

Course-Section: CHIN 102 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY CHINESE II
 Instructor: CHIN, IKU
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 372
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	4	3	12	4.30	849/1522	4.54	4.36	4.30	4.14	4.30	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	8	9	4.30	824/1522	4.59	4.33	4.26	4.18	4.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	7	12	4.50	531/1285	4.69	4.45	4.30	4.22	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	6	9	4.10	956/1476	4.33	4.33	4.22	4.09	4.10	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	161/1412	4.81	4.26	4.06	4.01	4.76	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	314/1381	4.34	4.19	4.08	3.93	4.53	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	5	12	4.45	571/1500	4.45	4.14	4.18	4.16	4.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1517	4.89	4.56	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	2	4	8	5	3.84	1081/1497	4.19	4.21	4.11	4.02	3.84	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	4	3	10	4.11	1148/1440	4.35	4.45	4.45	4.40	4.11	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	3	4	11	4.44	1207/1448	4.62	4.79	4.71	4.63	4.44	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	2	8	8	4.16	965/1436	4.48	4.39	4.29	4.24	4.16	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	3	4	10	4.11	991/1432	4.39	4.47	4.29	4.23	4.11	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	11	0	2	3	2	1	3.25	1011/1221	3.53	3.91	3.93	3.86	3.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	3	3	3	3.70	941/1280	4.35	4.28	4.10	3.92	3.70	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	766/1277	4.59	4.60	4.34	4.13	4.30	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	547/1269	4.78	4.47	4.31	4.04	4.56	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	4	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	363/ 854	4.20	4.16	4.02	3.87	4.20	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 14	Required for Majors 6	Graduate 0 Major 2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 3	C 2	General 7	Under-grad 20 Non-major 18
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives 4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 1		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 0		

Title ELEMENTARY CHINESE II
 Instructor: GUO, XIAONAN
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 19

Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

JUN 26, 2007
 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	1	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	290/1522	4.54	4.36	4.30	4.14	4.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	142/1522	4.59	4.33	4.26	4.18	4.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	0	17	4.89	165/1285	4.69	4.45	4.30	4.22	4.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	416/1476	4.33	4.33	4.22	4.09	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	119/1412	4.81	4.26	4.06	4.01	4.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	1	4	1	8	4.14	713/1381	4.34	4.19	4.08	3.93	4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	2	12	4.44	571/1500	4.45	4.14	4.18	4.16	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	767/1517	4.89	4.56	4.65	4.62	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	355/1497	4.19	4.21	4.11	4.02	4.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	682/1440	4.35	4.45	4.45	4.40	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	765/1448	4.62	4.79	4.71	4.63	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	217/1436	4.48	4.39	4.29	4.24	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	454/1432	4.39	4.47	4.29	4.23	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	10	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	759/1221	3.53	3.91	3.93	3.86	3.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1280	4.35	4.28	4.10	3.92	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	254/1277	4.59	4.60	4.34	4.13	4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1269	4.78	4.47	4.31	4.04	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	12	3	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 854	4.20	4.16	4.02	3.87	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	12	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	19	Non-major	17
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	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				
				?	1						

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	1	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	453/1522	4.64	4.36	4.30	4.34	4.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	383/1522	4.64	4.33	4.26	4.29	4.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	318/1285	4.71	4.45	4.30	4.36	4.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	285/1476	4.69	4.33	4.22	4.20	4.69	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	205/1412	4.69	4.26	4.06	4.00	4.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	263/1381	4.58	4.19	4.08	3.97	4.58	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	483/1500	4.50	4.14	4.18	4.20	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.56	4.65	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	506/1497	4.40	4.21	4.11	4.11	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	604/1440	4.67	4.45	4.45	4.42	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	494/1448	4.91	4.79	4.71	4.78	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	188/1436	4.83	4.39	4.29	4.29	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	145/1432	4.92	4.47	4.29	4.31	4.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	252/1221	4.55	3.91	3.93	4.02	4.55	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	324/1280	4.60	4.28	4.10	4.08	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	317/1277	4.80	4.60	4.34	4.33	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	332/1269	4.80	4.47	4.31	4.33	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	194/ 854	4.50	4.16	4.02	4.00	4.50	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	4.50	4.35	4.56	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	5.00	4.49	5.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.83	4.45	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.83	4.11	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	3.60	4.41	4.83	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	4.00	4.30	4.58	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	3.00	4.40	4.75	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	3.00	4.31	4.75	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	2.75	4.30	4.17	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.33	4.63	****	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	****	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0	Major 1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 4	Under-grad 15	Non-major 14
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			

