

Course-Section: KORE 101 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY KOREAN I
 Instructor: LEE, YONGHUN
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 956
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	2	2	18	4.73	295/1504	4.73	4.24	4.27	4.13	4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	7	12	4.41	649/1503	4.41	4.22	4.20	4.16	4.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	7	14	4.59	421/1290	4.59	4.32	4.28	4.19	4.59
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	3	3	7	8	3.95	1052/1453	3.95	4.22	4.21	4.11	3.95
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	3	6	11	4.40	410/1421	4.40	4.08	4.00	3.91	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	8	4	8	3.73	1025/1365	3.73	4.11	4.08	3.96	3.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	2	8	3	7	3.62	1242/1485	3.62	4.20	4.16	4.13	3.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	726/1504	4.86	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	3	10	7	4.10	798/1483	4.10	4.07	4.06	3.97	4.10
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	8	11	4.38	920/1425	4.38	4.41	4.41	4.36	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	1	3	16	4.62	1036/1426	4.62	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	3	6	11	4.29	818/1418	4.29	4.29	4.25	4.20	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	5	15	4.62	511/1416	4.62	4.34	4.26	4.21	4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	12	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	757/1199	3.89	3.95	3.97	3.82	3.89
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	2	6	2	4.00	716/1312	4.00	4.12	4.00	3.69	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	833/1303	4.20	4.39	4.24	3.93	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	1	3	3	2	3.40	1140/1299	3.40	4.34	4.25	3.94	3.40
4. Were special techniques successful	13	3	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	563/ 758	3.57	4.05	4.01	3.80	3.57
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.07	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 244	****	4.12	4.09	4.07	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 227	****	4.49	4.40	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 225	****	4.40	4.23	4.01	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 207	****	4.22	4.09	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	4.60	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 70	****	4.54	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 67	****	4.32	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	4.41	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	****	4.17	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	3.98	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 56	****	4.12	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.68	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	4.32	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.61	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	4.28	4.53	4.52	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	35	****	4.43	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	36	****	4.38	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	20	****	5.00	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	16	****	5.00	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: KORE 101 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY KOREAN I
 Instructor: LEE, YONGHUN
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 956
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	6	Under-grad	23	Non-major	5
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: KORE 102 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY KOREAN II
 Instructor: LEE, YONGHUN
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 957
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	2	0	1	0	0	6	4	4.09	1052/1504	4.09	4.24	4.27	4.13	4.09
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	0	1	6	3	3.91	1136/1503	3.91	4.22	4.20	4.16	3.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	839/1290	4.18	4.32	4.28	4.19	4.18
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	3	6	1	3.64	1241/1453	3.64	4.22	4.21	4.11	3.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	4	4	1	3.27	1232/1421	3.27	4.08	4.00	3.91	3.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	4	3	3	3.64	1084/1365	3.64	4.11	4.08	3.96	3.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	2	2	4	1	3.00	1387/1485	3.00	4.20	4.16	4.13	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	1	0	0	0	10	4.64	1006/1504	4.64	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	8	0	3.89	1009/1483	3.89	4.07	4.06	3.97	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	1165/1425	4.00	4.41	4.41	4.36	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	825/1426	4.75	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	848/1418	4.25	4.29	4.25	4.20	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	776/1416	4.38	4.34	4.26	4.21	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	3	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	636/1199	4.00	3.95	3.97	3.82	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	364/1312	4.50	4.12	4.00	3.69	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	910/1303	4.00	4.39	4.24	3.93	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	798/1299	4.25	4.34	4.25	3.94	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	648/ 758	3.25	4.05	4.01	3.80	3.25

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	3	Under-grad	13	Non-major	8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: KORE 201 0101
 Title INTERMEDIATE KOREAN I
 Instructor: SHIN, JONG
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 958
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	6	6	4.50	549/1504	4.50	4.24	4.27	4.26	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	7	4.42	633/1503	4.42	4.22	4.20	4.18	4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	344/1290	4.67	4.32	4.28	4.27	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	4	4	3.83	1148/1453	3.83	4.22	4.21	4.20	3.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	320/1421	4.50	4.08	4.00	3.90	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	0	4	4	3.90	903/1365	3.90	4.11	4.08	4.00	3.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	0	3	6	3.92	1076/1485	3.92	4.20	4.16	4.15	3.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	1087/1504	4.50	4.68	4.69	4.68	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	602/1483	4.29	4.07	4.06	4.02	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	474/1425	4.73	4.41	4.41	4.40	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	414/1418	4.64	4.29	4.25	4.22	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	366/1416	4.73	4.34	4.26	4.24	4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	0	1	3	1	2	3.57	894/1199	3.57	3.95	3.97	3.95	3.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	255/1312	4.67	4.12	4.00	3.98	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	268/1303	4.83	4.39	4.24	4.23	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	3	1	1	3.33	1153/1299	3.33	4.34	4.25	4.21	3.33
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 758	****	4.05	4.01	3.89	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	12	Non-major	6
84-150	1	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	3				
				?	0						