Course-Section: CHIN 102 0101

Title ELEMENTARY CHINESE II

Instructor: GUO, XIAONAN

Enrollment: 17
Questionnaires: 13

XIAONAN Spring 2006

Page 351 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies						Inst	ructor	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	3	10	4.77	280/1481		4.26	4.29	4.14	4.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	155/1481	4.66	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1249	4.82	4.37	4.27	4.14	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	287/1424			4.21	4.06	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	102/1396		4.07	3.98	3.89	4.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1 0	0 1	1 1	2	2	7 8	4.25	542/1342		4.12 4.19	4.07	3.88	4.25 4.23
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	4		792/1459 1178/1480		4.19	4.16	4.17 4.64	4.23
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	1	0	1	5		-,			4.09		4.43
7. Now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	J	_	U	_	U		,	1.13	443/1430	7.21	4.10	4.00	3.91	1.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	400/1409	4.54	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	400/1407	4.79	4.77	4.69	4.57	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	445/1399	4.47	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	1	9	4.38	729/1400	4.48	4.35	4.27	4.19	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	1	1	0	2	5	4.00	590/1179	3.92	3.94	3.96	3.85	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	249/1262		4.18	4.05	3.77	4.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	422/1259	4.54	4.40	4.29	4.06	4.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	636/1256	4.47	4.34	4.30	4.08	4.44
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	1	1	0	6	4.38	233/ 788	4.35	4.03	4.00	3.80	4.38
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 246	****	4.26	4.20	3.93	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 249	****	4.08	4.11	3.95	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 242	****	4.45	4.40	4.33	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 240	****	4.37	4.20	4.20	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 217	****	4.42	4.04	4.02	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	4.54	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 69	****	4.26	4.53	4.18	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 63	****	4.24	4.44	4.17	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.19	4.35	4.14	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	3.98	3.92	3.80	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	3.44	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 41	****	3.68	4.26	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 31	****	3.50	4.42	****	****
1. 11. 10m210moss morp 10m outry out richa acceptation		J	,	3	,	,	_	2.00	, 51		2.50			
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	3.90	4.55	4.48	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.28	4.75	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.42	4.65	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 34	****	4.50	4.83	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.82	4.58	****

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: CHIN 102 0101

Title ELEMENTARY CHINESE II

Instructor: GUO, XIAONAN

Enrollment: 17
Questionnaires: 13

17

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 351 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	11	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHIN 102 0201 University of Maryland Title ELEMENTARY CHINESE II

