

Course-Section: CHIN 101 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY CHINESE I
 Instructor: GUO, XIAONAN
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 379
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	3	13	4.81	248/1639	4.35	4.22	4.27	4.08	4.81	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	12	4.63	393/1639	4.22	4.15	4.22	4.17	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	182/1397	4.50	4.37	4.28	4.18	4.88	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	476/1583	4.19	4.18	4.19	4.01	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	141/1532	4.51	4.10	4.01	3.88	4.81	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	5	10	4.50	367/1504	4.13	4.04	4.05	3.78	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	4	9	4.31	743/1612	3.59	4.02	4.16	4.10	4.31	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.38	4.65	4.56	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	312/1579	4.15	4.00	4.08	3.95	4.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	271/1518	4.43	4.23	4.43	4.38	4.87	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	648/1520	4.78	4.67	4.70	4.61	4.87	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	239/1517	4.24	4.15	4.27	4.20	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	122/1550	4.53	4.27	4.22	4.17	4.93	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	0	4	3	5	3.85	776/1295	4.08	3.77	3.94	3.84	3.85	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	1	0	6	4.25	625/1398	4.06	4.18	4.07	3.85	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1391	4.69	4.51	4.30	4.07	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	758/1388	4.19	4.35	4.28	4.01	4.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	253/ 958	4.57	4.02	3.93	3.71	4.43	
Self Paced															
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	3	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	1	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 1						
			I 0	Other	3				
			? 0						

Course-Section: CHIN 101 0201
 Title ELEMENTARY CHINESE I
 Instructor: WANG, JIEYU
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 380
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	1	3	1	5	8	3.89	1266/1639	4.35	4.22	4.27	4.08	3.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	10	3	3.82	1313/1639	4.22	4.15	4.22	4.17	3.82	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	4	3	8	4.13	916/1397	4.50	4.37	4.28	4.18	4.13	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	1	2	7	5	3.88	1178/1583	4.19	4.18	4.19	4.01	3.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	0	0	4	9	4.20	633/1532	4.51	4.10	4.01	3.88	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	1	0	5	7	3.75	1051/1504	4.13	4.04	4.05	3.78	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	4	3	3	3	3	2.88	1551/1612	3.59	4.02	4.16	4.10	2.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.38	4.65	4.56	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	7	5	3	3.73	1185/1579	4.15	4.00	4.08	3.95	3.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	2	6	6	4.00	1237/1518	4.43	4.23	4.43	4.38	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	1006/1520	4.78	4.67	4.70	4.61	4.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	2	10	2	3.69	1286/1517	4.24	4.15	4.27	4.20	3.69	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	0	6	7	4.13	1000/1550	4.53	4.27	4.22	4.17	4.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	421/1295	4.08	3.77	3.94	3.84	4.31	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	2	5	1	3.88	899/1398	4.06	4.18	4.07	3.85	3.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	719/1391	4.69	4.51	4.30	4.07	4.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	0	3	3	4.00	944/1388	4.19	4.35	4.28	4.01	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	135/ 958	4.57	4.02	3.93	3.71	4.71	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	4.75	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****	
Seminar															
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.20	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	3.00	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	4.33	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	5	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough			

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	3	
?	1			

Course-Section: CHIN 201 0101
 Title INTERMEDIATE CHINESE I
 Instructor: GUO, XIAONAN
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 381
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	4	14	4.60	508/1639	4.60	4.22	4.27	4.35	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	163/1639	4.85	4.15	4.22	4.27	4.85	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	18	4.85	196/1397	4.85	4.37	4.28	4.39	4.85	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	4	3	9	4.18	871/1583	4.18	4.18	4.19	4.28	4.18	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	113/1532	4.89	4.10	4.01	4.09	4.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	275/1504	4.63	4.04	4.05	4.09	4.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	1	18	4.80	166/1612	4.80	4.02	4.16	4.21	4.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.38	4.65	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	269/1579	4.63	4.00	4.08	4.14	4.63	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	315/1518	4.83	4.23	4.43	4.48	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	1	16	4.78	855/1520	4.78	4.67	4.70	4.78	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	275/1517	4.78	4.15	4.27	4.34	4.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	388/1550	4.72	4.27	4.22	4.33	4.72	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	11	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	806/1295	3.80	3.77	3.94	4.07	3.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	426/1398	4.50	4.18	4.07	4.14	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	258/1391	4.88	4.51	4.30	4.35	4.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	647/1388	4.50	4.35	4.28	4.37	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	307/ 958	4.33	4.02	3.93	4.00	4.33	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 12	Required for Majors	7
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 1
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	5
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	D 1		Under-grad 19
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	3
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	3
			? 1		

Course-Section: CHIN 301 0101
 Title ADVANCED CHINESE I
 Instructor: BROWN, WILLIAM
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 382
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	3	5	4.63	482/1639	4.63	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	252/1639	4.75	4.15	4.22	4.20	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	282/1397	4.75	4.37	4.28	4.26	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	572/1583	4.43	4.18	4.19	4.24	4.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	262/1532	4.63	4.10	4.01	4.05	4.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	724/1504	4.14	4.04	4.05	4.12	4.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	128/1612	4.88	4.02	4.16	4.12	4.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	1	4.13	1441/1635	4.13	4.38	4.65	4.66	4.13	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	382/1579	4.50	4.00	4.08	4.07	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	656/1518	4.63	4.23	4.43	4.39	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.67	4.70	4.68	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	758/1517	4.38	4.15	4.27	4.23	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	208/1550	4.88	4.27	4.22	4.20	4.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	561/1295	4.13	3.77	3.94	3.95	4.13	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.18	4.07	4.13	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	816/1391	4.25	4.51	4.30	4.35	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	647/1388	4.50	4.35	4.28	4.34	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 958	5.00	4.02	3.93	3.97	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General 3	Under-grad 8 Non-major 8
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 1		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 0		

Course-Section: CHIN 309 0101
 Title BUSINESS CHINESE
 Instructor: BROWN, WILLIAM
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 383
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	6	9	4.50	615/1639	4.50	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	393/1639	4.63	4.15	4.22	4.20	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	2	13	4.63	400/1397	4.63	4.37	4.28	4.26	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	10	5	4.25	792/1583	4.25	4.18	4.19	4.24	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	335/1532	4.50	4.10	4.01	4.05	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	344/1504	4.53	4.04	4.05	4.12	4.53	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	160/1612	4.81	4.02	4.16	4.12	4.81	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	15	1	4.06	1471/1635	4.06	4.38	4.65	4.66	4.06	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	220/1579	4.70	4.00	4.08	4.07	4.70	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	149/1518	4.94	4.23	4.43	4.39	4.94	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	776/1520	4.81	4.67	4.70	4.68	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	299/1517	4.75	4.15	4.27	4.23	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	435/1550	4.69	4.27	4.22	4.20	4.69	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	4	6	6	4.13	561/1295	4.13	3.77	3.94	3.95	4.13	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	1	3	7	4.25	625/1398	4.25	4.18	4.07	4.13	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	816/1391	4.25	4.51	4.30	4.35	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	496/1388	4.67	4.35	4.28	4.34	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	2	0	1	3	4	3.70	643/ 958	3.70	4.02	3.93	3.97	3.70	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 224	****	4.00	4.10	4.06	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.75	4.11	4.08	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.04	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 1			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 8	Under-grad 16	Non-major 16
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 2		
				? 1			