Course-Section: KORE 101 1 University of Maryland Title Elementary Korean I Instructor: Yoon, Kyung-Eun

Questions

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Frequencies Instructor

NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean

Page 922 MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Enrollment:	23		
Questionnaires:	16	Student Course Evaluation Questionnair	re

		Genera	 1																
1. Did voi	u gain r	new insights,ski	_	m this cou	ırse	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	184/1509	4.88	4.42	4.31	4.18	4.88
		ictor make clear				0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	141/1509	4.88	4.39	4.26	4.25	4.88
		questions reflec				0	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	199/1287	4.81	4.48	4.30	4.24	4.81
		luations reflect				0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	191/1459	4.75	4.32	4.22	4.11	4.75
5. Did ass	signed r	readings contrib	ute to	what you 1	Learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	332/1406	4.50	4.19	4.09	4.02	4.50
6. Did wr	itten as	ssignments contr	ibute t	o what you	ı learned	0	0	0	1	2	2	11	4.44	412/1384	4.44	4.17	4.11	3.98	4.44
7. Was the	e gradir	ng system clearl	y expla	ined		0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	192/1489	4.75	4.07	4.17	4.20	4.75
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled			0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.55	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How wor	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effec	ctiveness	0	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	325/1463	4.50	4.16	4.09	4.02	4.50
		Lectur	e																
1. Were th	he instr	ructor's lecture	s well	prepared		0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.48	4.46	4.44	5.00
2. Did the	e instru	actor seem inter	ested i	n the sub	ject	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	614/1421	4.88	4.75	4.73	4.66	4.88
3. Was led	cture ma	aterial presente	d and e	explained of	clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	169/1411	4.88	4.39	4.31	4.27	4.88
4. Did the	e lectur	res contribute t	o what	you learne	ed	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	205/1405	4.88	4.45	4.32	4.27	4.88
5. Did aud	diovisua	al techniques en	hance y	our unders	standing	0	4	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	489/1236	4.25	3.92	4.00	3.87	4.25
		Discus	sion																
1. Did cla	ass disc	cussions contrib	ute to	what you l	Learned	9	0	0	1	1	0	5	4.29	597/1260	4.29	4.32	4.14	3.95	4.29
2. Were a	ll stude	ents actively en	courage	d to parti	icipate	9	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	246/1255	4.86	4.53	4.33	4.15	4.86
3. Did the	e instru	actor encourage	fair an	d open dis	scussion	9	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	700/1258	4.43	4.46	4.38	4.18	4.43
4. Were sp	pecial t	echniques succe	ssful			9	1	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	209/ 873	4.50	4.14	4.03	3.89	4.50
					Frequ	ency	Dis	cribu	ıtior	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades				Rea	ason	5			Тур	e			Majors	\$
00-27	 1	0.00-0.99	0	 A	 11			 quire					 2	Graduate		1	 Majo		0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	3		кес	4urr.e	=u 10	OT IM	JUL	Ö	4	Graduate	:	Τ.	Ma JC) <u>T</u>	U
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C C	3 1		Co	nera:	ı				2	Under-gr	-ad 1	.5	Non-	major	16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0		Gei	icia.	L				۷	JIIGET -GT	uu 1		IVOII-	ma jui	10
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3 1	F	0		וק	ectiv	7A C				7	#### - M	leand +	here =	re not	enous	rh
grau.	Τ.	3.30-4.00	Ŧ	P	0		11.1	-CL1	(CD				,	response				_	1++
				I	0		O+1	ner					3	response	.b .co .	c argii	ıııcaı		
				?	0		OLI	151					J						
				•	U														

Course-Section: KORE 102 1 University of Maryland Title Elementary Korean II

Baltimore County

Krippes, Yeon K. Instructor: Enrollment: 24

Questionnaires: 16

MAR 22, 2010 Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029

Page 923

Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionn	aire

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	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	5	9	4.53	563/1509	4.53	4.42	4.31	4.18	4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	699/1509	4.40	4.39	4.26	4.25	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	261/1287	4.75	4.48	4.30	4.24	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	164/1459	4.79	4.32	4.22	4.11	4.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	2	4	6	4.00	813/1406	4.00	4.19	4.09	4.02	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	6	7	4.20	677/1384	4.20	4.17	4.11	3.98	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	5	5	3	3.53	1291/1489	3.53	4.07	4.17	4.20	3.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	1166/1506	4.40	4.55	4.67	4.66	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	325/1463	4.50	4.16	4.09	4.02	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	Λ	1	12	4.71	514/1438	4.71	4.48	4.46	4.44	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.75	4.73	4.66	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	0	1	11	4.69	376/1411	4.69	4.39	4.31	4.27	4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	526/1405	4.62	4.45	4.32	4.27	4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	211/1236	4.60	3.92	4.00	3.87	4.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	187/1260	4.83	4.32	4.14	3.95	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	262/1255	4.83	4.53	4.33	4.15	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	324/1258	4.83	4.46	4.38	4.18	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	178/ 873	4.60	4.14	4.03	3.89	4.60

Frequency Distribution

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	5	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: KORE 201 1 University of Maryland Title Intermediate Korean I

Baltimore County

Krippes, Yeon K. Instructor: Enrollment: 26 Questionnaires: 21

MAR 22, 2010 Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029

Page 924

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionna	ire
---------	--------	------------	------------	-----