I	0	Other	2
?	0		

Course-Section: CHIN 302 0101
 Title ADVANCED CHINESE II
 Instructor: BROWN, WILLIAM
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 375
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	7	4.55	559/1522	4.55	4.36	4.30	4.34	4.55	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	623/1522	4.45	4.33	4.26	4.25	4.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	488/1285	4.55	4.45	4.30	4.30	4.55	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	735/1476	4.30	4.33	4.22	4.26	4.30	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	4	6	4.36	466/1412	4.36	4.26	4.06	4.03	4.36	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	1	7	4.27	585/1381	4.27	4.19	4.08	4.13	4.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	670/1500	4.36	4.14	4.18	4.13	4.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	1358/1517	4.09	4.56	4.65	4.62	4.09	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	654/1497	4.25	4.21	4.11	4.13	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	740/1440	4.56	4.45	4.45	4.46	4.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	548/1448	4.89	4.79	4.71	4.71	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	263/1436	4.78	4.39	4.29	4.30	4.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	579/1432	4.56	4.47	4.29	4.29	4.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	1	1	2	4	3.78	775/1221	3.78	3.91	3.93	3.94	3.78	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	286/1280	4.67	4.28	4.10	4.14	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	470/1277	4.67	4.60	4.34	4.38	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.47	4.31	4.39	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 854	5.00	4.16	4.02	4.00	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 1	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 1	B 3		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General 3	Under-grad 11 Non-major 11
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 0		

Course-Section: CHIN 319 0101
 Title CHINESE TRANSLATION
 Instructor: BROWN, WILLIAM
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 376
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	2	8	4.64	462/1522	4.64	4.36	4.30	4.34	4.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	499/1522	4.55	4.33	4.26	4.25	4.55	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	531/1285	4.50	4.45	4.30	4.30	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	629/1476	4.40	4.33	4.22	4.26	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	547/1412	4.27	4.26	4.06	4.03	4.27	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	482/1381	4.36	4.19	4.08	4.13	4.36	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	760/1500	4.27	4.14	4.18	4.13	4.27	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	4	5	2	3.82	1465/1517	3.82	4.56	4.65	4.62	3.82	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	385/1497	4.50	4.21	4.11	4.13	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	1	1	6	4.22	1071/1440	4.22	4.45	4.45	4.46	4.22	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	821/1448	4.78	4.79	4.71	4.71	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	415/1436	4.67	4.39	4.29	4.30	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	0	6	4.33	820/1432	4.33	4.47	4.29	4.29	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	1	1	2	4	3.78	775/1221	3.78	3.91	3.93	3.94	3.78	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	0	5	4.25	585/1280	4.25	4.28	4.10	4.14	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	804/1277	4.25	4.60	4.34	4.38	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	777/1269	4.25	4.47	4.31	4.39	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	2	0	1	2	3.60	652/ 854	3.60	4.16	4.02	4.00	3.60	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.21	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	4.50	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.50	4.51	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.35	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	5.00	4.23	4.26	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 65	****	5.00	4.49	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.83	4.45	4.34	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.83	4.11	3.33	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 47	****	3.60	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 45	****	4.00	4.30	4.39	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 39	****	3.00	4.40	4.68	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 35	****	3.00	4.31	4.26	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 34	****	2.75	4.30	4.12	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 37	****	4.33	4.63	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.75	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	****	****	

Course-Section: CHIN 319 0101
 Title CHINESE TRANSLATION
 Instructor: BROWN, WILLIAM
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 376
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	11	Non-major	11
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						