

Course-Section: WMST 100 0101  
 Title INTRO WOMEN'S STUDIES  
 Instructor: KELBER-KAYE, JO  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1675  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 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	1	1	4	17	4.61	485/1674	4.43	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.61	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	14	4.48	625/1674	4.33	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.48	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	18	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/1423	****	4.36	4.27	4.16	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	9	13	4.52	466/1609	4.42	4.23	4.22	4.05	4.52	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	6	14	4.43	386/1585	4.39	4.04	3.96	3.88	4.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	8	13	4.48	413/1535	4.31	4.08	4.08	3.89	4.48	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	5	15	4.52	497/1651	4.36	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.52	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	15	4.65	1082/1673	4.37	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.65	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	7	14	4.59	317/1656	4.37	4.06	4.07	3.96	4.59	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	10	9	4.22	1176/1586	4.19	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.22	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	1	21	4.83	762/1585	4.90	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	8	13	4.48	675/1582	4.33	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.48	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	4	18	4.70	453/1575	4.41	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	18	2	1	0	1	1	2.60	****/1380	****	3.94	3.94	3.78	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	191/1520	4.73	4.14	4.01	3.76	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	2	2	16	4.70	453/1515	4.68	4.37	4.24	3.97	4.70	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	0	19	4.90	244/1511	4.78	4.37	4.27	4.00	4.90	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	1	1	2	6	8	4.06	459/ 994	3.75	3.97	3.94	3.73	4.06	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	3.91	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	15	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	6	Under-grad	23	Non-major	5
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	1						

Course-Section: WMST 100 0201  
 Title INTRO WOMEN'S STUDIES  
 Instructor: KELBER-KAYE, JO  
 Enrollment: 39  
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1676  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 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	1	6	9	16	4.25	954/1674	4.43	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	2	14	14	4.19	1009/1674	4.33	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.19	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	28	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/1423	****	4.36	4.27	4.16	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	14	14	4.32	757/1609	4.42	4.23	4.22	4.05	4.32	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	5	7	18	4.35	462/1585	4.39	4.04	3.96	3.88	4.35	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	3	14	11	4.13	797/1535	4.31	4.08	4.08	3.89	4.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	5	8	16	4.19	934/1651	4.36	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.19	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	28	3	4.10	1529/1673	4.37	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.10	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	5	13	9	4.15	849/1656	4.37	4.06	4.07	3.96	4.15	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	3	2	12	13	4.17	1211/1586	4.19	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.17	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	31	4.97	227/1585	4.90	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.97	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	2	16	12	4.19	1007/1582	4.33	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.19	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	2	14	12	4.13	1080/1575	4.41	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	25	3	1	1	1	1	2.43	****/1380	****	3.94	3.94	3.78	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	8	21	4.67	295/1520	4.73	4.14	4.01	3.76	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	8	21	4.67	483/1515	4.68	4.37	4.24	3.97	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	2	2	25	4.67	507/1511	4.78	4.37	4.27	4.00	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	3	2	8	5	7	3.44	763/ 994	3.75	3.97	3.94	3.73	3.44	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	3.42	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	3.87	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	30	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	4.39	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	5	A 16	Required for Majors 10	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B 15			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C 0	General 9	Under-grad 32	Non-major 4
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 8		
				? 0			

Course-Section: WMST 200 0101  
 Title STUDIES IN FEM ACTIVIS  
 Instructor: KELBER-KAYE, JO  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1677  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 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	1	1	6	4.63	458/1674	4.63	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	776/1674	4.38	4.26	4.23	4.26	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	1016/1423	4.00	4.36	4.27	4.36	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	687/1609	4.38	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	251/1585	4.63	4.04	3.96	3.91	4.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	310/1535	4.57	4.08	4.08	4.03	4.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	1	4	3.75	1324/1651	3.75	4.20	4.18	4.20	3.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	958/1673	4.75	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	136/1656	4.83	4.06	4.07	4.10	4.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	974/1586	4.43	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	1166/1585	4.57	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.57	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	0	5	4.29	903/1582	4.29	4.30	4.26	4.35	4.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	1060/1575	4.14	4.32	4.27	4.39	4.14	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	540/1380	4.20	3.94	3.94	4.03	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	397/1520	4.50	4.14	4.01	4.03	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	523/1515	4.63	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	414/1511	4.75	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	160/ 994	4.63	3.97	3.94	3.98	4.63	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.34	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.42	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.48	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.07	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.22	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	8
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Major 0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1		
				Other	4

