       F   0       Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P   0                                 responses to be significant
                                       I   0       Other                 2
                                       ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: CHIN 202  01                University of Maryland                              Page  371
Title       Intermediate Chinese I          Baltimore County                                   JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:   Huang,Hui Chih                Spring 2010                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   11
Questionnaires:  9                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                       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  1  4  3  3.89 1174/1447  3.89  4.31  4.31 4.31  3.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  3  0  2  2  2  3.00 1400/1447  3.00  4.34  4.27 4.23  3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  1  0  2  3  3  3.78 1062/1241  3.78  4.48  4.33 4.35  3.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0  1  2  1  4  1  3.22 1337/1402  3.22  4.36  4.24 4.24  3.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  2  0  0  6  1  3.44 1195/1358  3.44  4.26  4.11 4.12  3.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  2  1  3  3  0  2.78 1280/1316  2.78  4.27  4.14 4.08  2.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  2  2  3  2  3.56 1243/1427  3.56  4.21  4.19 4.14  3.56
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  1  8  4.89  538/1447  4.89  4.66  4.69 4.70  4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0  0  1  3  2  0  3.17 1331/1434  3.17  4.12  4.10 3.97  3.17


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  0  1  3  3  2  3.67 1282/1387  3.67  4.45  4.46 4.42  3.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0  0  1  1  3  4  4.11 1300/1387  4.11  4.78  4.73 4.71  4.11
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0  0  1  2  4  2  3.78 1184/1386  3.78  4.35  4.32 4.24  3.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0  0  1  2  3  3  3.89 1113/1380  3.89  4.43  4.32 4.30  3.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  0  1  1  1  4  2  3.56  943/1193  3.56  4.02  4.02 4.04  3.56


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0   0  0  2  1  5  1  3.56  978/1172  3.56  4.26  4.15 4.12  3.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0   0  1  0  3  3  2  3.56 1065/1182  3.56  4.56  4.35 4.30  3.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1  0  0  1  2  4  1  3.63 1025/1170  3.63  4.41  4.38 4.32  3.63
4. Were special techniques successful                   0   5  0  2  0  1  1  3.25  720/ 800  3.25  4.17  4.06 4.01  3.25


            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   6   0  0  0  3  0  0  3.00  184/ 189  3.00  3.00  4.34 4.47  3.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 6 0  0  0  1  1  1  4.00  147/ 192  4.00  4.00  4.34 4.38  4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 6  1  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/ 186  ****  ****  4.48 4.57  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            6   0  0  0  2  0  1  3.67  161/ 187  3.67  3.67  4.33 4.46  3.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  6   0  0  0  2  0  1  3.67  145/ 168  3.67  3.67  4.20 4.15  3.67


            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 6   0  1  0  1  1  0  2.67   65/  66  2.67  3.99  4.58 4.43  2.67
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 7  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  62  ****  4.90  4.56 4.28  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 7   0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  58  ****  4.80  4.41 3.79  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     7   0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  65  ****  4.55  4.42 4.36  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 7   0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  64  ****  4.45  4.09 3.70  ****


            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  7   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  38  ****  5.00  4.49 2.25  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  7   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  36  ****  4.70  4.25 3.25  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        7   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  28  ****  ****  4.52 ****  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    7   0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  30  ****  4.00  4.30 ****  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  7   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  27  ****  4.50  4.43 ****  ****


