

Course-Section: AGNG 200 0101
 Title THE AGING EXPERIENCE
 Instructor: MAJESKI, ROBIN
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 37
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	1094/1670	4.25	4.49	4.31	4.32	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	3	3.92	1306/1666	4.17	4.46	4.27	4.27	3.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	799/1406	4.38	4.73	4.32	4.39	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	5	4	4.09	1033/1615	4.28	4.43	4.24	4.29	4.09
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	4	3	3.58	1241/1566	3.92	4.58	4.07	4.00	3.58
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	4	6	4.17	787/1528	4.16	4.48	4.12	4.11	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	3	5	3.92	1263/1650	4.28	4.57	4.22	4.20	3.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	1097/1667	4.45	4.80	4.67	4.64	4.58
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	5	1	2	3.63	1335/1626	3.97	4.18	4.11	4.06	3.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	8	3	4.17	1218/1559	4.44	4.60	4.46	4.40	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	1180/1560	4.70	4.65	4.72	4.73	4.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	1053/1549	4.44	4.24	4.31	4.25	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	1040/1546	4.52	4.59	4.32	4.30	4.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	423/1323	4.40	4.06	4.00	4.08	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	670/1384	4.55	4.58	4.10	4.07	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	603/1378	4.54	4.77	4.29	4.25	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	777/1378	4.58	4.79	4.31	4.26	4.38
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	461/ 904	4.00	4.40	4.03	4.01	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required for Majors 5	Graduate 1	Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 2			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 11	Non-major 12
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 2		
				? 0			

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	4	0	0	2	3	2	14	4.33	902/1670	4.25	4.49	4.31	4.32	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	3	6	12	4.43	751/1666	4.17	4.46	4.27	4.27	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	3	6	12	4.43	691/1406	4.38	4.73	4.32	4.39	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	1	2	4	14	4.48	592/1615	4.28	4.43	4.24	4.29	4.48
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	4	3	11	4.26	632/1566	3.92	4.58	4.07	4.00	4.26
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	4	6	9	4.15	796/1528	4.16	4.48	4.12	4.11	4.15
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	372/1650	4.28	4.57	4.22	4.20	4.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	1	0	0	9	9	4.32	1326/1667	4.45	4.80	4.67	4.64	4.32
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	670/1626	3.97	4.18	4.11	4.06	4.31
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	0	3	17	4.71	589/1559	4.44	4.60	4.46	4.40	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	855/1560	4.70	4.65	4.72	4.73	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	2	17	4.71	424/1549	4.44	4.24	4.31	4.25	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	288/1546	4.52	4.59	4.32	4.30	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	3	6	11	4.40	423/1323	4.40	4.06	4.00	4.08	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	195/1384	4.55	4.58	4.10	4.07	4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	3	0	11	4.57	548/1378	4.54	4.77	4.29	4.25	4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	407/1378	4.58	4.79	4.31	4.26	4.79
4. Were special techniques successful	11	8	1	1	0	1	3	3.67	****/ 904	4.00	4.40	4.03	4.01	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.33	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	4.25	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	4.20	4.65	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	3.75	4.64	4.75	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 75	****	3.33	4.57	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	2.80	4.45	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	3.75	3.97	4.30	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	2.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	2.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: AGNG 200 0201
 Title THE AGING EXPERIENCE
 Instructor: DE MEDEIROS, KA
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 38
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	25	Non-major	19
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	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	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AGNG 300 0101
 Title OVERVIEW: AGING SERVIC
 Instructor: MAJESKI, ROBIN
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 39
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	479/1670	4.67	4.49	4.31	4.24	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	556/1666	4.56	4.46	4.27	4.18	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	295/1406	4.78	4.73	4.32	4.22	4.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	499/1615	4.56	4.43	4.24	4.18	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	295/1566	4.67	4.58	4.07	4.04	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	300/1528	4.67	4.48	4.12	4.07	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	806/1650	4.33	4.57	4.22	4.12	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.80	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	1152/1626	3.88	4.18	4.11	4.06	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	486/1559	4.78	4.60	4.46	4.40	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	673/1560	4.88	4.65	4.72	4.67	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	229/1549	4.88	4.24	4.31	4.25	4.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	407/1546	4.75	4.59	4.32	4.24	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	260/1323	4.63	4.06	4.00	3.99	4.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	285/1384	4.71	4.58	4.10	4.12	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	441/1378	4.71	4.77	4.29	4.30	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	333/1378	4.86	4.79	4.31	4.33	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	179/ 904	4.67	4.40	4.03	4.03	4.67

