

Course-Section: CHIN 101 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY CHINESE I
 Instructor: WANG, JIEYU
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 399
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank						

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	372/1649	4.59	4.34	4.28	4.11	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	475/1648	4.50	4.31	4.23	4.16	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	133/1375	4.70	4.42	4.27	4.10	4.93		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	2	0	1	2	9	4.14	956/1595	4.20	4.29	4.20	4.03	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	1	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	95/1533	4.55	4.16	4.04	3.87	4.92	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	2	1	2	7	3.92	994/1512	4.12	4.19	4.10	3.86	3.92	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	382/1623	4.25	4.08	4.16	4.08	4.62	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	1230/1646	4.54	4.59	4.69	4.67	4.46	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	835/1621	4.06	4.14	4.06	3.96	4.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	767/1568	4.42	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1572	4.93	4.79	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	620/1564	4.47	4.28	4.28	4.20	4.54	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	347/1559	4.56	4.43	4.29	4.20	4.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	3	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	360/1352	4.22	3.97	3.98	3.86	4.44	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1384	4.33	4.28	4.08	3.86	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1382	4.25	4.57	4.29	4.03	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1368	4.08	4.42	4.30	4.01	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 948	3.63	4.10	3.95	3.75	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	7
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	3
			? 1		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: CHIN 101 0201
 Title ELEMENTARY CHINESE I
 Instructor: CHU, PENG
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 400
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	1	0	0	1	0	5	9	4.47	696/1649	4.59	4.34	4.28	4.11	4.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	658/1648	4.50	4.31	4.23	4.16	4.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	593/1375	4.70	4.42	4.27	4.10	4.47	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	4	3	8	4.27	806/1595	4.20	4.29	4.20	4.03	4.27	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	6	7	4.19	688/1533	4.55	4.16	4.04	3.87	4.19	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	6	8	4.31	616/1512	4.12	4.19	4.10	3.86	4.31	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	3	3	7	3.88	1198/1623	4.25	4.08	4.16	4.08	3.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	1081/1646	4.54	4.59	4.69	4.67	4.63	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	1	9	1	4.00	914/1621	4.06	4.14	4.06	3.96	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	1112/1568	4.42	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.27	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	690/1572	4.93	4.79	4.70	4.64	4.87	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	780/1564	4.47	4.28	4.28	4.20	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	901/1559	4.56	4.43	4.29	4.20	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	2	6	5	4.00	690/1352	4.22	3.97	3.98	3.86	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	613/1384	4.33	4.28	4.08	3.86	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	7	4	4.25	831/1382	4.25	4.57	4.29	4.03	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	3	2	6	4.08	925/1368	4.08	4.42	4.30	4.01	4.08	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	1	1	2	0	4	3.63	667/ 948	3.63	4.10	3.95	3.75	3.63	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 221	****	4.38	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 243	****	4.69	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 212	****	5.00	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	2.56	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 88	****	4.39	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	4.20	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	4.23	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.32	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 288	****	2.95	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.67	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.67	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 312	****	2.48	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	4.13	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: CHIN 101 0201
 Title ELEMENTARY CHINESE I
 Instructor: CHU, PENG
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 400
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	5	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHIN 201 0101
 Title INTERMEDIATE CHINESE I
 Instructor: WANG, JIEYU
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 401
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	13	4.80	274/1649	4.80	4.34	4.28	4.29	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	10	4.53	521/1648	4.53	4.31	4.23	4.25	4.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	321/1375	4.73	4.42	4.27	4.37	4.73	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	254/1595	4.73	4.29	4.20	4.22	4.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	128/1533	4.86	4.16	4.04	4.04	4.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	3	10	4.33	595/1512	4.33	4.19	4.10	4.14	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	3	8	4.27	803/1623	4.27	4.08	4.16	4.21	4.27	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	6	4.40	1287/1646	4.40	4.59	4.69	4.63	4.40	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	7	5	4.21	731/1621	4.21	4.14	4.06	4.01	4.21	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	554/1568	4.71	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	473/1572	4.93	4.79	4.70	4.73	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	406/1564	4.71	4.28	4.28	4.27	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	347/1559	4.79	4.43	4.29	4.33	4.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	482/1352	4.31	3.97	3.98	4.07	4.31	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	376/1384	4.60	4.28	4.08	3.99	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	540/1382	4.60	4.57	4.29	4.19	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	579/1368	4.60	4.42	4.30	4.21	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 948	****	4.10	3.95	3.89	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 12	Required for Majors	4
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	5
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 15
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	5
			? 0		