            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 7   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  31  ****  5.00  4.72 ****  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     7   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  21  ****  5.00  4.57 ****  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       7   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  31  ****  5.00  4.64 ****  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        7   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  20  ****  ****  4.60 ****  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      7   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  15  ****  ****  4.61 ****  ****
```

Questionnaires: 9   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                          Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	3	Under-grad	9	Non-major	9
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			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: CHIN 302  01                 University of Maryland                              Page  372
Title         Advanced Chinese II            Baltimore County                                   JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:   Brown,William I                Spring 2010                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    21
Questionnaires: 11                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                   Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
           Questions                        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  3   7  4.70   375/1447   4.70  4.31  4.31 4.32  4.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0  0  0  0  2   8  4.80   196/1447   4.80  4.34  4.27 4.23  4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   0  0  0  0  0  10  5.00     1/1241   5.00  4.48  4.33 4.33  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   1  0  0  0  3   6  4.67   314/1402   4.67  4.36  4.24 4.24  4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  1  0  0  0  1   8  4.89    97/1358   4.89  4.26  4.11 4.10  4.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0  0  0  1  1   8  4.70   212/1316   4.70  4.27  4.14 4.13  4.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0  0  0  1  0   9  4.80   154/1427   4.80  4.21  4.19 4.15  4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  0  1   9  4.90   485/1447   4.90  4.66  4.69 4.65  4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 0 0  0  0  1   4  4.80   117/1434   4.80  4.12  4.10 4.09  4.80


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  0  0  1   9  4.90   200/1387   4.90  4.45  4.46 4.44  4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  0  0  10  5.00     1/1387   5.00  4.78  4.73 4.71  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  0  1   9  4.90   136/1386   4.90  4.35  4.32 4.30  4.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  0  0  1  0   9  4.80   273/1380   4.80  4.43  4.32 4.32  4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0  0  0  0  1   9  4.90    65/1193   4.90  4.02  4.02 4.05  4.90


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5  0  0  0  0  0   6  5.00     1/1172   5.00  4.26  4.15 4.24  5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5  0  0  0  0  0   6  5.00     1/1182   5.00  4.56  4.35 4.42  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0  0  0  0  0   6  5.00     1/1170   5.00  4.41  4.38 4.49  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  5   2  0  0  0  0   4  5.00     1/ 800   5.00  4.17  4.06 4.12  5.00


                 Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  8   2  0  0  0  0   1  5.00  ****/ 189   ****  3.00  4.34 4.26  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 9 0  0  0  0  0   2  5.00  ****/ 192   ****  4.00  4.34 4.20  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 9 1  0  0  0  0   1  5.00  ****/ 186   ****  ****  4.48 4.36  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           9   1  0  0  0  0   1  5.00  ****/ 187   ****  3.67  4.33 4.11  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  9  1  0  0  0  0   1  5.00  ****/ 168   ****  3.67  4.20 4.02  ****


                 Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 8  2  0  0  0  1   0  4.00  ****/  66   ****  3.99  4.58 4.17  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 9 1  0  0  0  1   0  4.00  ****/  62   ****  4.90  4.56 4.21  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 9  1  0  0  0  1   0  4.00  ****/  58   ****  4.80  4.41 2.87  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    9   1  0  0  0  0   1  5.00  ****/  65   ****  4.55  4.42 4.01  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                9   1  0  0  0  0   1  5.00  ****/  64   ****  4.45  4.09 3.38  ****


                 Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  8  0  0  0  0  0   3  5.00     1/  38   5.00  5.00  4.49 4.73  5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  8  0  0  0  0  0   3  5.00     1/  36   5.00  4.70  4.25 3.81  5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       8   1  0  0  0  0   2  5.00  ****/  28   ****  ****  4.52 4.46  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   8   2  0  0  0  0   1  5.00  ****/  30   ****  4.00  4.30 4.42  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  8  2  0  0  0  0   1  5.00  ****/  27   ****  4.50  4.43 4.50  ****


                 Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 8  0  0  0  0  0   3  5.00     1/  31   5.00  5.00  4.72 5.00  5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    8   0  0  0  0  0   3  5.00     1/  21   5.00  5.00  4.57 5.00  5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      8   0  0  0  0  0   3  5.00     1/  31   5.00  5.00  4.64 5.00  5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       8   1  0  0  0  0   2  5.00  ****/  20   ****  ****  4.60 5.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     8   1  0  0  0  0   2  5.00  ****/  15   ****  ****  4.61 5.00  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	11	Non-major	11
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

```
Course-Section: CHIN 319  01              University of Maryland                          Page  373
Title        Chinese Translation              Baltimore County                        JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:  Brown,William I                   Spring 2010                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     15
Questionnaires:  12               Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                           Frequencies         Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions                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   8  4.67   408/1447   4.67  4.31  4.31  4.32  4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   0   0   0   4   8  4.67   352/1447   4.67  4.34  4.27  4.23  4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   4   0   0   0   2   6  4.75   282/1241   4.75  4.48  4.33  4.33  4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0   0   0   2   3   7  4.42   603/1402   4.42  4.36  4.24  4.24  4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   2   0   0   1   1   8  4.70   216/1358   4.70  4.26  4.11  4.10  4.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0   0   0   1   3   8  4.58   312/1316   4.58  4.27  4.14  4.13  4.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   1   0   1   1   2   7  4.36   644/1427   4.36  4.21  4.19  4.15  4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0   0   0   0   2  10  4.83   673/1447   4.83  4.66  4.69  4.65  4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0   0   0   0   1   7  4.88    96/1434   4.88  4.12  4.10  4.09  4.88


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0   0   0   0   2  10  4.83   307/1387   4.83  4.45  4.46  4.44  4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0   0   0   0   3   9  4.75   859/1387   4.75  4.78  4.73  4.71  4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0   0   0   0   4   8  4.67   431/1386   4.67  4.35  4.32  4.30  4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0   0   0   1   2   9  4.67   463/1380   4.67  4.43  4.32  4.32  4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  0   0   0   4   3   4  4.00   652/1193   4.00  4.02  4.02  4.05  4.00


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8   0   0   0   0   1   3  4.75   218/1172   4.75  4.26  4.15  4.24  4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8   0   0   0   0   1   3  4.75   347/1182   4.75  4.56  4.35  4.42  4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8  0   0   0   0   1   3  4.75   390/1170   4.75  4.41  4.38  4.49  4.75
4. Were special techniques successful                   8   1   0   1   0   0   2  4.00   423/ 800   4.00  4.17  4.06  4.12  4.00

                              Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned         Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons                  Type                    Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     0        0.00-0.99   0       A    9        Required for Majors   2     Graduate      0        Major        0
  28-55     3        1.00-1.99   0       B    2
  56-83     1        2.00-2.99   1       C    0        General               2     Under-grad   12        Non-major   12
  84-150    2        3.00-3.49   3       D    0
  Grad.     0        3.50-4.00   3       F    0        Electives             6     #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                    responses to be significant
                                         I    0        Other                 1
                                         ?    0
```