			Fre	eque	ncie	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	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	9	12	4.57	516/1509	4.57	4.42	4.31	4.34	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	8	13	4.62	412/1509	4.62	4.39	4.26	4.32	4.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	304/1287	4.71	4.48	4.30	4.35	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	7	12	4.50	454/1459	4.50	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	208/1406	4.68	4.19	4.09	4.09	4.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	8	12	4.52	334/1384	4.52	4.17	4.11	4.09	4.52
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	0	7	12	4.33	674/1489	4.33	4.07	4.17	4.19	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	782/1506	4.80	4.55	4.67	4.61	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	424/1463	4.44	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	617/1438	4.65	4.48	4.46	4.48	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	863/1421	4.76	4.75	4.73	4.76	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	592/1411	4.53	4.39	4.31	4.37	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	486/1405	4.65	4.45	4.32	4.39	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	1	0	3	3	9	4.19	545/1236	4.19	3.92	4.00	4.11	4.19
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1260	****	4.32	4.14	4.19	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	0	0			****/1255		4.53	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	0	0			****/1258		4.46	4.38	4.44	****
4. Were special techniques successful	17	0	0	0	0	0	4		****/ 873		4.14		4.04	****
Freq	iencv	Dis	trib	ut.io	n									
1104.	201107	210	C											
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	ason	s 			Ту	pe 			Majors	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	5	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	1	-			
				2	1						

Course-Section: KORE 202 1 University of Maryland

Page 925 Baltimore County Fall 2009 Title Intermediate Korean II MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029 Instructor: Krippes, Yeon K.

Enrollment:	7				
Ouestionnaires:	7	Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

							Fre	eauei	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1 Did vo	u gain n	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	1	0	Ο	1	5	4.29	852/1509	4.29	4.42	4.31	4.34	4.29
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	828/1509	4.29	4.39	4.26	4.32	4.29
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	453/1287		4.48	4.30	4.35	4.57
	_	uations reflect		_	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	586/1459	4.43	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.43
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	423/1406		4.19	4.09	4.09	4.43
	_	_		o what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	4		421/1384		4.17	4.11	4.09	4.43
		g system clearl		-	0	1	1	0	1	1	3		1155/1489	3.83	4.07	4.17	4.19	3.83
	-	was class canc			1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	941/1506	4.67	4.55	4.67	4.61	4.67
	-			hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	726/1463	4.17	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.17
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture		prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	1001/1438	4.33	4.48	4.46	4.48	4.33
		ctor seem inter			1	0	0	0	0	2	4		1014/1421	4.67	4.75	4.73	4.76	4.67
				xplained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	936/1411	4.20	4.39	4.31	4.37	4.20
		es contribute t			1	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1047/1405	4.00	4.45	4.32	4.39	4.00
				our understanding	2	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	824/1236		3.92	4.00	4.11	3.80
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc			what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1260	****	4.32	4.14	4.19	****
				d to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1255	****	4.53	4.33	4.37	****
				d open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1258	***	4.46	4.38	4.44	****
				Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ty	pe			Majors	\$
														- 				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Re	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajors		2	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 0		~		,				0	TT7		7	37		-
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Ge:	nera:	L				2	Under-g	rad	7	Non-	major	7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0								1			.1			.1-
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		ΕŢ	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1				_	lu
				1 0		٥.	1					0	respons	es to b	e sign	uricar	1T	
				I O		Ut.	her					0						

Course-Section: KORE 301 1 Title Advanced Korean Instructor: Yoon, Kyung-Eun

9

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 926 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Instructor

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
---------	--------	------------	---------------

Frequencies

							P L C	eque.	пстег	j .		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	телет	Sect
		Question	.s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	.1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.42	4.31	4.32	5.00
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.39	4.26	4.25	5.00
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.48	4.30	4.33	5.00
4. Did ot	her evalı	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.32	4.22	4.26	5.00
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.19	4.09	4.12	5.00
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.17	4.11	4.15	5.00
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	121/1489	4.86	4.07	4.17	4.14	4.86
8. How man	ny times	was class cand	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.55	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	209/1463	4.67	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.67
		Lectur	e															
1. Were the	he instru	actor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.48	4.46	4.43	5.00
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.75	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was le	cture mat	erial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.39	4.31	4.29	5.0
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.45	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did au	diovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	176/1236	4.67	3.92	4.00	4.07	4.6
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	187/1260	4.83	4.32	4.14	4.22	4.83
2. Were a	.ll studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	262/1255	4.83	4.53	4.33	4.37	4.83
3. Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.46	4.38	4.42	5.00
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		1	2	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 873	5.00	4.14	4.03	4.08	5.00
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99							or Ma				Graduat		0	Mo de		
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0 0	A 4 B 1		ке	quir	eu L	OT Mg	a JOE'S	5	0	Graduati	=	0	Majo)T	1
28-55 56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Co	nera:	1				2	Under-q	rad	7	Non	-major	6
84-150	1	3.00-2.99	0	D 0		Ge	nera.	L				4	onder-g.	Lau	,	NOI1-	·iiia JUL	0
Grad.	0	3.50-3.49	2	Б 0		E-1.	ectiv					2	#### - 1	Moona +	howe o	not	- 0200116	~h
Grau.	U	3.30-4.00	4	P 0		E-10	EC.LT.	/ C S				4	respons					ltt
				I 0		O+1	her					1	respons	es to L	e sign	ıııcaı.	16	
				Ι υ		UL.	rier					т						

3 0 ° 1