

Course-Section: HAPP 100 0101
 Title SURVEY US HLTH CARE SY
 Instructor: RILEY, JOYCE L.
 Enrollment: 48
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 860
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	3	0	0	0	2	3	23	4.75	320/1522	4.75	4.67	4.30	4.14	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	4	24	4.86	164/1522	4.86	4.60	4.26	4.18	4.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	3	25	4.89	157/1285	4.89	4.54	4.30	4.22	4.89	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	11	1	0	0	4	12	4.53	454/1476	4.53	4.42	4.22	4.09	4.53	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	2	2	6	16	4.14	663/1412	4.14	4.09	4.06	4.01	4.14	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	19	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	136/1381	4.78	4.34	4.08	3.93	4.78	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	0	2	26	4.93	87/1500	4.93	4.67	4.18	4.16	4.93	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.74	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	0	0	2	13	4	4.11	833/1497	4.11	4.25	4.11	4.02	4.11	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	0	26	4.93	153/1440	4.93	4.88	4.45	4.40	4.93	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	4	23	4.85	629/1448	4.85	4.91	4.71	4.63	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	2	25	4.93	98/1436	4.93	4.77	4.29	4.24	4.93	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	3	24	4.89	187/1432	4.89	4.76	4.29	4.23	4.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	5	0	0	6	4	12	4.27	448/1221	4.27	4.38	3.93	3.86	4.27	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	311/1280	4.63	4.51	4.10	3.92	4.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	508/1277	4.63	4.46	4.34	4.13	4.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	493/1269	4.63	4.66	4.31	4.04	4.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	11	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	****/ 854	****	4.32	4.02	3.87	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	****	4.23	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	4.11	****	

Course-Section: HAPP 100 0101
 Title SURVEY US HLTH CARE SY
 Instructor: RILEY, JOYCE L.
 Enrollment: 48
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 860
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	16	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	5	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	31	Non-major	15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	21				
				?	1						

Course-Section: HAPP 200 0101
 Title HMN DEV IMPL HLTH/DISE
 Instructor: TURNER, PATRICI
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 861
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	0	3	3	8	4.36	791/1522	4.36	4.67	4.30	4.34	4.36	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	2	4	1	7	3.93	1168/1522	3.93	4.60	4.26	4.29	3.93	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	6	5	2	3.57	1147/1285	3.57	4.54	4.30	4.36	3.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	4	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	1127/1476	3.90	4.42	4.22	4.20	3.90	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	0	3	4	4	3.83	948/1412	3.83	4.09	4.06	4.00	3.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	5	3	3	3.82	1008/1381	3.82	4.34	4.08	3.97	3.82	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	3	4	6	4.07	950/1500	4.07	4.67	4.18	4.20	4.07	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	11	2	4.15	1325/1517	4.15	4.74	4.65	4.63	4.15	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	898/1497	4.00	4.25	4.11	4.11	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	353/1440	4.80	4.88	4.45	4.42	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	395/1448	4.93	4.91	4.71	4.78	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	696/1436	4.43	4.77	4.29	4.29	4.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	732/1432	4.43	4.76	4.29	4.31	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	1	3	9	4.36	394/1221	4.36	4.38	3.93	4.02	4.36	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	677/1280	4.11	4.51	4.10	4.08	4.11	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	1	2	0	4	3.63	1106/1277	3.63	4.46	4.34	4.33	3.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	637/1269	4.44	4.66	4.31	4.33	4.44	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.56	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.51	4.57	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.72	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	****	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: Happ 398 0101
 Title Global Issues in Health & Disease
 Instructor: Jeffrey, Jeanette
 Enrollment: 0
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 8
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	8	0	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	482/1522	****	4.69	4.30	4.14	4.62	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	8	0	0	0	5	3	13	4.38	726/1522	****	4.64	4.26	4.18	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	8	0	0	1	1	4	15	4.57	456/1285	****	4.72	4.30	4.22	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	8	0	0	0	1	7	13	4.57	406/1476	****	4.58	4.22	4.09	4.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	3	6	11	4.24	585/1412	****	4.57	4.06	4.01	4.24	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	4	0	0	1	8	8	4.41	423/1381	****	4.28	4.08	3.93	4.41	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8	0	0	0	2	6	13	4.52	463/1500	****	4.45	4.18	4.16	4.52	
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	0	7	15	4.68	911/1517	****	4.72	4.65	4.62	4.68	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	1	8	10	4.47	421/1497	****	4.43	4.11	4.02	4.47	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	1	5	6	10	4.14	1130/1440	****	4.68	4.45	4.40	4.14	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1448	****	4.95	4.71	4.63	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	4	5	12	4.38	741/1436	****	4.57	4.29	4.24	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	4	5	12	4.38	775/1432	****	4.55	4.29	4.23	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	144/1221	****	3.94	3.93	3.86	4.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	324/1280	****	4.72	4.10	3.92	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	263/1277	****	4.80	4.34	4.13	4.87	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	156/1269	****	4.82	4.31	4.04	4.93	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	5	1	1	1	3	4	3.80	569/ 854	****	4.55	4.02	3.87	3.80	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 11	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	12
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 29
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	7
			? 1		

