

Course-Section: KORE 101 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY KOREAN I
 Instructor: SOOAH, LEE
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1091
 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	7	10	4.30	891/1674	4.30	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.30	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	6	12	4.40	737/1674	4.40	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	4	12	4.35	750/1423	4.35	4.36	4.27	4.16	4.35	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	2	5	10	4.21	905/1609	4.21	4.23	4.22	4.05	4.21	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	5	4	9	4.11	702/1585	4.11	4.04	3.96	3.88	4.11	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	6	3	7	3.68	1196/1535	3.68	4.08	4.08	3.89	3.68	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	5	11	4.30	809/1651	4.30	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	9	3	4.25	719/1656	4.25	4.06	4.07	3.96	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	5	11	4.37	1044/1586	4.37	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.37	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	960/1585	4.74	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.74	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	6	11	4.47	675/1582	4.47	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.47	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	669/1575	4.53	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.53	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	2	3	4	9	4.11	612/1380	4.11	3.94	3.94	3.78	4.11	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	0	5	8	4.43	489/1520	4.43	4.14	4.01	3.76	4.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.37	4.24	3.97	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	312/1511	4.85	4.37	4.27	4.00	4.85	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	1	7	4	4.25	360/ 994	4.25	3.97	3.94	3.73	4.25	

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 7	Graduate	0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0	Under-grad	20
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other	2
			? 2		

Course-Section: KORE 102 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY KOREAN II
 Instructor: LEE, YONGHUN
 Enrollment: 51
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1092
 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	3	3	9	4.40	768/1674	4.40	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	6	5	3.93	1233/1674	3.93	4.26	4.23	4.16	3.93	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	4	8	4.20	894/1423	4.20	4.36	4.27	4.16	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	3	4	6	4.00	1094/1609	4.00	4.23	4.22	4.05	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	512/1585	4.31	4.04	3.96	3.88	4.31	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	6	6	4.00	870/1535	4.00	4.08	4.08	3.89	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	5	4	5	3.87	1252/1651	3.87	4.20	4.18	4.10	3.87	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	1072/1673	4.67	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	7	4	4.15	838/1656	4.15	4.06	4.07	3.96	4.15	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	2	4	5	3.92	1356/1586	3.92	4.43	4.43	4.37	3.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	737/1585	4.83	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	2	6	3	3.92	1208/1582	3.92	4.30	4.26	4.17	3.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	806/1575	4.42	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.42	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	1082/1380	3.43	3.94	3.94	3.78	3.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	810/1520	4.00	4.14	4.01	3.76	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1167/1515	3.83	4.37	4.24	3.97	3.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	1	4	0	3.50	1308/1511	3.50	4.37	4.27	4.00	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	944/ 994	2.75	3.97	3.94	3.73	2.75	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: KORE 102 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY KOREAN II
 Instructor: LEE, YONGHUN
 Enrollment: 51
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1092
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	15	Non-major	6
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						