

Course-Section: KORE 101 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY KOREAN I
 Instructor: KRIPPES, Y
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 993
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	5	14	4.60	500/1576	4.60	4.34	4.30	4.11	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	16	4.70	350/1576	4.70	4.32	4.27	4.18	4.70	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	298/1342	4.75	4.48	4.32	4.19	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	14	4.60	395/1520	4.60	4.30	4.25	4.09	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	0	3	14	4.61	297/1465	4.61	4.26	4.12	4.02	4.61	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	398/1434	4.50	4.22	4.14	3.94	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	2	5	9	3.85	1182/1547	3.85	4.12	4.19	4.10	3.85	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.55	4.64	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	1	6	9	4.35	597/1554	4.35	4.13	4.10	4.01	4.35	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	278/1488	4.88	4.39	4.47	4.41	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	607/1493	4.88	4.78	4.73	4.65	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	778/1486	4.44	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	364/1489	4.76	4.40	4.32	4.22	4.76	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	0	1	4	10	4.38	429/1277	4.38	3.99	4.03	3.91	4.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	445/1279	4.50	4.30	4.17	3.96	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	288/1270	4.88	4.57	4.35	4.09	4.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	444/1269	4.75	4.38	4.35	4.09	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	299/ 878	4.38	4.19	4.05	3.91	4.38	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	4.99	4.08	3.86	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	B 5			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General 5	Under-grad 20	Non-major 20
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 2		
				? 1			

Course-Section: KORE 102 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY KOREAN II
 Instructor: KRIPPES, Y
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 994
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	10	4	3.94	1203/1576	3.94	4.34	4.30	4.11	3.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	6	6	3.89	1248/1576	3.89	4.32	4.27	4.18	3.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	9	4.33	770/1342	4.33	4.48	4.32	4.19	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	4	10	4.28	837/1520	4.28	4.30	4.25	4.09	4.28
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	616/1465	4.29	4.26	4.12	4.02	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	4	10	4.33	594/1434	4.33	4.22	4.14	3.94	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	4	4	6	3.56	1325/1547	3.56	4.12	4.19	4.10	3.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	281/1574	4.94	4.55	4.64	4.59	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	4	5	4	3.79	1145/1554	3.79	4.13	4.10	4.01	3.79
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	3	5	9	4.22	1134/1488	4.22	4.39	4.47	4.41	4.22
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	966/1493	4.72	4.78	4.73	4.65	4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	3	5	8	4.06	1085/1486	4.06	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.06
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	3	11	4.28	941/1489	4.28	4.40	4.32	4.22	4.28
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	2	3	4	5	3.67	943/1277	3.67	3.99	4.03	3.91	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1279	****	4.30	4.17	3.96	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1270	****	4.57	4.35	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1269	****	4.38	4.35	4.09	****
4. Were special techniques successful	15	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 878	****	4.19	4.05	3.91	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors 8	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General 2	Under-grad 18 Non-major 18
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 0	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 0		

Course-Section: KORE 201 0101
 Title INTERMEDIATE KOREAN I
 Instructor: KRIPPES, Y
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 995
 JUL 2, 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	2	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	415/1576	4.67	4.34	4.30	4.35	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	392/1576	4.67	4.32	4.27	4.32	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	467/1342	4.61	4.48	4.32	4.41	4.61	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	339/1520	4.67	4.30	4.25	4.26	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	0	2	14	4.71	238/1465	4.71	4.26	4.12	4.09	4.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	270/1434	4.67	4.22	4.14	4.06	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	3	3	11	4.47	575/1547	4.47	4.12	4.19	4.22	4.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	508/1574	4.89	4.55	4.64	4.62	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	692/1554	4.27	4.13	4.10	4.05	4.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	589/1488	4.71	4.39	4.47	4.44	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	445/1493	4.93	4.78	4.73	4.75	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	678/1486	4.50	4.33	4.32	4.29	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	614/1489	4.57	4.40	4.32	4.31	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	1	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	215/1277	4.67	3.99	4.03	4.01	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.30	4.17	4.14	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/1270	****	4.57	4.35	4.30	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1269	****	4.38	4.35	4.29	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 878	****	4.19	4.05	3.92	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors 5	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 3	C 1	General 3	Under-grad 20 Non-major 19
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 3	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 1	
			? 0		

Course-Section: KORE 202 0101
 Title INTERMEDIATE KOREAN II
 Instructor: KRIPPES, Y
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 996
 JUL 2, 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	1	0	2	6	4.44	727/1576	4.44	4.34	4.30	4.35	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	698/1576	4.44	4.32	4.27	4.32	4.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	0	8	4.67	406/1342	4.67	4.48	4.32	4.41	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	339/1520	4.67	4.30	4.25	4.26	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	264/1465	4.67	4.26	4.12	4.09	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	270/1434	4.67	4.22	4.14	4.06	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	0	2	5	4.11	963/1547	4.11	4.12	4.19	4.22	4.11	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	720/1574	4.78	4.55	4.64	4.62	4.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	395/1554	4.50	4.13	4.10	4.05	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	589/1488	4.71	4.39	4.47	4.44	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	632/1493	4.88	4.78	4.73	4.75	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	221/1486	4.86	4.33	4.32	4.29	4.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	378/1489	4.75	4.40	4.32	4.31	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1277	5.00	3.99	4.03	4.01	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.30	4.17	4.14	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.57	4.35	4.30	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.38	4.35	4.29	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.19	4.05	3.92	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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