

Course-Section: CHIN 102 0101  
 Title ELEMENTARY CHINESE II  
 Instructor: GUO, XIAONAN  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 351  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	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	4.57	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	4.51	4.27	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	4.74	4.07	3.98	3.89	4.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	542/1342	4.21	4.12	4.07	3.88	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	0	3	8	4.23	792/1459	4.14	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.23	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	4	4.31	1178/1480	4.15	4.64	4.68	4.64	4.31	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	445/1450	4.21	4.10	4.09	3.97	4.43	
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	4.60	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	5.00	****/ 249	****	4.08	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	4.45	4.40	4.33	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.37	4.20	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 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	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.26	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 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	5.00	****/ 41	****	3.68	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	3.50	4.42	****	****	
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	5.00	****/ 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	****	

Course-Section: CHIN 102 0101  
 Title ELEMENTARY CHINESE II  
 Instructor: GUO, XIAONAN  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 351  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	11	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHIN 102 0201  
 Title ELEMENTARY CHINESE II  
 Instructor: GUO, XIAONAN  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 352  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	3	6	10	4.37	718/1481	4.57	4.26	4.29	4.14	4.37	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	11	4.47	560/1481	4.66	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	369/1249	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	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	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	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	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	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	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	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	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. 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
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 2	
			? 1		

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

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	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	4.43	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	4.57	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	4.56	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	4.58	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	626/1342	4.17	4.12	4.07	4.05	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	5	6	4.14	872/1459	4.14	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	4.64	4.68	4.68	4.64	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	217/1450	4.67	4.10	4.09	4.15	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	5.00	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	4.31	4.30	4.26	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	4.35	4.27	4.34	4.31	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	1	0	4	4	3.90	692/1179	3.90	3.94	3.96	4.05	3.90	
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	4.11	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	1	0	6	4.71	406/1256	4.71	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	3.00	****/ 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 Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	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	B	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 responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

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

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	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	2	11	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	5.00	****/ 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	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.26	4.53	4.66	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	4.24	4.44	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 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	5.00	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.48	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	4.13	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	4.33	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 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	5.00	****/ 55	****	3.90	4.55	4.88	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.28	4.75	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 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		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						