

Course-Section: KORE 101 0101  
 Title ELEMENTARY KOREAN I  
 Instructor: HAHM, YOUNG HAE  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1005  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	0	0	2.00	1637/1639	2.00	4.22	4.27	4.08	2.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1579/1639	3.00	4.15	4.22	4.17	3.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.37	4.28	4.18	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1524/1532	2.00	4.10	4.01	3.88	2.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1499/1504	1.00	4.04	4.05	3.78	1.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1606/1612	1.00	4.02	4.16	4.10	1.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.38	4.65	4.56	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1477/1579	3.00	4.00	4.08	3.95	3.00	
-----															
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1237/1518	4.00	4.23	4.43	4.38	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1520/1520	1.00	4.67	4.70	4.61	1.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1515/1517	1.00	4.15	4.27	4.20	1.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1440/1550	3.00	4.27	4.22	4.17	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 0	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 1		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
				Other	0

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: KORE 101C 0101  
 Title ELEMENTARY KOREAN I CO  
 Instructor: HAHM, YOUNG HAE  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1006  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	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	0	4	5	3	3.69	1397/1639	3.69	4.22	4.27	4.08	3.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	5	2	4	3.54	1469/1639	3.54	4.15	4.22	4.17	3.54	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	3	6	4.00	973/1397	4.00	4.37	4.28	4.18	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	3	2	3	4	3.67	1324/1583	3.67	4.18	4.19	4.01	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	6	0	6	4.00	774/1532	4.00	4.10	4.01	3.88	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	3	1	6	3.92	932/1504	3.92	4.04	4.05	3.78	3.92	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	5	1	3	3.15	1499/1612	3.15	4.02	4.16	4.10	3.15	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	2	0	10	4.46	1175/1635	4.46	4.38	4.65	4.56	4.46	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	6	1	2	3.40	1364/1579	3.40	4.00	4.08	3.95	3.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	6	1	2	3.56	1411/1518	3.56	4.23	4.43	4.38	3.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	1394/1520	4.11	4.67	4.70	4.61	4.11	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	2	1	3	1	2	3.00	1453/1517	3.00	4.15	4.27	4.20	3.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	2	2	2	2	3.22	1407/1550	3.22	4.27	4.22	4.17	3.22	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	1	1	2	3	1	3.25	1101/1295	3.25	3.77	3.94	3.84	3.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1398	****	4.18	4.07	3.85	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1391	****	4.51	4.30	4.07	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1388	****	4.35	4.28	4.01	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 958	****	4.02	3.93	3.71	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	4.00	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	4.75	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.67	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.60	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	4.80	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	4.20	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	3.00	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	4.33	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: KORE 101C 0101  
 Title ELEMENTARY KOREAN I CO  
 Instructor: HAHM, YOUNG HAE  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1006  
 FEB 13, 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	4	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	B	1						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	5	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
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 102 0101  
 Title ELEMENTARY KOREAN II  
 Instructor: HAHM, YOUNG HAE  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1007  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	1	3	14	4.72	354/1639	4.72	4.22	4.27	4.08	4.72	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	284/1639	4.72	4.15	4.22	4.17	4.72	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	209/1397	4.83	4.37	4.28	4.18	4.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	270/1583	4.72	4.18	4.19	4.01	4.72	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	133/1532	4.83	4.10	4.01	3.88	4.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	3	13	4.50	367/1504	4.50	4.04	4.05	3.78	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	317/1612	4.67	4.02	4.16	4.10	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	397/1635	4.94	4.38	4.65	4.56	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	175/1579	4.75	4.00	4.08	3.95	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	416/1518	4.78	4.23	4.43	4.38	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	328/1520	4.94	4.67	4.70	4.61	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	405/1517	4.67	4.15	4.27	4.20	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	253/1550	4.83	4.27	4.22	4.17	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	173/1295	4.69	3.77	3.94	3.84	4.69	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	2	9	4.50	426/1398	4.50	4.18	4.07	3.85	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	300/1391	4.83	4.51	4.30	4.07	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	387/1388	4.75	4.35	4.28	4.01	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	143/ 958	4.70	4.02	3.93	3.71	4.70	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 224	****	4.00	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	4.75	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.67	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 82	****	4.60	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	4.80	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 80	****	4.20	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 82	****	3.00	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	4.33	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: KORE 102 0101  
 Title ELEMENTARY KOREAN II  
 Instructor: HAHM, YOUNG HAE  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1007  
 FEB 13, 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	11	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: KORE 102C 0101  
 Title ELEMENTARY KOREAN II C  
 Instructor: HAHM, YOUNG HAE  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1008  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	1	3	12	4.69	404/1639	4.69	4.22	4.27	4.08	4.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	252/1639	4.75	4.15	4.22	4.17	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	182/1397	4.88	4.37	4.28	4.18	4.88	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	181/1583	4.81	4.18	4.19	4.01	4.81	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	141/1532	4.81	4.10	4.01	3.88	4.81	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	146/1504	4.81	4.04	4.05	3.78	4.81	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	428/1612	4.56	4.02	4.16	4.10	4.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.38	4.65	4.56	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	342/1579	4.55	4.00	4.08	3.95	4.55	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	286/1518	4.86	4.23	4.43	4.38	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	674/1520	4.86	4.67	4.70	4.61	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	198/1517	4.86	4.15	4.27	4.20	4.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	231/1550	4.86	4.27	4.22	4.17	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	155/1295	4.71	3.77	3.94	3.84	4.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	161/1398	4.91	4.18	4.07	3.85	4.91	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	227/1391	4.91	4.51	4.30	4.07	4.91	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	317/1388	4.82	4.35	4.28	4.01	4.82	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	79/ 958	4.89	4.02	3.93	3.71	4.89	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 224	****	4.00	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 240	****	4.75	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 85	****	4.67	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 82	****	4.60	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 78	****	4.80	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 80	****	4.20	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 82	****	3.00	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 32	****	4.33	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: KORE 102C 0101  
 Title ELEMENTARY KOREAN II C  
 Instructor: HAHM, YOUNG HAE  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1008  
 FEB 13, 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	9	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: KORE 201 0101  
 Title INTERMEDIATE KOREAN I  
 Instructor: KRIPPES, Y  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1009  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	1	0	2	4.33	814/1639	4.33	4.22	4.27	4.35	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	774/1639	4.33	4.15	4.22	4.27	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	722/1397	4.33	4.37	4.28	4.39	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	697/1583	4.33	4.18	4.19	4.28	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	506/1532	4.33	4.10	4.01	4.09	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	544/1504	4.33	4.04	4.05	4.09	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	718/1612	4.33	4.02	4.16	4.21	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.38	4.65	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.00	4.08	4.14	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	1021/1518	4.33	4.23	4.43	4.48	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	1318/1520	4.33	4.67	4.70	4.78	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.15	4.27	4.34	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	832/1550	4.33	4.27	4.22	4.33	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	398/1295	4.33	3.77	3.94	4.07	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	770/1398	4.00	4.18	4.07	4.14	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	983/1391	4.00	4.51	4.30	4.35	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	944/1388	4.00	4.35	4.28	4.37	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	456/ 958	4.00	4.02	3.93	4.00	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	1 Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 1		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0 Under-grad 3 Non-major 3
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	1
			? 0		

