

Course-Section: KORE 101 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY KOREAN I
 Instructor: LEE, YONGHUN
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 922
 JUN 13, 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	16	4.89	173/1481	4.89	4.26	4.29	4.14	4.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	458/1481	4.56	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	270/1249	4.72	4.37	4.27	4.14	4.72	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	437/1424	4.50	4.27	4.21	4.06	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	2	3	10	4.38	403/1396	4.38	4.07	3.98	3.89	4.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	5	9	4.22	565/1342	4.22	4.12	4.07	3.88	4.22	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	4	1	9	3.88	1063/1459	3.88	4.19	4.16	4.17	3.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	729/1480	4.89	4.64	4.68	4.64	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	459/1450	4.42	4.10	4.09	3.97	4.42	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	705/1409	4.56	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.57	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	445/1399	4.61	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.61	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	0	15	4.76	299/1400	4.76	4.35	4.27	4.19	4.76	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	1	2	1	2	6	3.83	739/1179	3.83	3.94	3.96	3.85	3.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	2	2	1	6	4.00	708/1262	4.00	4.18	4.05	3.77	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	556/1259	4.55	4.40	4.29	4.06	4.55	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	760/1256	4.27	4.34	4.30	4.08	4.27	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	0	1	1	0	5	4.29	278/ 788	4.29	4.03	4.00	3.80	4.29	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	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 0	General	4
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	2
			? 1		

Course-Section: KORE 102 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY KOREAN II
 Instructor: LEE, SOOAH
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 923
 JUN 13, 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	6	15	4.71	340/1481	4.71	4.26	4.29	4.14	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	12	4.48	560/1481	4.48	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.48	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	334/1249	4.67	4.37	4.27	4.14	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	15	4.57	364/1424	4.57	4.27	4.21	4.06	4.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	82/1396	4.90	4.07	3.98	3.89	4.90	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	238/1342	4.60	4.12	4.07	3.88	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	7	11	4.38	635/1459	4.38	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	351/1480	4.95	4.64	4.68	4.64	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	9	8	4.47	375/1450	4.47	4.10	4.09	3.97	4.47	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	334/1409	4.81	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.81	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	250/1407	4.95	4.77	4.69	4.57	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	6	13	4.52	545/1399	4.52	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.52	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	361/1400	4.71	4.35	4.27	4.19	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	4	5	11	4.24	457/1179	4.24	3.94	3.96	3.85	4.24	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	167/1262	4.80	4.18	4.05	3.77	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	248/1259	4.87	4.40	4.29	4.06	4.87	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	248/1256	4.87	4.34	4.30	4.08	4.87	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	1	0	2	2	10	4.33	254/ 788	4.33	4.03	4.00	3.80	4.33	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors 14	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 1	B 3		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 1	C 2	General 3	Under-grad 21 Non-major 5
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 3	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 0	
			? 2		

Course-Section: KORE 201 0101
 Title INTERMEDIATE KOREAN I
 Instructor: LEE, YONGHUN
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 924
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	0	0	1	0	1	1	12	4.53	522/1481	4.53	4.26	4.29	4.40	4.53	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	6	5	3.93	1082/1481	3.93	4.26	4.23	4.29	3.93	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	2	4	7	3.93	953/1249	3.93	4.37	4.27	4.36	3.93	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	1	7	4	4.00	959/1424	4.00	4.27	4.21	4.28	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	5	8	4.27	493/1396	4.27	4.07	3.98	3.94	4.27	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	1	5	7	4.21	573/1342	4.21	4.12	4.07	4.05	4.21	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	3	2	7	3.73	1165/1459	3.73	4.19	4.16	4.17	3.73	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	491/1480	4.93	4.64	4.68	4.68	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	2	6	5	4.07	797/1450	4.07	4.10	4.09	4.15	4.07	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	2	5	7	4.13	1104/1409	4.13	4.46	4.42	4.47	4.13	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	963/1407	4.67	4.77	4.69	4.78	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	2	5	7	4.13	938/1399	4.13	4.30	4.26	4.29	4.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	3	10	4.50	591/1400	4.50	4.35	4.27	4.34	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	5	0	1	2	2	2.60	1123/1179	2.60	3.94	3.96	4.05	2.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	708/1262	4.00	4.18	4.05	4.11	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	588/1259	4.50	4.40	4.29	4.34	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	773/1256	4.25	4.34	4.30	4.28	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 788	****	4.03	4.00	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 246	****	4.26	4.20	4.51	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	4.08	4.11	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	4.45	4.40	4.63	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	4.37	4.20	4.58	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 217	****	4.42	4.04	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	5.00	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.26	4.53	4.83	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	4.24	4.44	4.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.19	4.35	4.72	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	3.98	3.92	3.55	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.67	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	4.07	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	4.64	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	3.68	4.26	4.69	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	3.50	4.42	4.80	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	3.90	4.55	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	4.28	4.75	4.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	4.42	4.65	4.66	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.83	4.43	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.82	5.00	****	

Course-Section: KORE 201 0101
 Title INTERMEDIATE KOREAN I
 Instructor: LEE, YONGHUN
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 924
 JUN 13, 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	9	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	4	Under-grad	15	Non-major	2
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	5	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	Other	6				
				?	0						