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

Course-Section: WMST 210 0101  
 Title LESBIAN AND GAY STUDIE  
 Instructor: CUTTS, RHONA  
 Enrollment: 33  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1678  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 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	2	1	1	5	8	3.94	1271/1674	3.94	4.23	4.27	4.32	3.94	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	6	7	3.94	1221/1674	3.94	4.26	4.23	4.26	3.94	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	459/1423	4.60	4.36	4.27	4.36	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	1	5	8	4.13	1007/1609	4.13	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	4	7	4.00	769/1585	4.00	4.04	3.96	3.91	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	6	7	4.27	655/1535	4.27	4.08	4.08	4.03	4.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	4	3	8	4.06	1057/1651	4.06	4.20	4.18	4.20	4.06	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	3	4	3	3.82	1192/1656	3.82	4.06	4.07	4.10	3.82	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	2	2	9	4.20	1191/1586	4.20	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.20	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	811/1585	4.80	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	2	2	9	4.20	998/1582	4.20	4.30	4.26	4.35	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	1	3	9	4.20	1010/1575	4.20	4.32	4.27	4.39	4.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	1	2	2	7	4.00	666/1380	4.00	3.94	3.94	4.03	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	1	2	10	4.27	635/1520	4.27	4.14	4.01	4.03	4.27	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	543/1515	4.60	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	1	2	11	4.53	618/1511	4.53	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.53	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	1	1	1	4	7	4.07	453/ 994	4.07	3.97	3.94	3.98	4.07	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.07	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	3.97	****	
Self Paced															
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	4.53	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General 8	Under-grad 17	Non-major 7
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 2		
				? 0			

Course-Section: WMST 310 0101  
 Title GENDER AND INEQUALITY  
 Instructor: MCCANN, CAROLE  
 Enrollment: 37  
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1679  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 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	2	0	4	12	11	4.03	1171/1674	4.15	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.03	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	6	6	15	4.21	980/1674	4.31	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.21	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	18	0	1	2	1	7	4.27	828/1423	4.39	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.27	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	2	2	5	17	4.30	799/1609	4.41	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.30	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	1	8	16	4.32	492/1585	4.43	4.04	3.96	3.95	4.32	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	2	7	16	4.21	715/1535	4.36	4.08	4.08	4.15	4.21	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	3	1	3	8	12	3.93	1201/1651	4.12	4.20	4.18	4.16	3.93	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	1	4	19	3	3.79	1637/1673	4.19	4.65	4.69	4.68	3.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	2	1	4	9	6	3.73	1260/1656	3.96	4.06	4.07	4.07	3.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	3	3	22	4.55	805/1586	4.56	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.55	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	2	2	24	4.66	1083/1585	4.78	4.72	4.69	4.66	4.66	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	1	4	8	14	4.07	1099/1582	4.28	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.07	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	2	7	18	4.34	876/1575	4.47	4.32	4.27	4.25	4.34	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	1	2	7	6	9	3.80	866/1380	4.18	3.94	3.94	4.01	3.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	1	7	12	4.38	529/1520	4.47	4.14	4.01	4.09	4.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	2	4	7	7	3.95	1080/1515	4.36	4.37	4.24	4.32	3.95	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	2	1	3	14	4.45	707/1511	4.67	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.45	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	12	4	0	2	0	2	2.50	964/ 994	2.89	3.97	3.94	3.96	2.50	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.49	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.33	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.18	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	4.29	****	

Course-Section: WMST 310 0101  
 Title GENDER AND INEQUALITY  
 Instructor: MCCANN, CAROLE  
 Enrollment: 37  
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1679  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 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	10	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	6	C	3	General	10	Under-grad	29	Non-major	6
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	2						

Course-Section: WMST 310 0201  
 Title GENDER AND INEQUALITY  
 Instructor: TAYLOR, DABRINA  
 Enrollment: 32  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1680  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 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	1	3	7	11	4.27	928/1674	4.15	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.27	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	12	4.41	737/1674	4.31	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.41	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	16	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	575/1423	4.39	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	5	14	4.52	466/1609	4.41	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.52	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	15	4.55	301/1585	4.43	4.04	3.96	3.95	4.55	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	7	13	4.50	373/1535	4.36	4.08	4.08	4.15	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	9	10	4.32	795/1651	4.12	4.20	4.18	4.16	4.32	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	1	3	17	4.59	1141/1673	4.19	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.59	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	0	0	1	11	4	4.19	805/1656	3.96	4.06	4.07	4.07	4.19	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	3	15	4.57	784/1586	4.56	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	0	19	4.90	567/1585	4.78	4.72	4.69	4.66	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	3	14	4.50	632/1582	4.28	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	3	15	4.60	579/1575	4.47	4.32	4.27	4.25	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	2	0	2	14	4.56	272/1380	4.18	3.94	3.94	4.01	4.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	0	2	14	4.56	367/1520	4.47	4.14	4.01	4.09	4.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	360/1515	4.36	4.37	4.24	4.32	4.78	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	0	17	4.89	266/1511	4.67	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.89	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	3	0	5	2	4	3.29	827/ 994	2.89	3.97	3.94	3.96	3.29	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 15		Graduate 0
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	5
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 22
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	9
			? 0		

