

Course Section: KORE 101 0101  
 Title ELEMENTARY KOREAN I  
 Instructor: KRIPPES, Y  
 Enrollment: 29  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1065  
 JAN 18, 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	2	8	4.38	757/1669	4.38	4.33	4.23	4.02	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	908/1666	4.23	4.28	4.19	4.11	4.23	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	8	4.31	773/1421	4.31	4.36	4.24	4.11	4.31	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	1	8	4.33	717/1617	4.33	4.27	4.15	3.99	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	340/1555	4.50	4.17	4.00	3.92	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	3	6	4.08	850/1543	4.08	4.19	4.06	3.86	4.08	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	3	6	3.92	1137/1647	3.92	4.18	4.12	4.06	3.92	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.60	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	918/1605	4.00	4.13	4.07	3.96	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	1082/1514	4.25	4.39	4.39	4.32	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	705/1551	4.83	4.72	4.66	4.55	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	1	4	4	3.82	1205/1503	3.82	4.31	4.24	4.17	3.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	2	7	4.17	980/1506	4.17	4.40	4.26	4.17	4.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	1	1	1	0	5	3.88	718/1311	3.88	3.78	3.85	3.68	3.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	0	1	5	4.00	849/1490	4.00	4.26	4.05	3.85	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	880/1502	4.25	4.54	4.26	4.06	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	2	0	0	6	4.25	920/1489	4.25	4.43	4.29	4.07	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	625/1006	3.86	4.14	4.00	3.81	3.86	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.42	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.01	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	4.33	4.22	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 13
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	3
			? 0		

Course Section: KORE 102 0101  
 Title ELEMENTARY KOREAN II  
 Instructor: HAHM, YOUNG  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1066  
 JAN 18, 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	1	3	4	6	4.07	1124/1669	4.07	4.33	4.23	4.02	4.07	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	3	5	3.93	1206/1666	3.93	4.28	4.19	4.11	3.93	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	5	4.07	943/1421	4.07	4.36	4.24	4.11	4.07	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	4	4	3.86	1196/1617	3.86	4.27	4.15	3.99	3.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	516/1555	4.31	4.17	4.00	3.92	4.31	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	5	3	5	3.79	1115/1543	3.79	4.19	4.06	3.86	3.79	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	3	6	4.00	1043/1647	4.00	4.18	4.12	4.06	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	1	12	4.71	1017/1668	4.71	4.60	4.67	4.62	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	2	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	810/1605	4.14	4.13	4.07	3.96	4.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	584/1514	4.67	4.39	4.39	4.32	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	3	0	9	4.50	1193/1551	4.50	4.72	4.66	4.55	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	959/1503	4.17	4.31	4.24	4.17	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	3	1	2	6	3.92	1163/1506	3.92	4.40	4.26	4.17	3.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	1	3	2	4	3.64	868/1311	3.64	3.78	3.85	3.68	3.64	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	692/1490	4.25	4.26	4.05	3.85	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	632/1502	4.50	4.54	4.26	4.06	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	684/1489	4.50	4.43	4.29	4.07	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	1	0	2	0	4	3.86	625/1006	3.86	4.14	4.00	3.81	3.86	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.09	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.00	4.38	4.04	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	4.00	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.33	4.22	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	4.42	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	4.33	4.45	4.26	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 1		14
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
Other 2					
#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant					

Course Section: KORE 201 0101  
 Title INTERMEDIATE KOREAN I  
 Instructor: HAHM, YOUNG HAE  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1067  
 JAN 18, 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	1	2	3	11	4.22	951/1669	4.22	4.33	4.23	4.34	4.22	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	4	10	4.17	984/1666	4.17	4.28	4.19	4.29	4.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	8	10	4.56	511/1421	4.56	4.36	4.24	4.35	4.56	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	626/1617	4.41	4.27	4.15	4.24	4.41	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	225/1555	4.67	4.17	4.00	3.96	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	4	13	4.61	290/1543	4.61	4.19	4.06	4.10	4.61	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	3	12	4.39	682/1647	4.39	4.18	4.12	4.19	4.39	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	750/1668	4.88	4.60	4.67	4.59	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	4	1	9	4.36	565/1605	4.36	4.13	4.07	4.15	4.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	775/1514	4.53	4.39	4.39	4.39	4.53	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	862/1551	4.76	4.72	4.66	4.72	4.76	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	266/1503	4.76	4.31	4.24	4.29	4.76	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	2	12	4.47	680/1506	4.47	4.40	4.26	4.33	4.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	3	2	10	4.47	291/1311	4.47	3.78	3.85	3.96	4.47	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	340/1490	4.67	4.26	4.05	4.11	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	558/1502	4.58	4.54	4.26	4.31	4.58	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	532/1489	4.67	4.43	4.29	4.36	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	155/1006	4.73	4.14	4.00	3.99	4.73	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 11	Required for Majors	8
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	3
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	3
			? 0		