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Instructor: GUO, XIAONAN

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 19

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 352 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Questions								Frequencies				Inst	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect	
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 7. Was the instructor seem interested in the subject 7. Was the instructor's lectures well prepared 8. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8. Did assigned reading system clearly explained 9. The world of the subject 9. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 9. O 0 0 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0			Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 2 6 11 4.47 560/1481 4.66 4.26 4.28 4.18 4.47 3 Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 2 3 14 4.63 569/1429 4.82 4.37 4.27 4.14 4.63 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 2 0 1 1 6 9 4.35 620/1424 4.51 4.27 4.21 4.06 4.35 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 1 0 0 1 4 12 4.65 209/1396 4.74 4.07 3.98 3.89 4.65 Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 1 0 0 1 3 5 8 4.18 615/1342 4.21 4.12 4.07 3.98 3.89 4.65 Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 1 0 0 1 5 7 6 4.06 935/1459 4.14 4.19 4.16 4.17 4.06 4.35 4.18 4.19 4.06 4.07 3.98 3.89 4.05 4.10 4.09 3.09 3.09 3.09 3.09 3.09 3.09 3.09 3			Genera	 1															
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 2 3 14 4.63 369/1249 4.82 4.37 4.27 4.14 4.63 4.00 dother evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 2 0 1 1 6 6 9 4.35 620/1424 4.51 4.27 4.21 4.06 4.35 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 1 0 0 1 3 5 8 4.18 615/1342 4.21 4.12 4.07 3.98 3.89 4.65 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 1 0 0 1 3 5 8 4.18 615/1342 4.21 4.12 4.07 3.98 3.89 4.65 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 1 0 0 0 5 7 6 4.06 935/1459 4.14 4.19 4.07 3.98 4.18 4.19 4.06 4.00 8.10 4.10 4.00 8.10 4.10 4.00 8.10 4.10 4.00 8.10 4.10 4.00 8.10 4.10 4.00 8.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4	1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	3	6	10	4.37	718/1481	4.57	4.26	4.29	4.14	4.37
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 2 0 1 1 1 6 9 4.35 620/1424 4.51 4.27 4.21 4.06 4.35 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 1 0 0 1 4 2 4.65 209/1396 4.74 4.07 3.98 3.89 4.65 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 1 0 0 1 3 5 8 4.18 615/1342 4.21 4.07 3.98 3.88 4.18 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 0 5 7 6 4.06 935/1459 4.14 4.19 4.16 4.17 4.06 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 5 7 6 4.06 935/1459 4.14 4.19 4.16 4.17 4.06 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 5 7 6 4.06 935/1459 4.14 4.19 4.16 4.17 4.06 8. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 6 5 6 4.00 836/1450 4.21 4.10 4.09 3.97 4.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 6 5 6 4.00 836/1450 4.21 4.10 4.09 3.97 4.00 9. How would you grade the overall prepared 0 0 0 0 1 0 10 8 4.32 990/1409 4.54 4.46 4.68 4.42 4.36 4.32 2. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 1 0 10 8 4.32 990/1409 4.54 4.46 4.42 4.36 4.32 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 1 4 13 4.67 963/1407 4.79 4.77 4.69 4.57 4.67 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 1 6 1 2 4.58 521/1400 4.89 4.35 4.27 4.19 4.58 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 5 1 0 3 5 4 3.85 732/1179 3.92 3.94 3.96 3.85 3.85 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5						0	0	0	0	2	6	11	4.47	560/1481	4.66	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 1 0 0 0 1 4 12 4.65 209/1396 4.74 4.07 3.98 3.89 4.65 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 1 0 0 0 1 3 5 8 4.18 615/1342 4.21 4.12 4.07 3.88 4.18 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 1 0 0 1 3 5 8 4.18 615/1342 4.21 4.12 4.12 4.17 4.06 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 1 0 15 2 4.00 1349/1480 4.15 4.64 4.68 4.64 4.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 6 5 6 4.00 836/1450 4.21 4.10 4.09 3.97 4.00 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 1	3. Did th	ne exam qu	uestions reflect	the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	369/1249	4.82	4.37	4.27	4.14	4.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 1 0 0 1 3 5 8 4.18 615/1342 4.21 4.12 4.07 3.88 4.18 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 0 5 7 6 4.06 335/1459 4.14 4.19 4.16 4.17 4.06 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 1 0 15 2 4.00 1349/1480 4.15 4.64 4.68 4.64 4.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 6 5 6 4.00 836/1450 4.21 4.10 4.09 3.97 4.00 Lecture Lecture 1. 0 0 0 1 0 10 8 4.32 990/1409 4.54 4.46 4.42 4.36 4.32 2.01 4.00 140 4.09 4.09 4.57 4.67 4.67 4.67 4.07 3.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00	4. Did ot	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals							1	1	6	9	4.35	620/1424	4.51	4.27	4.21	4.06	4.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 0 5 7 6 4.06 935/1459 4.14 4.19 4.16 4.17 4.06 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 1 0 15 2 4.00 1349/1480 4.15 4.64 4.68 4.64 4.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 6 5 6 4.00 836/1450 4.21 4.10 4.09 3.97 4.00 **Lecture** 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 1 0 10 10 8 4.32 990/1409 4.54 4.46 4.42 4.36 4.32 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 1 4 13 4.67 963/1407 4.79 4.77 4.69 4.57 4.67 4.67 4.51 4.00 did to be considered and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 1 6 12 4.58 521/1400 4.48 4.35 4.27 4.19 4.58 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 5 1 0 3 5 4 3.85 732/1179 3.92 3.94 3.96 3.85 3.85 **Discussion** 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11 0 1 0 0 0 7 4.50 345/1262 4.60 4.18 4.05 3.77 4.50 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11 0 0 0 1 2 5 4.38 701/1259 4.54 4.40 4.29 4.06 4.38 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0 0 0 1 2 5 4.50 571/1256 4.47 4.34 4.30 4.08 4.53 4.33 **Frequency Distribution** **Trequency Distribution** **Trequen	5. Did as	. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned						0	0	1	4	12	4.65	209/1396	4.74	4.07	3.98	3.89	4.65
