

Course-Section: KORE 101 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY KOREAN I
 Instructor: KRIPPES, Y
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 993
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	1	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	388/1670	4.73	4.36	4.31	4.23	4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	686/1666	4.47	4.31	4.27	4.30	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	495/1406	4.60	4.48	4.32	4.31	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	0	3	10	4.57	477/1615	4.57	4.34	4.24	4.17	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	0	3	10	4.50	389/1566	4.50	4.26	4.07	4.03	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	221/1528	4.75	4.23	4.12	4.00	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	3	2	10	4.25	903/1650	4.25	4.16	4.22	4.28	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	1062/1667	4.63	4.47	4.67	4.61	4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	403/1626	4.50	4.08	4.11	4.07	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	371/1559	4.85	4.38	4.46	4.47	4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.75	4.72	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	424/1549	4.71	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	185/1546	4.93	4.40	4.32	4.32	4.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	1	0	2	0	8	4.27	529/1323	4.27	3.96	4.00	3.91	4.27
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	300/1384	4.70	4.29	4.10	3.92	4.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.56	4.29	4.09	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	281/1378	4.90	4.45	4.31	4.08	4.90
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	167/ 904	4.70	4.11	4.03	3.94	4.70
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.63	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	5.00	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.88	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.13	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****

Course-Section: KORE 101 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY KOREAN I
 Instructor: KRIPPES, Y
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 993
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	4	Under-grad	16	Non-major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: KORE 101C 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY KOREAN I CO
 Instructor: KRIPPES, Y
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 994
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	665/1670	4.50	4.36	4.31	4.23	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.31	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.48	4.32	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.34	4.24	4.17	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.26	4.07	4.03	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.23	4.12	4.00	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1135/1650	4.00	4.16	4.22	4.28	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.47	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	953/1626	4.00	4.08	4.11	4.07	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.38	4.46	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.75	4.72	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.34	4.31	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.40	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1179/1323	3.00	3.96	4.00	3.91	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	434/1384	4.50	4.29	4.10	3.92	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.56	4.29	4.09	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	653/1378	4.50	4.45	4.31	4.08	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	4.11	4.03	3.94	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: KORE 102 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY KOREAN II
 Instructor: KRIPPES, Y
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 995
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	5	10	4.41	794/1670	4.41	4.36	4.31	4.23	4.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	595/1666	4.53	4.31	4.27	4.30	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	447/1406	4.65	4.48	4.32	4.31	4.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	10	4.35	750/1615	4.35	4.34	4.24	4.17	4.35
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	5	8	4.25	643/1566	4.25	4.26	4.07	4.03	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	670/1528	4.29	4.23	4.12	4.00	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	6	8	4.24	926/1650	4.24	4.16	4.22	4.28	4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	9	6	4.31	1326/1667	4.31	4.47	4.67	4.61	4.31
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	953/1626	4.00	4.08	4.11	4.07	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	521/1559	4.75	4.38	4.46	4.47	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	417/1560	4.94	4.75	4.72	4.68	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	776/1549	4.44	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	4	8	4.25	987/1546	4.25	4.40	4.32	4.32	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	0	2	2	2	5	3.91	820/1323	3.91	3.96	4.00	3.91	3.91
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	434/1384	4.50	4.29	4.10	3.92	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	400/1378	4.75	4.56	4.29	4.09	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	312/1378	4.88	4.45	4.31	4.08	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	356/ 904	4.29	4.11	4.03	3.94	4.29

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 2	General 3	Under-grad 17	Non-major 17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	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 2		
				? 0			

