

Course-Section: CHIN 101 0101  
 Title ELEMENTARY CHINESE I  
 Instructor: JIAO, XIAOLI  
 Enrollment: 32  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 378  
 JAN 21, 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	1	2	2	16	4.57	521/1674	4.65	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	7	10	4.19	1001/1674	4.00	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.19	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	11	4.38	718/1423	4.33	4.36	4.27	4.16	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	8	8	4.05	1068/1609	3.74	4.23	4.22	4.05	4.05	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	204/1585	4.40	4.04	3.96	3.88	4.70	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	0	9	9	4.32	598/1535	4.52	4.08	4.08	3.89	4.32	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	10	3	5	3.55	1422/1651	3.68	4.20	4.18	4.10	3.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1673	4.91	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	1	4	7	4	3.71	1275/1656	3.41	4.06	4.07	3.96	3.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	4	10	6	4.00	1300/1586	4.05	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	1130/1585	4.63	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.62	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	4	8	8	4.05	1109/1582	3.93	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.05	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	7	11	4.29	932/1575	4.23	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	8	2	2	2	2	3	3.18	1184/1380	3.84	3.94	3.94	3.78	3.18	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	3	0	2	3	2	3.10	1333/1520	3.10	4.14	4.01	3.76	3.10	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	7	3	4.30	857/1515	4.30	4.37	4.24	3.97	4.30	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	2	6	2	4.00	1050/1511	4.00	4.37	4.27	4.00	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	6	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	****/ 994	****	3.97	3.94	3.73	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 2	A 13	Required for Majors 10	Graduate 1 Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 2	C 2	General 6	Under-grad 20 Non-major 4
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 3	
			? 1		

Course-Section: CHIN 101 0201  
 Title ELEMENTARY CHINESE I  
 Instructor: GUO, XIAONAN  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 379  
 JAN 21, 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	1	9	4.73	331/1674	4.65	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	4	3	3.82	1333/1674	4.00	4.26	4.23	4.16	3.82	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	828/1423	4.33	4.36	4.27	4.16	4.27	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	1	2	0	3	3.43	1477/1609	3.74	4.23	4.22	4.05	3.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	708/1585	4.40	4.04	3.96	3.88	4.09	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	200/1535	4.52	4.08	4.08	3.89	4.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	4	3	3.82	1282/1651	3.68	4.20	4.18	4.10	3.82	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	868/1673	4.91	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.82	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	6	2	0	3.11	1522/1656	3.41	4.06	4.07	3.96	3.11	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	2	5	4.09	1255/1586	4.05	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.09	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	1106/1585	4.63	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.64	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	6	2	3.82	1266/1582	3.93	4.30	4.26	4.17	3.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	1020/1575	4.23	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.18	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	303/1380	3.84	3.94	3.94	3.78	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1520	3.10	4.14	4.01	3.76	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1515	4.30	4.37	4.24	3.97	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1511	4.00	4.37	4.27	4.00	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 994	****	3.97	3.94	3.73	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 11
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	2
			? 1		

Course-Section: CHIN 201 0101  
 Title INTERMEDIATE CHINESE I  
 Instructor: BROWN, WILLIAM  
 Enrollment: 29  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 380  
 JAN 21, 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	6	16	4.65	419/1674	4.65	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.65	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	17	4.65	392/1674	4.65	4.26	4.23	4.26	4.65	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	349/1423	4.68	4.36	4.27	4.36	4.68	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	7	11	4.53	466/1609	4.53	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.53	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	11	9	4.38	432/1585	4.38	4.04	3.96	3.91	4.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	8	13	4.48	413/1535	4.48	4.08	4.08	4.03	4.48	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	7	13	4.39	686/1651	4.39	4.20	4.18	4.20	4.39	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	635/1673	4.91	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	324/1656	4.59	4.06	4.07	4.10	4.59	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	663/1586	4.67	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	567/1585	4.91	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	7	15	4.68	409/1582	4.68	4.30	4.26	4.35	4.68	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	407/1575	4.73	4.32	4.27	4.39	4.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	2	1	2	6	6	3.76	894/1380	3.76	3.94	3.94	4.03	3.76	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	251/1520	4.73	4.14	4.01	4.03	4.73	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.37	4.24	4.28	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	610/1511	4.55	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.55	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	4	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	131/ 994	4.71	3.97	3.94	3.98	4.71	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.36	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	3.97	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	4.23	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	10
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 7		
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	C 5	General	5
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0	Under-grad	23
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0	### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0		
			? 1	Other	5

Course-Section: CHIN 301 0101  
 Title ADVANCED CHINESE I  
 Instructor: BROWN, WILLIAM  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 381  
 JAN 21, 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	0	2	4	4.67	406/1674	4.67	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.26	4.23	4.21	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	181/1423	4.83	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.23	4.22	4.27	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.04	3.96	3.95	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	131/1535	4.80	4.08	4.08	4.15	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1651	5.00	4.20	4.18	4.16	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	185/1656	4.75	4.06	4.07	4.07	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	336/1586	4.83	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.66	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	217/1582	4.83	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	246/1575	4.83	4.32	4.27	4.25	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	303/1380	4.50	3.94	3.94	4.01	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.14	4.01	4.09	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.37	4.24	4.32	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	205/ 994	4.50	3.97	3.94	3.96	4.50	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.30	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHIN 309 0101  
 Title BUSINESS CHINESE  
 Instructor: BROWN, WILLIAM  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 382  
 JAN 21, 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	0	1	13	4.93	118/1674	4.93	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.93	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.26	4.23	4.21	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.36	4.27	4.27	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.23	4.22	4.27	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.04	3.96	3.95	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1535	5.00	4.08	4.08	4.15	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1651	5.00	4.20	4.18	4.16	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1656	5.00	4.06	4.07	4.07	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.43	4.43	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.66	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.30	4.26	4.26	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.32	4.27	4.25	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	2	0	10	4.67	200/1380	4.67	3.94	3.94	4.01	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.14	4.01	4.09	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.37	4.24	4.32	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 994	5.00	3.97	3.94	3.96	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.26	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.49	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.33	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.18	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	4.29	****	

Course-Section: CHIN 309 0101  
 Title BUSINESS CHINESE  
 Instructor: BROWN, WILLIAM  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 382  
 JAN 21, 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	14	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	7	Under-grad	14	Non-major	3
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						