8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How mony times was class cancelled 1 0 0 1 0 15 2 4.00 1349/1480 4.15 4.64 4.68 4.64 4.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 6 5 6 4.00 836/1450 4.21 4.10 4.09 3.97 4.00 Lecture	6. Did wr							0	1	3	5	8	4.18	615/1342	4.21	4.12	4.07	3.88	4.18
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 6 5 6 4.00 836/1450 4.21 4.10 4.09 3.97 4.00 Lecture	7. Was th								0	5	7	6	4.06	935/1459	4.14	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.06
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 1 0 10 8 4.32 990/1409 4.54 4.46 4.42 4.36 4.32 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 1 4 13 4.67 963/1407 4.79 4.77 4.69 4.57 4.67 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 3 7 9 4.32 773/1399 4.47 4.30 4.26 4.23 4.32 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 6 12 4.58 521/1400 4.48 4.35 4.27 4.19 4.58 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 5 1 0 3 5 4 3.85 732/1179 3.92 3.94 3.96 3.85 3.85 Discussion	8. How ma	. How many times was class cancelled						0	1	0	15	2	4.00	1349/1480	4.15	4.64	4.68	4.64	4.00
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 1 0 10 8 4.32 990/1409 4.54 4.46 4.42 4.36 4.32 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 1 4 13 4.67 963/1407 4.79 4.70 4.69 4.57 4.67 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 3 7 9 4.32 773/1399 4.47 4.30 4.26 4.23 4.32 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 6 12 4.58 521/1400 4.48 4.35 4.27 4.19 4.58 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 5 1 0 3 5 4 3.85 732/1179 3.92 3.94 3.96 3.85 3.85 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11 0 1 0 0 0 7 4.50 345/1262 4.60 4.18 4.05 3.77 4.50 3.85 3.85 3.85 Did audiovisual techniques encouraged to participate 11 0 0 0 0 7 4.50 345/1262 4.60 4.18 4.05 3.77 4.50 3.85 3.85 3.85 3.85 3.85 3.85 3.85 3.85	9. How wo	9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness						0	0	6	5	6	4.00	836/1450	4.21	4.10	4.09	3.97	4.00
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 1 0 10 8 4.32 990/1409 4.54 4.46 4.42 4.36 4.32 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 1 1 4 13 4.67 963/1407 4.79 4.77 4.69 4.57 4.63 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 3 7 9 4.32 773/1399 4.47 4.30 4.26 4.23 4.32 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 6 12 4.58 521/1400 4.48 4.35 4.27 4.19 4.58 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 5 1 0 3 5 4 3.85 732/1179 3.92 3.94 3.96 3.85 3.85 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11 0 1 0 0 0 7 4.50 345/1262 4.60 4.18 4.05 3.77 4.50 3.85 3.85 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11 0 0 0 0 2 1 5 4.38 701/1259 4.54 4.40 4.29 4.06 4.38 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0 0 0 0 1 2 5 4.38 701/1259 4.54 4.40 4.29 4.06 4.38 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0 0 0 0 1 2 5 4.38 701/1256 4.47 4.34 4.30 4.08 4.50 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.0			Lecture	<u> </u>															
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 1 4 13 4.67 963/1407 4.79 4.77 4.69 4.57 4.67 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 3 7 9 4.32 773/1399 4.47 4.30 4.26 4.23 4.32 4.01 the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 6 12 4.58 521/1400 4.48 4.35 4.27 4.19 4.58 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 5 1 0 3 5 4 3.85 732/1179 3.92 3.94 3.96 3.85 3.85 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11 0 1 0 0 0 7 4.50 345/1262 4.60 4.18 4.05 3.77 4.50 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11 0 0 0 0 7 4.50 345/1262 4.60 4.18 4.05 3.77 4.50 2. Were special techniques successful 11 0 0 0 0 1 2 5 4.50 571/1256 4.47 4.34 4.30 4.08 4.55 4.00 4.08 4.50 4.00 4.08 4.50 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00	1. Were t	0	0	0	1	0	10	8	4.32	990/1409	4.54	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.32				
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 1 3 7 9 4.32 773/1399 4.47 4.30 4.26 4.23 4.32 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 6 12 4.58 521/1400 4.48 4.35 4.27 4.19 4.58 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 5 1 0 3 5 4 3.85 732/1179 3.92 3.94 3.96 3.85 3.85 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11 0 1 0 0 0 7 4.50 345/1262 4.60 4.18 4.05 3.77 4.50 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11 0 0 0 0 2 1 5 4.38 701/1259 4.54 4.40 4.29 4.06 4.38 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0 0 0 0 1 2 5 4.50 571/1256 4.47 4.34 4.30 4.08 4.50 4. Were special techniques successful 11 2 0 0 0 1 2 5 4.50 571/1256 4.47 4.34 4.30 4.08 4.50 4.00 3.80 4.33 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors O0-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 8 Required for Majors 9 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 2 1.00-1.99 0 B 5 5 2 1.00-1.99 0 B 5 5 2 1.00-1.99 0 B 5 5 6-83 3 2.00-2.99 2 C 1 General 4 Under-grad 19 Non-major 0 84-150 2 3.00-3.49 3 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives F 0 Electives 1 H### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant							0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67						
