

Course-Section: CHIN 102 0101  
 Title ELEMENTARY CHINESE II  
 Instructor: JIAO, XIAOLI  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 304  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	416/1504	4.74	4.24	4.27	4.13	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	5	9	4.40	649/1503	4.48	4.22	4.20	4.16	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	642/1290	4.59	4.32	4.28	4.19	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	5	7	4.29	741/1453	4.48	4.22	4.21	4.11	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	0	6	7	4.36	459/1421	4.40	4.08	4.00	3.91	4.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	274/1365	4.66	4.11	4.08	3.96	4.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	2	5	6	3.87	1110/1485	4.16	4.20	4.16	4.13	3.87
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	1030/1504	4.80	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	2	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	850/1483	4.08	4.07	4.06	3.97	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	830/1425	4.45	4.41	4.41	4.36	4.46
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	4	8	4.46	1155/1426	4.56	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.46
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	438/1418	4.70	4.29	4.25	4.20	4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	675/1416	4.62	4.34	4.26	4.21	4.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	636/1199	3.89	3.95	3.97	3.82	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	5	4	4.20	632/1312	4.00	4.12	4.00	3.69	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	507/1303	4.60	4.39	4.24	3.93	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	834/1299	4.40	4.34	4.25	3.94	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	387/ 758	3.70	4.05	4.01	3.80	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	15	Non-major	7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	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				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHIN 102 0201  
 Title ELEMENTARY CHINESE II  
 Instructor: JIAO, XIAOLI  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 305  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5							
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	146/1504	4.74	4.24	4.27	4.13	4.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	437/1503	4.48	4.22	4.20	4.16	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	230/1290	4.59	4.32	4.28	4.19	4.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	270/1453	4.48	4.22	4.21	4.11	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	374/1421	4.40	4.08	4.00	3.91	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	129/1365	4.66	4.11	4.08	3.96	4.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	536/1485	4.16	4.20	4.16	4.13	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1504	4.80	4.68	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	731/1483	4.08	4.07	4.06	3.97	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	853/1425	4.45	4.41	4.41	4.36	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	967/1426	4.56	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	233/1418	4.70	4.29	4.25	4.20	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	296/1416	4.62	4.34	4.26	4.21	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	4	0	4	3.78	810/1199	3.89	3.95	3.97	3.82	3.78
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	877/1312	4.00	4.12	4.00	3.69	3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	507/1303	4.60	4.39	4.24	3.93	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	504/1299	4.40	4.34	4.25	3.94	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	2	1	0	2	3.40	614/ 758	3.70	4.05	4.01	3.80	3.40
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	4.12	4.09	4.07	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 227	****	4.49	4.40	4.24	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	3.98	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 56	****	4.12	4.23	4.11	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.28	4.53	4.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	4.43	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	4.38	4.60	4.48	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 1			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 1	General 1	Under-grad 9	Non-major 4
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			

I 0  
? 0

Other

3

Course-Section: CHIN 302 0101  
 Title ADVANCED CHINESE II  
 Instructor: BROWN, WILLIAM  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 306  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	6	15	4.71	306/1504	4.71	4.24	4.27	4.27	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	138/1503	4.86	4.22	4.20	4.22	4.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	240/1290	4.76	4.32	4.28	4.31	4.76
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	2	15	4.60	331/1453	4.60	4.22	4.21	4.23	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	0	5	14	4.55	283/1421	4.55	4.08	4.00	4.01	4.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	4	14	4.43	395/1365	4.43	4.11	4.08	4.08	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	290/1485	4.67	4.20	4.16	4.17	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	11	4.52	1075/1504	4.52	4.68	4.69	4.65	4.52
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	338/1483	4.50	4.07	4.06	4.08	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	0	3	15	4.63	618/1425	4.63	4.41	4.41	4.43	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	0	2	16	4.68	940/1426	4.68	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.68
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	0	4	14	4.58	488/1418	4.58	4.29	4.25	4.26	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	221/1416	4.83	4.34	4.26	4.27	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	177/1199	4.67	3.95	3.97	4.02	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	0	0	2	5	3.89	826/1312	3.89	4.12	4.00	4.09	3.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	701/1303	4.38	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	233/1299	4.88	4.34	4.25	4.30	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	13	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	101/ 758	4.75	4.05	4.01	4.00	4.75
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	4.12	4.09	4.20	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	8	Under-grad	21	Non-major	8
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	7	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	2				
				?	0						