

Course-Section: KORE 101 1
 Title Elementary Korean I
 Instructor: Yoon,Kyung-Eun
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 922
 MAR 22, 2010
 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	14	4.88	184/1509	4.88	4.42	4.31	4.18	4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	141/1509	4.88	4.39	4.26	4.25	4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	199/1287	4.81	4.48	4.30	4.24	4.81
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	191/1459	4.75	4.32	4.22	4.11	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	332/1406	4.50	4.19	4.09	4.02	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	2	11	4.44	412/1384	4.44	4.17	4.11	3.98	4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	192/1489	4.75	4.07	4.17	4.20	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.55	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	325/1463	4.50	4.16	4.09	4.02	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.48	4.46	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	614/1421	4.88	4.75	4.73	4.66	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	169/1411	4.88	4.39	4.31	4.27	4.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	205/1405	4.88	4.45	4.32	4.27	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	489/1236	4.25	3.92	4.00	3.87	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	1	0	5	4.29	597/1260	4.29	4.32	4.14	3.95	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	246/1255	4.86	4.53	4.33	4.15	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	700/1258	4.43	4.46	4.38	4.18	4.43
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	209/ 873	4.50	4.14	4.03	3.89	4.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 1	Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 1	General 2	Under-grad 15	Non-major 16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives 7	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 3		
				? 0			

Course-Section: KORE 102 1
 Title Elementary Korean II
 Instructor: Krippes, Yeon K.
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 923
 MAR 22, 2010
 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	5	9	4.53	563/1509	4.53	4.42	4.31	4.18	4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	699/1509	4.40	4.39	4.26	4.25	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	261/1287	4.75	4.48	4.30	4.24	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	164/1459	4.79	4.32	4.22	4.11	4.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	2	4	6	4.00	813/1406	4.00	4.19	4.09	4.02	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	6	7	4.20	677/1384	4.20	4.17	4.11	3.98	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	5	5	3	3.53	1291/1489	3.53	4.07	4.17	4.20	3.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	1166/1506	4.40	4.55	4.67	4.66	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	325/1463	4.50	4.16	4.09	4.02	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	1	12	4.71	514/1438	4.71	4.48	4.46	4.44	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.75	4.73	4.66	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	0	1	11	4.69	376/1411	4.69	4.39	4.31	4.27	4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	526/1405	4.62	4.45	4.32	4.27	4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	211/1236	4.60	3.92	4.00	3.87	4.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	187/1260	4.83	4.32	4.14	3.95	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	262/1255	4.83	4.53	4.33	4.15	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	324/1258	4.83	4.46	4.38	4.18	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	178/ 873	4.60	4.14	4.03	3.89	4.60

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 4	Under-grad 16 Non-major 16
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives 5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 2	
			? 0		

Course-Section: KORE 201 1
 Title Intermediate Korean I
 Instructor: Krippes, Yeon K.
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 924
 MAR 22, 2010
 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	9	12	4.57	516/1509	4.57	4.42	4.31	4.34	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	8	13	4.62	412/1509	4.62	4.39	4.26	4.32	4.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	304/1287	4.71	4.48	4.30	4.35	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	7	12	4.50	454/1459	4.50	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	208/1406	4.68	4.19	4.09	4.09	4.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	8	12	4.52	334/1384	4.52	4.17	4.11	4.09	4.52
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	0	7	12	4.33	674/1489	4.33	4.07	4.17	4.19	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	782/1506	4.80	4.55	4.67	4.61	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	424/1463	4.44	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	617/1438	4.65	4.48	4.46	4.48	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	863/1421	4.76	4.75	4.73	4.76	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	592/1411	4.53	4.39	4.31	4.37	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	486/1405	4.65	4.45	4.32	4.39	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	1	0	3	3	9	4.19	545/1236	4.19	3.92	4.00	4.11	4.19
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1260	****	4.32	4.14	4.19	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1255	****	4.53	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1258	****	4.46	4.38	4.44	****
4. Were special techniques successful	17	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 873	****	4.14	4.03	4.04	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 1			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1	General 5	Under-grad 21	Non-major 21
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 1	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 1			

Course-Section: KORE 202 1
 Title Intermediate Korean II
 Instructor: Krippes, Yeon K.
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 925
 MAR 22, 2010
 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	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	852/1509	4.29	4.42	4.31	4.34	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	828/1509	4.29	4.39	4.26	4.32	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	453/1287	4.57	4.48	4.30	4.35	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	586/1459	4.43	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	423/1406	4.43	4.19	4.09	4.09	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	421/1384	4.43	4.17	4.11	4.09	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	1155/1489	3.83	4.07	4.17	4.19	3.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	941/1506	4.67	4.55	4.67	4.61	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	726/1463	4.17	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	1001/1438	4.33	4.48	4.46	4.48	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	1014/1421	4.67	4.75	4.73	4.76	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	936/1411	4.20	4.39	4.31	4.37	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1047/1405	4.00	4.45	4.32	4.39	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	824/1236	3.80	3.92	4.00	4.11	3.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1260	****	4.32	4.14	4.19	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1255	****	4.53	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1258	****	4.46	4.38	4.44	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors		2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	0							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General		2	Under-grad	7	Non-major	7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	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 301 1
 Title Advanced Korean
 Instructor: Yoon,Kyung-Eun
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 926
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.42	4.31	4.32	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.39	4.26	4.25	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.48	4.30	4.33	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.32	4.22	4.26	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.19	4.09	4.12	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.17	4.11	4.15	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	121/1489	4.86	4.07	4.17	4.14	4.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.55	4.67	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	209/1463	4.67	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.48	4.46	4.43	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.75	4.73	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.39	4.31	4.29	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.45	4.32	4.32	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	176/1236	4.67	3.92	4.00	4.07	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	187/1260	4.83	4.32	4.14	4.22	4.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	262/1255	4.83	4.53	4.33	4.37	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.46	4.38	4.42	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 873	5.00	4.14	4.03	4.08	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors					
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General	2	Under-grad	7	Non-major	6
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P 0						
				I 0	Other	1				
				? 0						