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 6 12 4.58 521/1400 4.48 4.35 4.27 4.19 4.58 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 5 1 0 3 5 4 3.85 732/1179 3.92 3.94 3.96 3.85 3.85 Discussion							0	0	0	3	7	9	4.32	773/1399	4.47	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.32
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11 0 1 0 0 0 7 4.50 345/1262 4.60 4.18 4.05 3.77 4.50 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11 0 0 0 0 2 1 5 4.38 701/1259 4.54 4.40 4.29 4.06 4.38 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0 0 0 0 1 2 5 4.50 571/1256 4.47 4.34 4.30 4.08 4.50 4. Were special techniques successful 11 2 0 0 2 0 4 4.33 254/788 4.35 4.03 4.00 3.80 4.33 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 8 Required for Majors 9 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 2 1.00-1.99 0 B 5 56-83 3 2.00-2.99 2 C 1 General 4 Under-grad 19 Non-major 0 84-150 2 3.00-3.49 3 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant						0	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	521/1400	4.48	4.35	4.27	4.19	4.58
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11 0 1 0 0 0 7 4.50 345/1262 4.60 4.18 4.05 3.77 4.50 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11 0 0 0 0 2 1 5 4.38 701/1259 4.54 4.40 4.29 4.06 4.38 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0 0 0 0 1 2 5 4.50 571/1256 4.47 4.34 4.30 4.08 4.50 4.08 4.08 4.50 4.08 4.50 4.08 4.50 4.08 4.50 4.08 4.50 4.08 4.50 4.08 4.08 4.50 4.08 4.50 4.08 4.50 4.08 4.50 4.08 4.50 4.08 4.50 4.08 4.50 4.08 4.50 4.08 4.50 4.08 4.50 4.08 4.08 4.50 4.08 4.08 4.50 4.08 4.50 4.08 4.50 4.08 4.50 4.08 4.50 4.08 4.50 4.08 4.50 4.08 4.08 4.50 4.08 4.08 4.50 4.08 4.08 4.08 4.50 4.08 4.50 4.08 4.08 4.50 4.08 4.08 4.50 4.08 4.50 4.08 4.50 4.08 4.50 4.08 4.08 4	5. Did au	diovisual	l techniques enl	nance y	our understanding	1	5	1	0	3	5	4	3.85	732/1179	3.92	3.94	3.96	3.85	3.85
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11 0 1 0 0 0 7 4.50 345/1262 4.60 4.18 4.05 3.77 4.50 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11 0 0 0 0 2 1 5 4.38 701/1259 4.54 4.40 4.29 4.06 4.38 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0 0 0 0 1 2 5 4.50 571/1256 4.47 4.34 4.30 4.08 4.50 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.30 4.00 3.80 4.33 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.0			Discus	sion															
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11 0 0 0 2 1 5 4.38 701/1259 4.54 4.40 4.29 4.06 4.38 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0 0 0 1 2 5 4.50 571/1256 4.47 4.34 4.30 4.08 4.50 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 5.00 4.00 5.00 5	1. Did cl	ass disc			what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	7	4.50	345/1262	4.60	4.18	4.05	3.77	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0 0 0 1 2 5 4.50 571/1256 4.47 4.34 4.30 4.08 4.50 4. Were special techniques successful							0	0											
4. Were special techniques successful 11 2 0 0 2 0 4 4.33 254/788 4.35 4.03 4.00 3.80 4.33 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 8 Required for Majors 9 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 2 1.00-1.99 0 B 5 56-83 3 2.00-2.99 2 C 1 General 4 Under-grad 19 Non-major 0 84-150 2 3.00-3.49 3 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant						11	0	0	0		2	5	4.50	571/1256			4.30	4.08	4.50
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 8 Required for Majors 9 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 2 1.00-1.99 0 B 5 5 56-83 3 2.00-2.99 2 C 1 General 4 Under-grad 19 Non-major 0 84-150 2 3.00-3.49 3 D 0 6rad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant																			
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 8 Required for Majors 9 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 2 1.00-1.99 0 B 5 5 Under-grad 19 Non-major 0 56-83 3 2.00-2.99 2 C 1 General 4 Under-grad 19 Non-major 0 84-150 2 3.00-3.49 3 D 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant					Frequ	encs	niet	tribi	ut i ou	า									
00-27					11040	ccircy	DISC	CIID	ac101										
28-55	Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	S			Ту	pe			Majors	;
28-55	00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 8		Red	quire	ed f	or M	ajor	s	9	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r r	0
84-150 2 3.00-3.49 3 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 responses to be significant	28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В 5			_			-								
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 1 $\#\#\#$ - Means there are not enough P 0 responses to be significant	56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C 1		Ger	nera:	1				4	Under-g	rad 1	.9	Non-	major	0
P 0 responses to be significant	84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D 0														
1 0 1 coponible to be dignificant	Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ıh
I O Other 2					P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
1 0 Other 2					I 0		Oth	ner					2						
? 1					? 1														