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	1 Graduate 0 Major 5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 2		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0 Under-grad 10 Non-major 5
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	6
			? 0		

Course-Section: AGNG 401 0101
 Title FOUNDATIONS - AGING SV
 Instructor: WEPPRECHT, MARI
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 40
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	4	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	621/1670	4.55	4.49	4.31	4.45	4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	703/1666	4.45	4.46	4.27	4.35	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	459/1406	4.64	4.73	4.32	4.48	4.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	412/1615	4.64	4.43	4.24	4.37	4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	181/1566	4.82	4.58	4.07	4.17	4.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	391/1528	4.55	4.48	4.12	4.26	4.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	513/1650	4.55	4.57	4.22	4.28	4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	842/1667	4.82	4.80	4.67	4.73	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	637/1626	4.33	4.18	4.11	4.28	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	2	0	1	8	4.36	1062/1559	4.36	4.60	4.46	4.58	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.65	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	525/1549	4.64	4.24	4.31	4.43	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	1040/1546	4.18	4.59	4.32	4.43	4.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	567/1323	4.22	4.06	4.00	4.10	4.22
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	4	5	4.20	712/1384	4.20	4.58	4.10	4.32	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	0	0	9	4.70	459/1378	4.70	4.77	4.29	4.55	4.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	0	0	9	4.70	501/1378	4.70	4.79	4.31	4.60	4.70
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	1	3	1	4	3.89	577/ 904	3.89	4.40	4.03	4.22	3.89

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	1 Graduate 0 Major 4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 1		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	2 Under-grad 15 Non-major 11
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	6
			? 0		

Course-Section: AGNG 422 0101
 Title RESEARCH APPLICATIONS
 Instructor: ASH, JEFFREY R
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 41
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	363/1670	4.75	4.49	4.31	4.45	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	312/1666	4.75	4.46	4.27	4.35	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	318/1406	4.75	4.73	4.32	4.48	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	874/1615	4.25	4.43	4.24	4.37	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	389/1566	4.50	4.58	4.07	4.17	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	421/1528	4.50	4.48	4.12	4.26	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.57	4.22	4.28	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1368/1667	4.25	4.80	4.67	4.73	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	278/1626	4.67	4.18	4.11	4.28	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	521/1559	4.75	4.60	4.46	4.58	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	948/1560	4.75	4.65	4.72	4.80	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.24	4.31	4.43	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.59	4.32	4.43	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1295/1323	2.00	4.06	4.00	4.10	2.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	257/1384	4.75	4.58	4.10	4.32	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.77	4.29	4.55	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.79	4.31	4.60	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	461/ 904	4.00	4.40	4.03	4.22	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	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	4
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
					Other
					4

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: AGNG 461 0101
 Title INTERNSHIP/AGING SVCS
 Instructor: ADLER, DEBORAH
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 42
 AUG 6, 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		

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	2	0	1	2.80	1640/1670	2.80	4.49	4.31	4.45	2.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	1603/1666	3.00	4.46	4.27	4.35	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1565/1615	3.00	4.43	4.24	4.37	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1233/1528	3.60	4.48	4.12	4.26	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	0	0	2	3.50	1460/1650	3.50	4.57	4.22	4.28	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.80	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	1534/1626	3.00	4.18	4.11	4.28	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1559	****	4.60	4.46	4.58	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1524/1560	3.50	4.65	4.72	4.80	3.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	1534/1549	2.00	4.24	4.31	4.43	2.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1546	****	4.59	4.32	4.43	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1103/1384	3.50	4.58	4.10	4.32	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	603/1378	4.50	4.77	4.29	4.55	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	653/1378	4.50	4.79	4.31	4.60	4.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	70/ 87	4.20	4.20	4.65	4.80	4.20
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	1	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	74/ 79	3.75	3.75	4.64	4.60	3.75
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	73/ 75	3.33	3.33	4.57	4.56	3.33
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	2	0	2.80	77/ 79	2.80	2.80	4.45	4.53	2.80
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	1	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	51/ 80	3.75	3.75	3.97	3.67	3.75

