

Course-Section: KORE 101 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY KOREAN I
 Instructor: HAHM, YOUNG HAE
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 928
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	1	1	4	8	8	3.95	1171/1522	3.95	4.36	4.30	4.14	3.95	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	1	6	9	4	3.55	1348/1522	3.55	4.33	4.26	4.18	3.55	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	0	2	7	11	4.14	857/1285	4.14	4.45	4.30	4.22	4.14	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	2	0	7	6	6	3.67	1245/1476	3.67	4.33	4.22	4.09	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	6	6	8	3.95	826/1412	3.95	4.26	4.06	4.01	3.95	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	6	7	6	3.64	1113/1381	3.64	4.19	4.08	3.93	3.64	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	2	6	5	7	3.59	1265/1500	3.59	4.14	4.18	4.16	3.59	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	577/1517	4.86	4.56	4.65	4.62	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	0	4	7	4	3.81	1105/1497	3.81	4.21	4.11	4.02	3.81	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	5	8	6	3.90	1252/1440	3.90	4.45	4.45	4.40	3.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	0	2	3	14	4.45	1207/1448	4.45	4.79	4.71	4.63	4.45	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	1	5	9	4	3.70	1228/1436	3.70	4.39	4.29	4.24	3.70	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	2	1	9	7	3.95	1081/1432	3.95	4.47	4.29	4.23	3.95	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	1	4	5	3	4	3.29	998/1221	3.29	3.91	3.93	3.86	3.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	4	3	5	3.92	803/1280	3.92	4.28	4.10	3.92	3.92	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	4	2	7	4.23	819/1277	4.23	4.60	4.34	4.13	4.23	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	4	4	4	3.77	1024/1269	3.77	4.47	4.31	4.04	3.77	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	5	4	3	3.83	555/ 854	3.83	4.16	4.02	3.87	3.83	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 14	Required for Majors	5
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 4	C 0	General	3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		Under-grad 23
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives	5
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	3
			? 0		

Course-Section: KORE 101C 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY KOREAN I CO
 Instructor: HAHM, YOUNG HAE
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 929
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	2	2	4	8	6	3.64	1351/1522	3.64	4.36	4.30	4.14	3.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	3	5	8	5	3.59	1327/1522	3.59	4.33	4.26	4.18	3.59	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	2	0	3	6	6	3.82	1057/1285	3.82	4.45	4.30	4.22	3.82	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	3	1	4	5	7	3.60	1281/1476	3.60	4.33	4.22	4.09	3.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	2	3	9	5	3.75	1013/1412	3.75	4.26	4.06	4.01	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	0	5	7	6	3.75	1046/1381	3.75	4.19	4.08	3.93	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	2	2	4	6	6	3.60	1262/1500	3.60	4.14	4.18	4.16	3.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	577/1517	4.86	4.56	4.65	4.62	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	1	0	1	8	5	4.07	859/1497	4.07	4.21	4.11	4.02	4.07	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	4	9	6	3.95	1219/1440	3.95	4.45	4.45	4.40	3.95	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	0	4	4	11	4.20	1319/1448	4.20	4.79	4.71	4.63	4.20	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	1	6	9	2	3.53	1277/1436	3.53	4.39	4.29	4.24	3.53	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	3	3	6	7	3.75	1191/1432	3.75	4.47	4.29	4.23	3.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	2	3	4	3	4	3.25	1011/1221	3.25	3.91	3.93	3.86	3.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	3	6	5	4.00	718/1280	4.00	4.28	4.10	3.92	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	743/1277	4.33	4.60	4.34	4.13	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	4	5	5	3.87	976/1269	3.87	4.47	4.31	4.04	3.87	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	1	3	5	4	3.92	505/ 854	3.92	4.16	4.02	3.87	3.92	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 13	Required for Majors 5	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 4	C 0	General 3	Under-grad 23 Non-major 23
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives 4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 4	
			? 1		

Course-Section: KORE 102 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY KOREAN II
 Instructor: KRIPPES, Y
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 930
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	5	10	4.67	433/1522	4.67	4.36	4.30	4.14	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	277/1522	4.73	4.33	4.26	4.18	4.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	181/1285	4.87	4.45	4.30	4.22	4.87	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	316/1476	4.67	4.33	4.22	4.09	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	179/1412	4.73	4.26	4.06	4.01	4.73	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	247/1381	4.60	4.19	4.08	3.93	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	1	3	9	4.20	839/1500	4.20	4.14	4.18	4.16	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	577/1517	4.87	4.56	4.65	4.62	4.87	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	385/1497	4.50	4.21	4.11	4.02	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	353/1440	4.80	4.45	4.45	4.40	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	602/1448	4.87	4.79	4.71	4.63	4.87	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	217/1436	4.80	4.39	4.29	4.24	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	372/1432	4.73	4.47	4.29	4.23	4.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	2	4	7	4.14	540/1221	4.14	3.91	3.93	3.86	4.14	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	214/1280	4.77	4.28	4.10	3.92	4.77	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	573/1277	4.54	4.60	4.34	4.13	4.54	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	437/1269	4.69	4.47	4.31	4.04	4.69	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	287/ 854	4.33	4.16	4.02	3.87	4.33	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 0	Major 1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 2	Under-grad 16	Non-major 15
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 0			