Course-Section: CHIN 202 0101

Title INTERMEDIATE CHINESE I

BROWN, WILLIAM

Instructor:

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 353 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	Frequencies				Inst	ructor	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	1	4	9	4.57	487/1481	4.57	4.26	4.29	4.40	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	632/1481		4.26	4.23	4.29	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	432/1249		4.37	4.27	4.36	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	385/1424		4.27	4.21	4.28	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	252/1396		4.07	3.98	3.94	4.58
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	2	3	6	4.17				4.07	4.05	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	5	6	4.14	872/1459		4.19	4.16	4.17	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	966/1480		4.64	4.68	4.68	4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	3	6		217/1450		4.10	4.09		4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	727/1409	4.54	4.46	4.42	4.47	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1407		4.77	4.69	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	783/1399		4.30		4.29	4.31
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	829/1400					4.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	1	0	4		3.90	692/1179			3.96	4.05	
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	146/1262		4.18	4.05	4.11	4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	402/1259		4.40	4.29	4.34	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	406/1256		4.34	4.30	4.28	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	2	0	1	0	1	2.50	763/ 788	2.50	4.03	4.00	3.98	2.50
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 249	****	4.08	4.11	4.32	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 242	****	4.45	4.40	4.63	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 240		4.37	4.20	4.58	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 217	****	4.42	4.04	4.28	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.26	4.53	4.83	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 63	****	4.24	4.44	4.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	***	4.19	4.35	4.72	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.67	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	4.07	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 55	****	3.90	4.55	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.28	4.75	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.42	4.65	4.66	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.83	4.43	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.82	5.00	****

Course-Section: CHIN 202 0101

Title INTERMEDIATE CHINESE I

Instructor: BROWN, WILLIAM

Enrollment: 19
Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 353 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	14	Non-major	6
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	6	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	1			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHIN 302 0101

Title ADVANCED CHINESE II

BROWN, WILLIAM

Instructor:

Enrollment: 21 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 354 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	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	1	3	10	4.64	417/1481	4.64	4.26	4.29	4.29	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	149/1481	4.86	4.26	4.23	4.23	4.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	219/1249	4.79	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.79
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	263/1424	4.70	4.27	4.21	4.27	4.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	96/1396	4.86	4.07	3.98	4.00	4.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	77/1342	4.92	4.12	4.07	4.12	4.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	81/1459	4.93	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.93
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	770/1480	4.86	4.64	4.68	4.65	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	304/1450	4.55	4.10	4.09	4.10	4.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	275/1409	4.85	4.46	4.42	4.43	4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	400/1407	4.93	4.77	4.69	4.67	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0			4.85	178/1399	4.85	4.30	4.26	4.27	4.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	198/1400	4.86	4.35	4.27	4.28	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	0	1	12	4.64	187/1179	4.64	3.94	3.96	4.02	4.64
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	146/1262	4.86	4.18	4.05	4.14	4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	402/1259	4.71	4.40	4.29	4.34	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.34	4.30	4.34	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	133/ 788	4.67	4.03	4.00	4.07	4.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	4.26	4.20	4.20	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	4.08	4.11	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	4.45	4.40	4.36	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 240	****	4.37	4.20	3.96	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.42	4.04	4.11	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	4.70	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 69	****	4.26	4.53	4.66	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 63	****	4.24	4.44	4.56	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 69	****	4.19	4.35	4.48	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	3.98	3.92	4.43	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.48	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	4.33	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 41	****	3.68	4.26	3.90	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	3.50	4.42	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 55	****	3.90	4.55	4.88	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 31	****	4.28	4.75	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 51	****	4.42	4.65	4.88	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.83	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.82	4.67	****

Course-Section: CHIN 302 0101

Title ADVANCED CHINESE II

Instructor: BROWN, WILLIAM

Enrollment: 21
Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 354 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	10	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0	
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	2							
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	14	Non-major	6	
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı	
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant		
				I	0	Other	1					
				?	0							