

Course-Section: KORE 101 0101  
 Title ELEMENTARY KOREAN I  
 Instructor: KRIPPES, Y  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1028  
 FEB 11, 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	2	3	8	6	3.95	1236/1649	3.95	4.34	4.28	4.11	3.95	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	6	6	3.84	1279/1648	3.84	4.31	4.23	4.16	3.84	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	6	7	3.95	1000/1375	3.95	4.42	4.27	4.10	3.95	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	1	9	6	3.84	1236/1595	3.84	4.29	4.20	4.03	3.84	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	7	3	7	4.00	815/1533	4.00	4.16	4.04	3.87	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	7	4	7	3.89	1028/1512	3.89	4.19	4.10	3.86	3.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	6	5	4	3.50	1387/1623	3.50	4.08	4.16	4.08	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	1	1	0	6	9	4.24	1412/1646	4.24	4.59	4.69	4.67	4.24	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	5	3	7	4.13	824/1621	4.13	4.14	4.06	3.96	4.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	7	6	6	3.95	1319/1568	3.95	4.39	4.43	4.39	3.95	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	3	13	4.53	1222/1572	4.53	4.79	4.70	4.64	4.53	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	5	6	6	3.94	1182/1564	3.94	4.28	4.28	4.20	3.94	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	6	5	7	3.95	1166/1559	3.95	4.43	4.29	4.20	3.95	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	2	3	3	7	3.81	872/1352	3.81	3.97	3.98	3.86	3.81	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	737/1384	4.14	4.28	4.08	3.86	4.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	562/1382	4.57	4.57	4.29	4.03	4.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	900/1368	4.14	4.42	4.30	4.01	4.14	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	265/ 948	4.43	4.10	3.95	3.75	4.43	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	1	2	0	0	1	2.50	****/ 555	****	2.56	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	3	1	0	1	0	1.80	275/ 288	1.80	2.95	3.68	3.54	1.80	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.67	4.47	4.36	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	4	1	0	1	0	1.67	302/ 312	1.67	2.48	3.68	3.51	1.67	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	4.13	3.99	3.83	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	2	A	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	0	D	0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
			Required for Majors	5	Graduate
			General	4	Under-grad
			Electives	3	19
			Other	2	Major
					Non-major
					19
					0

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



Course-Section: KORE 102 0101  
 Title ELEMENTARY KOREAN II  
 Instructor: KRIPPES, Y  
 Enrollment: 29  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1029  
 FEB 11, 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	1	0	5	5	4.27	943/1649	4.27	4.34	4.28	4.11	4.27	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	873/1648	4.27	4.31	4.23	4.16	4.27	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	2	1	1	7	4.18	862/1375	4.18	4.42	4.27	4.10	4.18	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	636/1595	4.40	4.29	4.20	4.03	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	545/1533	4.33	4.16	4.04	3.87	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	451/1512	4.45	4.19	4.10	3.86	4.45	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	4	2	5	4.09	984/1623	4.09	4.08	4.16	4.08	4.09	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	816/1646	4.82	4.59	4.69	4.67	4.82	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	313/1621	4.57	4.14	4.06	3.96	4.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	588/1568	4.70	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	591/1572	4.90	4.79	4.70	4.64	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	651/1564	4.50	4.28	4.28	4.20	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	475/1559	4.70	4.43	4.29	4.20	4.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	4	0	5	4.11	624/1352	4.11	3.97	3.98	3.86	4.11	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	541/1384	4.40	4.28	4.08	3.86	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	342/1382	4.80	4.57	4.29	4.03	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	579/1368	4.60	4.42	4.30	4.01	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	170/ 948	4.60	4.10	3.95	3.75	4.60	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 221	****	4.38	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 243	****	4.69	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 212	****	5.00	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	1	2	1	0	3	3.29	484/ 555	3.29	2.56	4.29	4.14	3.29	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.39	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.20	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.23	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.32	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	1	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	229/ 288	3.00	2.95	3.68	3.54	3.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.67	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.67	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	247/ 312	3.25	2.48	3.68	3.51	3.25	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	88/ 110	3.75	4.13	3.99	3.83	3.75	