Course-Section: WMST 325 0101  
 Title HIST/AMER WOMEN TO 187  
 Instructor: Hoyt, Marguerit  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1681  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 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	1	3	15	4.74	320/1674	4.74	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.74	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	16	4.74	292/1674	4.74	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.74	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	17	4.84	174/1423	4.84	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.84	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	397/1609	4.59	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.59	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	17	4.84	116/1585	4.84	4.04	3.96	3.95	4.84	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	6	11	4.42	481/1535	4.42	4.08	4.08	4.15	4.42	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	121/1651	4.89	4.20	4.18	4.16	4.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	742/1673	4.89	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	207/1656	4.72	4.06	4.07	4.07	4.72	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	128/1586	4.95	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.95	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	340/1585	4.95	4.72	4.69	4.66	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	17	4.84	208/1582	4.84	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.84	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	18	4.89	181/1575	4.89	4.32	4.27	4.25	4.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	1	2	6	8	4.24	505/1380	4.24	3.94	3.94	4.01	4.24	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	185/1520	4.81	4.14	4.01	4.09	4.81	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.37	4.24	4.32	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	1	1	3	2	4	3.64	687/ 994	3.64	3.97	3.94	3.96	3.64	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	3.91	****	
Field Work															
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	3.87	****	
Self Paced															
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	3.50	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 11	
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C 1	General 7
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D 0	Under-grad 19
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Non-major 0
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	
					Electives 0
					Other 7

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



Course-Section: WMST 390A 0101  
 Title WOM & GENDER US BUS HI  
 Instructor: REILLY, KEVIN  
 Enrollment: 35  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1682  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 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	4	3	13	4.45	703/1674	4.45	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.45	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	8	12	4.60	460/1674	4.60	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	13	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	493/1423	4.57	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	490/1609	4.50	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	295/1585	4.55	4.04	3.96	3.95	4.55	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	310/1535	4.58	4.08	4.08	4.15	4.58	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	497/1651	4.53	4.20	4.18	4.16	4.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	887/1673	4.80	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	8	7	4.38	561/1656	4.38	4.06	4.07	4.07	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	0	2	17	4.70	618/1586	4.70	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	340/1585	4.95	4.72	4.69	4.66	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	452/1582	4.65	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.65	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	279/1575	4.80	4.32	4.27	4.25	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	4	2	13	4.30	447/1380	4.30	3.94	3.94	4.01	4.30	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	2	14	4.47	431/1520	4.47	4.14	4.01	4.09	4.47	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	2	0	17	4.79	348/1515	4.79	4.37	4.24	4.32	4.79	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	146/1511	4.95	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.95	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	10	1	1	1	1	5	3.89	577/ 994	3.89	3.97	3.94	3.96	3.89	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.24	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.30	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	4.29	****	

Course-Section: WMST 390A 0101  
 Title WOM & GENDER US BUS HI  
 Instructor: REILLY, KEVIN  
 Enrollment: 35  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1682  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 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	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	11	Under-grad	21	Non-major	2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: WMST 390B 0101  
 Title GENDER & THE ENVIRONME  
 Instructor: STUPSKI, KAREN  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1683  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 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	2	10	4.69	367/1674	4.69	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	705/1674	4.43	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	376/1423	4.67	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	1	10	4.54	455/1609	4.54	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	116/1585	4.85	4.04	3.96	3.95	4.85	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	253/1535	4.64	4.08	4.08	4.15	4.64	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	1	11	4.57	432/1651	4.57	4.20	4.18	4.16	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	796/1673	4.86	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	693/1656	4.27	4.06	4.07	4.07	4.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	431/1586	4.79	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.66	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	366/1582	4.71	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	311/1575	4.79	4.32	4.27	4.25	4.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	213/1380	4.64	3.94	3.94	4.01	4.64	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	379/1520	4.54	4.14	4.01	4.09	4.54	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	778/1515	4.38	4.37	4.24	4.32	4.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	553/1511	4.62	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.62	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	148/ 994	4.67	3.97	3.94	3.96	4.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.26	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.49	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.33	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.18	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	4.29	****	

Course-Section: WMST 390B 0101  
 Title GENDER & THE ENVIRONME  
 Instructor: STUPSKI, KAREN  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1683  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	7	Under-grad	14	Non-major	1
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	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	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: WMST 480 0101  
 Title THEORIES OF FEMINISM  
 Instructor: MCCANN, CAROLE  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1684  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 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	10	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.23	4.27	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	338/1674	4.70	4.26	4.23	4.31	4.70	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	181/1423	4.83	4.36	4.27	4.34	4.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	121/1609	4.90	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.90	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.04	3.96	4.01	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1535	5.00	4.08	4.08	4.18	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	298/1651	4.70	4.20	4.18	4.23	4.70	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	1	6	2	3.90	1624/1673	3.90	4.65	4.69	4.67	3.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	292/1656	4.63	4.06	4.07	4.19	4.63	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	214/1586	4.90	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	394/1582	4.70	4.30	4.26	4.31	4.70	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.32	4.27	4.35	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	866/1380	3.80	3.94	3.94	4.04	3.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	191/1520	4.80	4.14	4.01	4.18	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	207/1515	4.90	4.37	4.24	4.40	4.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.45	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	86/ 994	4.86	3.97	3.94	4.19	4.86	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	1
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						