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: AGNG 470 0101
 Title CAPSTONE SEMINAR
 Instructor: RONCH, JUDAH (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 43
 AUG 6, 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	0	0	2	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.49	4.31	4.45	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.46	4.27	4.35	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.73	4.32	4.48	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.43	4.24	4.37	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.58	4.07	4.17	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.48	4.12	4.26	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.57	4.22	4.28	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.80	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	403/1626	4.50	4.18	4.11	4.28	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.58	4.10	4.32	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.77	4.29	4.55	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.79	4.31	4.60	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	4.40	4.03	4.22	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 1	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 2	Non-major 0
84-150	1	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: AGNG 470 0101
 Title CAPSTONE SEMINAR
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 44
 AUG 6, 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	0	0	2	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.49	4.31	4.45	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.46	4.27	4.35	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.73	4.32	4.48	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.43	4.24	4.37	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.58	4.07	4.17	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.48	4.12	4.26	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.57	4.22	4.28	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.80	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	403/1626	4.50	4.18	4.11	4.28	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.58	4.10	4.32	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.77	4.29	4.55	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.79	4.31	4.60	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	4.40	4.03	4.22	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 1	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 2	Non-major 0
84-150	1	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: AGNG 470 0101
 Title CAPSTONE SEMINAR
 Instructor: (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 45
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	0	2	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.49	4.31	4.45	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.46	4.27	4.35	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.73	4.32	4.48	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.43	4.24	4.37	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.58	4.07	4.17	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.48	4.12	4.26	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.57	4.22	4.28	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.80	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	403/1626	4.50	4.18	4.11	4.28	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.58	4.10	4.32	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.77	4.29	4.55	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.79	4.31	4.60	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	4.40	4.03	4.22	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

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	0	1	25	4.96	83/1670	****	4.51	4.31	4.23	4.96
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	3	21	4.73	333/1666	****	4.52	4.27	4.30	4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	191/1406	****	4.52	4.32	4.31	4.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	189/1615	****	4.45	4.24	4.17	4.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	1	22	4.62	331/1566	****	4.39	4.07	4.03	4.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	2	21	4.76	211/1528	****	4.40	4.12	4.00	4.76
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	4	21	4.73	289/1650	****	4.51	4.22	4.28	4.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1667	****	4.86	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	199/1626	****	4.34	4.11	4.07	4.81
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	24	4.92	221/1559	****	4.65	4.46	4.47	4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/1560	****	4.87	4.72	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	4	20	4.69	451/1549	****	4.48	4.31	4.32	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	1	23	4.73	432/1546	****	4.51	4.32	4.32	4.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	3	0	4	5	13	4.00	692/1323	****	4.13	4.00	3.91	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	68/1384	****	4.63	4.10	3.92	4.96
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	0	24	4.92	194/1378	****	4.75	4.29	4.09	4.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	113/1378	****	4.89	4.31	4.08	4.96
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	100/ 904	****	4.22	4.03	3.94	4.92
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 87	****	4.95	4.65	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 75	****	4.97	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.72	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 80	****	4.22	3.97	3.99	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	26	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	1	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	26	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	27				
				?	0						