Course-Section: HAPP 401 0101
 Title OCCUPTNL HLTH POL & PR
 Instructor: NETZER, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 862
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	1	4	23	4.79	275/1522	4.79	4.67	4.30	4.42	4.79	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	6	20	4.70	310/1522	4.70	4.60	4.26	4.34	4.70	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	24	4.82	212/1285	4.82	4.54	4.30	4.42	4.82	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	11	14	4.44	566/1476	4.44	4.42	4.22	4.31	4.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	5	10	11	4.11	688/1412	4.11	4.09	4.06	4.11	4.11	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	1	5	5	13	4.12	733/1381	4.12	4.34	4.08	4.21	4.12	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	5	22	4.75	211/1500	4.75	4.67	4.18	4.25	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	25	4.89	509/1517	4.89	4.74	4.65	4.71	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	0	0	1	9	7	4.35	554/1497	4.35	4.25	4.11	4.21	4.35	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	23	4.82	320/1440	4.82	4.88	4.45	4.52	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	4	23	4.85	629/1448	4.85	4.91	4.71	4.75	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	3	22	4.81	217/1436	4.81	4.77	4.29	4.32	4.81	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	25	4.89	187/1432	4.89	4.76	4.29	4.34	4.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	5	21	4.74	129/1221	4.74	4.38	3.93	4.04	4.74	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	207/1280	4.77	4.51	4.10	4.28	4.77	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	409/1277	4.73	4.46	4.34	4.50	4.73	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	6	15	4.64	485/1269	4.64	4.66	4.31	4.49	4.64	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	7	1	0	2	5	7	4.13	396/ 854	4.13	4.32	4.02	4.31	4.13	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.51	4.55	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.20	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	4.65	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	4.58	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.11	4.14	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.51	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	4.22	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.03	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.13	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.33	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.92	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	4.25	****	

Course-Section: HAPP 401 0101
 Title OCCUPTNL HLTH POL & PR
 Instructor: NETZER, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 862
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	19	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	29	Non-major	16
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	6	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	24				
				?	1						

Course-Section: HAPP 498 0101
 Title FINAN MGMT & DEC SUPP
 Instructor: COAKLEY, PAUL
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 863
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	5	0	0	0	0	5	19	4.79	260/1522	4.79	4.67	4.30	4.42	4.79	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	115/1522	4.92	4.60	4.26	4.34	4.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	181/1285	4.87	4.54	4.30	4.42	4.87	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	1	0	0	1	2	20	4.83	167/1476	4.83	4.42	4.22	4.31	4.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	3	4	14	4.26	557/1412	4.26	4.09	4.06	4.11	4.26	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	1	0	1	1	3	18	4.65	214/1381	4.65	4.34	4.08	4.21	4.65	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	98/1500	4.92	4.67	4.18	4.25	4.92	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	438/1517	4.92	4.74	4.65	4.71	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	2	0	0	0	8	9	4.53	370/1497	4.53	4.25	4.11	4.21	4.53	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	96/1440	4.96	4.88	4.45	4.52	4.96	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.91	4.71	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	110/1436	4.92	4.77	4.29	4.32	4.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	254/1432	4.83	4.76	4.29	4.34	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	2	0	3	5	12	4.14	548/1221	4.14	4.38	3.93	4.04	4.14	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	376/1280	4.53	4.51	4.10	4.28	4.53	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	254/1277	4.88	4.46	4.34	4.50	4.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	156/1269	4.94	4.66	4.31	4.49	4.94	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	7	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	194/ 854	4.50	4.32	4.02	4.31	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	19	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	19
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	29	Non-major	10
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	6	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	21				
				?	0						