Course-Section: KORE 201 0101
 Title INTERMEDIATE KOREAN I
 Instructor: KRIPPES, Y
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 996
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	271/1670	4.83	4.36	4.31	4.32	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	415/1666	4.67	4.31	4.27	4.27	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	423/1406	4.67	4.48	4.32	4.39	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	379/1615	4.67	4.34	4.24	4.29	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	170/1566	4.83	4.26	4.07	4.00	4.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	300/1528	4.67	4.23	4.12	4.11	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	361/1650	4.67	4.16	4.22	4.20	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	1157/1667	4.50	4.47	4.67	4.64	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	207/1626	4.75	4.08	4.11	4.06	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	772/1559	4.60	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.75	4.72	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	562/1549	4.60	4.34	4.31	4.25	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	345/1546	4.80	4.40	4.32	4.30	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1323	5.00	3.96	4.00	4.08	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.29	4.10	4.07	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.56	4.29	4.25	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.45	4.31	4.26	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	4.11	4.03	4.01	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 5	Under-grad 6	Non-major 5
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	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 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: KORE 201C 0101
 Title INTER KOREAN I CONVER
 Instructor: KRIPPES, Y
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 997
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	0	0	2	6	4.75	363/1670	4.75	4.36	4.31	4.32	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	312/1666	4.75	4.31	4.27	4.27	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	318/1406	4.75	4.48	4.32	4.39	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	423/1615	4.63	4.34	4.24	4.29	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	389/1566	4.50	4.26	4.07	4.00	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	330/1528	4.63	4.23	4.12	4.11	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	570/1650	4.50	4.16	4.22	4.20	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	1279/1667	4.38	4.47	4.67	4.64	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	151/1626	4.83	4.08	4.11	4.06	4.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	809/1559	4.57	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	1023/1560	4.71	4.75	4.72	4.73	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	598/1549	4.57	4.34	4.31	4.25	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	310/1546	4.83	4.40	4.32	4.30	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	3	0	0	0	1	2.00	1295/1323	2.00	3.96	4.00	4.08	2.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.29	4.10	4.07	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.56	4.29	4.25	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.45	4.31	4.26	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	4.11	4.03	4.01	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 5	Under-grad 8	Non-major 7
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	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 0		
				? 0			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	505/1670	4.64	4.36	4.31	4.32	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	355/1666	4.71	4.31	4.27	4.27	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	11	4.57	525/1406	4.57	4.48	4.32	4.39	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	346/1615	4.69	4.34	4.24	4.29	4.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	118/1566	4.92	4.26	4.07	4.00	4.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	192/1528	4.79	4.23	4.12	4.11	4.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	782/1650	4.36	4.16	4.22	4.20	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	1104/1667	4.57	4.47	4.67	4.64	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	255/1626	4.69	4.08	4.11	4.06	4.69
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	503/1559	4.77	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	751/1560	4.85	4.75	4.72	4.73	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	451/1549	4.69	4.34	4.31	4.25	4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	482/1546	4.69	4.40	4.32	4.30	4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	3	1	7	4.36	456/1323	4.36	3.96	4.00	4.08	4.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	300/1384	4.70	4.29	4.10	4.07	4.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	603/1378	4.50	4.56	4.29	4.25	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	501/1378	4.70	4.45	4.31	4.26	4.70
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	138/ 904	4.78	4.11	4.03	4.01	4.78
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.33	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.61	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	4.25	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	4.63	4.64	4.75	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 75	****	5.00	4.57	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	4.88	4.45	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	4.13	3.97	4.30	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	2.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	2.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: KORE 202 0101
 Title INTERMEDIATE KOREAN II
 Instructor: KRIPPES, Y
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 998
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	8	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: KORE 202C 0101
 Title INTERMED KOREAN II CON
 Instructor: KRIPPES, Y
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 999
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	0	1	1	8	4.70	440/1670	4.70	4.36	4.31	4.32	4.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	490/1666	4.60	4.31	4.27	4.27	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	387/1406	4.70	4.48	4.32	4.39	4.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	346/1615	4.70	4.34	4.24	4.29	4.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	143/1566	4.89	4.26	4.07	4.00	4.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	121/1528	4.90	4.23	4.12	4.11	4.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	229/1650	4.80	4.16	4.22	4.20	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	992/1667	4.70	4.47	4.67	4.64	4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	151/1626	4.83	4.08	4.11	4.06	4.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	589/1559	4.71	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	948/1560	4.75	4.75	4.72	4.73	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	366/1549	4.75	4.34	4.31	4.25	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	457/1546	4.71	4.40	4.32	4.30	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	144/1323	4.83	3.96	4.00	4.08	4.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	390/1384	4.57	4.29	4.10	4.07	4.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	295/1378	4.86	4.56	4.29	4.25	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	481/1378	4.71	4.45	4.31	4.26	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	214/ 904	4.57	4.11	4.03	4.01	4.57
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.33	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.61	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	4.25	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	4.63	4.64	4.75	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 75	****	5.00	4.57	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 79	****	4.88	4.45	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 80	****	4.13	3.97	4.30	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	2.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	2.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: KORE 202C 0101
 Title INTERMED KOREAN II CON
 Instructor: KRIPPES, Y
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 999
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	10	Non-major	10
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						