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	0	1	25	4.96	83/1670	****	4.51	4.31	4.23	4.96
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	3	21	4.73	333/1666	****	4.52	4.27	4.30	4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	191/1406	****	4.52	4.32	4.31	4.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	189/1615	****	4.45	4.24	4.17	4.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	1	22	4.62	331/1566	****	4.39	4.07	4.03	4.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	2	21	4.76	211/1528	****	4.40	4.12	4.00	4.76
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	4	21	4.73	289/1650	****	4.51	4.22	4.28	4.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1667	****	4.86	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	141/1626	****	4.34	4.11	4.07	4.81
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	248/1559	****	4.65	4.46	4.47	4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1560	****	4.87	4.72	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	0	5	17	4.65	500/1549	****	4.48	4.31	4.32	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	116/1546	****	4.51	4.32	4.32	4.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	3	0	3	4	12	4.00	692/1323	****	4.13	4.00	3.91	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	68/1384	****	4.63	4.10	3.92	4.96
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	0	24	4.92	194/1378	****	4.75	4.29	4.09	4.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	113/1378	****	4.89	4.31	4.08	4.96
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	100/ 904	****	4.22	4.03	3.94	4.92
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 87	****	4.95	4.65	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 75	****	4.97	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.72	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 80	****	4.22	3.97	3.99	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	26	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	1	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	26	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	27				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AGNG 605 0101
 Title MANAG & POLI ECONOMICS
 Instructor: GRIBBIN, JOSEPH
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 46
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	1	6	16	4.65	492/1670	4.65	4.49	4.31	4.46	4.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	9	13	4.52	595/1666	4.52	4.46	4.27	4.34	4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	483/1406	4.62	4.73	4.32	4.36	4.62
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	7	11	4.27	849/1615	4.27	4.43	4.24	4.33	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	8	13	4.39	500/1566	4.39	4.58	4.07	4.20	4.39
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	7	10	4.13	814/1528	4.13	4.48	4.12	4.33	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	6	17	4.74	289/1650	4.74	4.57	4.22	4.30	4.74
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.80	4.67	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	9	10	4.53	387/1626	4.53	4.18	4.11	4.20	4.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	0	21	4.83	403/1559	4.83	4.60	4.46	4.49	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.65	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	10	10	4.32	924/1549	4.32	4.24	4.31	4.37	4.32
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	8	14	4.57	643/1546	4.57	4.59	4.32	4.40	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	205/1323	4.71	4.06	4.00	4.03	4.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	2	17	4.55	409/1384	4.55	4.58	4.10	4.21	4.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	1	1	19	4.73	431/1378	4.73	4.77	4.29	4.42	4.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	470/1378	4.73	4.79	4.31	4.51	4.73
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	1	3	4	4	7	3.68	662/ 904	3.68	4.40	4.03	4.04	3.68
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	4.20	4.65	4.61	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	3.75	4.64	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	3.33	4.57	4.66	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	2.80	4.45	4.58	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	3.75	3.97	4.32	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	22	Major	22
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	1	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	22	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	24	4.92	165/1670	****	4.51	4.31	4.23	4.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	22	4.85	224/1666	****	4.52	4.27	4.30	4.85	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	226/1406	****	4.52	4.32	4.31	4.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	390/1615	****	4.45	4.24	4.17	4.65	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	25	4.96	53/1566	****	4.39	4.07	4.03	4.96	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	20	4.62	338/1528	****	4.40	4.12	4.00	4.62	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	3	20	4.65	372/1650	****	4.51	4.22	4.28	4.65	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1667	****	4.86	4.67	4.61	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	126/1626	****	4.34	4.11	4.07	4.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/1559	****	4.65	4.46	4.47	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/1560	****	4.87	4.72	4.68	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/1549	****	4.48	4.31	4.32	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	24	4.92	185/1546	****	4.51	4.32	4.32	4.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	4	2	20	4.62	266/1323	****	4.13	4.00	3.91	4.62	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	23	4.81	221/1384	****	4.63	4.10	3.92	4.81	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	2	23	4.85	306/1378	****	4.75	4.29	4.09	4.85	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	25	4.92	225/1378	****	4.89	4.31	4.08	4.92	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	2	0	3	17	4.59	206/ 904	****	4.22	4.03	3.94	4.59	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 232	****	3.79	4.19	4.25	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors		0	Graduate	26	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General		0	Under-grad	0	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0							
Grad.	26	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives		0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		26				
				?	0							