Course-Section: CHIN 301 0101
 Title ADVANCED CHINESE I
 Instructor: BROWN, WILLIAM
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 402
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	1	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	350/1649	4.73	4.34	4.28	4.27	4.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	281/1648	4.73	4.31	4.23	4.18	4.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	233/1375	4.80	4.42	4.27	4.22	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	321/1595	4.67	4.29	4.20	4.21	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	133/1533	4.85	4.16	4.04	4.05	4.85	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	194/1512	4.75	4.19	4.10	4.11	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	145/1623	4.86	4.08	4.16	4.08	4.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	9	5	4.36	1325/1646	4.36	4.59	4.69	4.67	4.36	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	129/1621	4.82	4.14	4.06	4.02	4.82	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.39	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.79	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	0	1	11	4.69	434/1564	4.69	4.28	4.28	4.25	4.69	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	272/1559	4.85	4.43	4.29	4.23	4.85	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	280/1352	4.55	3.97	3.98	3.97	4.55	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	201/1384	4.80	4.28	4.08	4.11	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	243/1382	4.90	4.57	4.29	4.37	4.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	369/1368	4.80	4.42	4.30	4.39	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	186/ 948	4.56	4.10	3.95	4.00	4.56	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	4.38	4.16	4.07	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	4.69	4.12	3.89	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.12	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.39	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.20	4.47	4.55	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.23	4.43	4.30	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.32	4.35	4.46	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHIN 309 0101
 Title BUSINESS CHINESE
 Instructor: BROWN, WILLIAM
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 403
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	13	4.75	328/1649	4.75	4.34	4.28	4.27	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.31	4.23	4.18	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	296/1375	4.75	4.42	4.27	4.22	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	236/1595	4.75	4.29	4.20	4.21	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	12	4.56	319/1533	4.56	4.16	4.04	4.05	4.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	3	11	4.38	553/1512	4.38	4.19	4.10	4.11	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	135/1623	4.88	4.08	4.16	4.08	4.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	1139/1646	4.56	4.59	4.69	4.67	4.56	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	456/1621	4.44	4.14	4.06	4.02	4.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	1	13	4.73	517/1568	4.73	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	414/1572	4.93	4.79	4.70	4.64	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	206/1564	4.87	4.28	4.28	4.25	4.87	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	1	13	4.73	419/1559	4.73	4.43	4.29	4.23	4.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	1	1	1	9	4.23	528/1352	4.23	3.97	3.98	3.97	4.23	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	326/1384	4.67	4.28	4.08	4.11	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	555/1382	4.58	4.57	4.29	4.37	4.58	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	426/1368	4.75	4.42	4.30	4.39	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	310/ 948	4.33	4.10	3.95	4.00	4.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	31/ 221	4.75	4.38	4.16	4.07	4.75	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 243	5.00	4.69	4.12	3.89	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 212	****	5.00	4.40	4.21	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.12	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 555	****	2.56	4.29	4.22	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.39	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.20	4.47	4.55	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.23	4.43	4.30	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.32	4.35	4.46	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 288	****	2.95	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.59	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.09	4.21	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.67	4.47	4.43	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.67	4.38	4.32	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 312	****	2.48	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.30	4.32	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.44	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 110	****	4.13	3.99	4.05	****	

Course-Section: CHIN 309 0101
 Title BUSINESS CHINESE
 Instructor: BROWN, WILLIAM
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 403
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	4	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	1	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	6				
				?	0						