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant



Course-Section: KORE 201C 0101  
 Title INTER KOREAN I CONVER  
 Instructor: KRIPPES, Y  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1010  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	3	8	4.73	354/1639	4.73	4.22	4.27	4.35	4.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	0	7	4.27	840/1639	4.27	4.15	4.22	4.27	4.27	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	477/1397	4.55	4.37	4.28	4.39	4.55	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	654/1583	4.36	4.18	4.19	4.28	4.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	1	7	4.36	478/1532	4.36	4.10	4.01	4.09	4.36	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	0	8	4.45	429/1504	4.45	4.04	4.05	4.09	4.45	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	892/1612	4.18	4.02	4.16	4.21	4.18	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.38	4.65	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	889/1579	4.00	4.00	4.08	4.14	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	807/1518	4.50	4.23	4.43	4.48	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	1188/1520	4.50	4.67	4.70	4.78	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	726/1517	4.40	4.15	4.27	4.34	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	638/1550	4.50	4.27	4.22	4.33	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	623/1295	4.00	3.77	3.94	4.07	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	695/1398	4.17	4.18	4.07	4.14	4.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	887/1391	4.17	4.51	4.30	4.35	4.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	887/1388	4.17	4.35	4.28	4.37	4.17	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	399/ 958	4.17	4.02	3.93	4.00	4.17	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 224	****	4.00	4.10	4.33	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.75	4.11	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.61	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.67	4.58	4.00	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	4.60	4.52	3.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	4.80	4.47	****	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.20	4.47	2.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	3.00	4.16	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.28	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	****	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.45	3.24	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	4.33	4.51	4.33	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	****	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	1.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	3.00	****	

Course-Section: KORE 201C 0101  
 Title INTER KOREAN I CONVER  
 Instructor: KRIPPES, Y  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1010  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	4	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	12
84-150	3	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	2				
				?	0						