Course-Section: KORE 102C 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY KOREAN II C
 Instructor: KRIPPES, Y
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 931
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	6	9	4.60	492/1522	4.60	4.36	4.30	4.14	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	277/1522	4.73	4.33	4.26	4.18	4.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	298/1285	4.73	4.45	4.30	4.22	4.73	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	444/1476	4.53	4.33	4.22	4.09	4.53	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	283/1412	4.60	4.26	4.06	4.01	4.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	207/1381	4.67	4.19	4.08	3.93	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	0	4	9	4.27	770/1500	4.27	4.14	4.18	4.16	4.27	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	577/1517	4.87	4.56	4.65	4.62	4.87	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	445/1497	4.45	4.21	4.11	4.02	4.45	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	353/1440	4.80	4.45	4.45	4.40	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	765/1448	4.80	4.79	4.71	4.63	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	217/1436	4.80	4.39	4.29	4.24	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	454/1432	4.67	4.47	4.29	4.23	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	532/1221	4.15	3.91	3.93	3.86	4.15	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	337/1280	4.58	4.28	4.10	3.92	4.58	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	682/1277	4.42	4.60	4.34	4.13	4.42	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	524/1269	4.58	4.47	4.31	4.04	4.58	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	4	4	4	4.00	426/ 854	4.00	4.16	4.02	3.87	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General	2
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		Under-grad 16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives	0
			P 1		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	2
			? 0		

Course-Section: KORE 201 0101
 Title INTERMEDIATE KOREAN I
 Instructor: HAHM, YOUNG HAE
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 932
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	11	4.47	643/1522	4.47	4.36	4.30	4.34	4.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	8	4.29	834/1522	4.29	4.33	4.26	4.29	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	566/1285	4.47	4.45	4.30	4.36	4.47	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	12	4.53	454/1476	4.53	4.33	4.22	4.20	4.53	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	248/1412	4.65	4.26	4.06	4.00	4.65	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	4	10	4.29	565/1381	4.29	4.19	4.08	3.97	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	6	4	7	4.06	961/1500	4.06	4.14	4.18	4.20	4.06	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	292/1517	4.94	4.56	4.65	4.63	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	0	0	2	7	2	4.00	898/1497	4.00	4.21	4.11	4.11	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	552/1440	4.71	4.45	4.45	4.42	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	575/1448	4.88	4.79	4.71	4.78	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	527/1436	4.56	4.39	4.29	4.29	4.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	280/1432	4.81	4.47	4.29	4.31	4.81	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	0	3	3	7	4.07	582/1221	4.07	3.91	3.93	4.02	4.07	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	207/1280	4.78	4.28	4.10	4.08	4.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	351/1277	4.78	4.60	4.34	4.33	4.78	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	547/1269	4.56	4.47	4.31	4.33	4.56	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	402/ 854	4.13	4.16	4.02	4.00	4.13	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.62	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 228	****	4.50	4.35	4.56	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.50	4.51	4.57	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.72	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	5.00	4.23	4.37	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.58	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	5.00	4.49	5.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 78	****	4.83	4.45	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.83	4.11	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	3.60	4.41	4.83	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	4.00	4.30	4.58	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	3.00	4.40	4.75	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	3.00	4.31	4.75	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	2.75	4.30	4.17	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	4.33	4.63	****	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	****	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	****	****	

Course-Section: KORE 201 0101
 Title INTERMEDIATE KOREAN I
 Instructor: HAHM, YOUNG HAE
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 932
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	10	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	16	Non-major	17
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: KORE 201C 0101
 Title INTER KOREAN I CONVER
 Instructor: HAHM, YOUNG HAE
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 933
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	1	0	6	6	5	3.78	1284/1522	3.78	4.36	4.30	4.34	3.78	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	9	7	4.28	854/1522	4.28	4.33	4.26	4.29	4.28	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	8	8	4.41	638/1285	4.41	4.45	4.30	4.36	4.41	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	6	7	4.00	1009/1476	4.00	4.33	4.22	4.20	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	7	7	4.18	638/1412	4.18	4.26	4.06	4.00	4.18	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	2	5	8	4.00	806/1381	4.00	4.19	4.08	3.97	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	3	7	5	3.88	1099/1500	3.88	4.14	4.18	4.20	3.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	292/1517	4.94	4.56	4.65	4.63	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	2	0	0	5	7	1	3.69	1186/1497	3.69	4.21	4.11	4.11	3.69	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	763/1440	4.54	4.45	4.45	4.42	4.54	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	1131/1448	4.54	4.79	4.71	4.78	4.54	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	564/1436	4.54	4.39	4.29	4.29	4.54	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	600/1432	4.54	4.47	4.29	4.31	4.54	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	279/1221	4.50	3.91	3.93	4.02	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	311/1280	4.63	4.28	4.10	4.08	4.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	508/1277	4.63	4.60	4.34	4.33	4.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	586/1269	4.50	4.47	4.31	4.33	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	287/ 854	4.33	4.16	4.02	4.00	4.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.62	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 228	****	4.50	4.35	4.56	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.50	4.51	4.57	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.72	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	5.00	4.23	4.37	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.58	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	5.00	4.49	5.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 78	****	4.83	4.45	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.83	4.11	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	3.60	4.41	4.83	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	4.00	4.30	4.58	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	3.00	4.40	4.75	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	3.00	4.31	4.75	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	2.75	4.30	4.17	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	4.33	4.63	****	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	****	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	****	****	

Course-Section: KORE 201C 0101
 Title INTER KOREAN I CONVER
 Instructor: HAHM, YOUNG HAE
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 933
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	14	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						