Course-Section: KORE 102 0101  
 Title ELEMENTARY KOREAN II  
 Instructor: KRIPPES, Y  
 Enrollment: 29  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1029  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	3	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	3	Under-grad	13	Non-major	11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	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	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: KORE 201 0101  
 Title INTERMEDIATE KOREAN I  
 Instructor: KRIPPES, Y  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1030  
 FEB 11, 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	0	2	2	5	4.33	871/1649	4.33	4.34	4.28	4.29	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	643/1648	4.44	4.31	4.23	4.25	4.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	271/1375	4.78	4.42	4.27	4.37	4.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	580/1595	4.44	4.29	4.20	4.22	4.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	653/1533	4.22	4.16	4.04	4.04	4.22	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	595/1512	4.33	4.19	4.10	4.14	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	1029/1623	4.00	4.08	4.16	4.21	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	1193/1646	4.50	4.59	4.69	4.63	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	1151/1621	3.80	4.14	4.06	4.01	3.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	852/1568	4.50	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.79	4.70	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	473/1564	4.67	4.28	4.28	4.27	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	318/1559	4.80	4.43	4.29	4.33	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	303/1352	4.50	3.97	3.98	4.07	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.28	4.08	3.99	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.57	4.29	4.19	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.42	4.30	4.21	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	4.10	3.95	3.89	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 221	****	4.38	4.16	4.45	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 243	5.00	4.69	4.12	4.47	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 212	****	5.00	4.40	4.62	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.64	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 555	****	2.56	4.29	4.33	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.39	4.54	3.75	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.20	4.47	3.33	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.23	4.43	3.67	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 92	5.00	4.32	4.35	5.00	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 288	5.00	2.95	3.68	3.65	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	5.00	4.06	3.93	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 48	5.00	5.00	4.09	4.05	5.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	19/ 39	4.67	4.67	4.47	4.49	4.67	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	17/ 39	4.67	4.67	4.38	3.66	4.67	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 312	****	2.48	3.68	3.59	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 53	5.00	5.00	4.30	4.07	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	1.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	3.50	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	2.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 110	****	4.13	3.99	3.72	****	

Course-Section: KORE 201 0101  
 Title INTERMEDIATE KOREAN I  
 Instructor: KRIPPES, Y  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1030  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	9	Non-major	9
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	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: KORE 202 0101  
 Title INTERMEDIATE KOREAN II  
 Instructor: KRIPPES, Y  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1031  
 FEB 11, 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	0	2	3	6	4.36	830/1649	4.36	4.34	4.28	4.29	4.36	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	629/1648	4.45	4.31	4.23	4.25	4.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	513/1375	4.55	4.42	4.27	4.37	4.55	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	263/1595	4.73	4.29	4.20	4.22	4.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	264/1533	4.64	4.16	4.04	4.04	4.64	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	217/1512	4.73	4.19	4.10	4.14	4.73	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	894/1623	4.18	4.08	4.16	4.21	4.18	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	1157/1646	4.55	4.59	4.69	4.63	4.55	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	483/1621	4.43	4.14	4.06	4.01	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	287/1568	4.88	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.79	4.70	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	342/1564	4.75	4.28	4.28	4.27	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	390/1559	4.75	4.43	4.29	4.33	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	303/1352	4.50	3.97	3.98	4.07	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1384	****	4.28	4.08	3.99	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1382	****	4.57	4.29	4.19	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1368	****	4.42	4.30	4.21	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	****	4.10	3.95	3.89	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 555	****	2.56	4.29	4.33	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	2.95	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	2.48	3.68	3.59	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 11
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	0
			? 0		