Course-Section: EHS 200 0101 Title

CONCEPTS EMER HLTH SER

Instructor: KRUMPERMAN, KUR

Enrollment: 39 Questionnaires: 15 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 630 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	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	7	7	4.40	787/1576	4.40	4.60	4.30	4.35	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	568/1576	4.53	4.53	4.27	4.32	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	2	9	4.27	827/1342	4.27	4.69	4.32	4.41	4.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	805/1520	4.31	4.56	4.25	4.26	4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	4	8	4.13	768/1465	4.13	4.45	4.12	4.09	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	4	7	4.07	852/1434	4.07	4.35	4.14	4.06	4.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	827/1547	4.27	4.46	4.19	4.22	4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	1177/1574	4.43	4.69	4.64	4.62	4.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	4	5	2	3.67	1227/1554	3.67	4.13	4.10	4.05	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	547/1488	4.73	4.70	4.47	4.44	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	390/1493	4.93	4.76	4.73	4.75	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	561/1486	4.60	4.68	4.32	4.29	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	742/1489	4.47	4.62	4.32	4.31	4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	293/1277	4.53	4.67	4.03	4.01	4.53
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	419/1279	4.55	4.76	4.17	4.14	4.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	447/1270	4.73	4.84	4.35	4.30	4.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	479/1269	4.73	4.85	4.35	4.29	4.73
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	322/ 878	4.33	4.70	4.05	3.92	4.33

Frequency Distribution

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	3	Under-grad	15	Non-major	8
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	Ĺ
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EHS 310 0101 University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 631

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Title SEMINAR IN EHS MGMT Instructor: WALZ, BRUCE J Spring 2009

Enrollment: 17 Questionnaires: 15 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fr	eque:	ncie	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sec
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mea
General														
. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	2	0	11	4.50	637/1576	4.50	4.60	4.30	4.30	4.5
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	825/1576	4.36	4.53	4.27	4.28	4.3
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	12	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1342	****	4.69	4.32	4.30	* * *
1. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	511/1520	4.50	4.56	4.25	4.25	4.5
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	13	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1465	****	4.45	4.12	4.09	***
5. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	l 1	0	0	2	3	2	7	4.00	878/1434	4.00	4.35	4.14	4.15	4.0
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	492/1547	4.54	4.46	4.19	4.21	4.5
3. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	702/1574	4.79	4.69	4.64	4.61	4.7
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	4	0	2	1	6	1	3.60	1267/1554	3.60	4.13	4.10	4.09	3.6
Lecture														
. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	945/1488	4.44	4.70	4.47	4.47	4.4
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	1366/1493	4.22	4.76	4.73	4.70	4.
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	468/1486	4.67	4.68	4.32	4.32	4.
1. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	637/1489	4.56	4.62	4.32	4.34	4.
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	215/1277	4.67	4.67	4.03	4.11	4.6
Discussion														
. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1000/1279	3.67	4.76	4.17	4.20	3.
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	636/1270	4.50	4.84	4.35	4.42	4.
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	535/1269	4.67	4.85	4.35	4.41	4.
1. Were special techniques successful	9	2	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	631/ 878	3.75	4.70	4.05	4.09	3.
Seminar														
. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	68/ 85	4.44	4.44	4.72	4.67	4.
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.69	**
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	5	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.53	**
1. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	66/ 80	4.25	4.25	4.61	4.22	4.3
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	3	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	164/ 375	4.40	4.40	4.01	4.12	4.
Freq	[uenc]	Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	ason	7			Ty	ne			Majors	3

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	1	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	10	Under-grad	15	Non-major	6
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2				
				2	0						

Course-Section: EHS 330 0101

MANAGEMENT:SEARCH/RESC

Title Instructor:

Enrollment: 23 Questionnaires: 6

MITCHELL, JEFFR (Instr. A) Spring 2009

Ι

0

Baltimore County

Page 632

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

						Fr	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sec
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mea
		 General															
1 Did voi	ı gain ne	ew insights, skills	from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.60	4.30	4.30	5.0
		ctor make clear the		0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	392/1576		4.53	4.27	4.28	4.6
		estions reflect th		0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	406/1342		4.69	4.32	4.30	4.6
		ations reflect the		0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	179/1520		4.56	4.25	4.25	4.8
			to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	366/1465		4.45	4.12	4.09	4.5
			e to what you learned	0	1	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	748/1434		4.35	4.14		4.2
		g system clearly ex	-	0	0	0	0	1	1	4		527/1547		4.46	4.19	4.21	4.
		was class cancelle		0	0	0	0	0	1		4.83	- , -		4.69	4.64		4.8
			eaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	532/1554		4.13		4.09	
		Lecture															
Were +h	e instri	ictor's lectures we	ll prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	355/1488	4.83	4.70	4.47	4.47	4 9
		ctor seem intereste	1 1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1493		4.76	4.73		5.
			d explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	-	4.83			4.68		4.70	
		es contribute to wh		0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	500/1489		4.62	4.32	4.34	
			e your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	3		4.50	300/1409				4.11	
. Did auc	IIOVISUAI	e your understanding	U	U	U	U	U	3	3	4.50	309/12//	4.50	4.07	4.03	4.11	4.:	
	2.	Discussion		-	0	0	0	0		4	4 00	010/1050	4 00	4 56	4 15	4 00	
			to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1		4.80	219/1279			4.17	4.20	4.
			aged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	0		4.60			4.84	4.35		4.
			and open discussion	1 1	0	0	0	0 1	1 1	4	4.80	386/1269			4.35	4.41	
. were sp	ecial te	echniques successfu	11	Т	U	U	U	Τ	Т	3	4.40	283/ 878	4.40	4.70	4.05	4.09	4.
		Field Work															
			o what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 52		4.95	4.48	4.37	5.0
_	_	-	valuation criteria	2	0	0	0	0	2		4.50	27/ 48		4.60	4.40		4.
		ctor available for		2	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	35/ 44		4.70	4.73	4.63	
		could you discuss		2	0	0	0	1	1		4.25	36/ 45		4.50	4.57		4.3
. Did con	ferences	s help you carry ou	t field activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	139/ 326	4.75	4.72	4.03	4.23	4.
			Frequ	ıency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	rned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0 1.00-1.99 0	A 3 B 3		Ke	quir	ed f	OT. MS	Jor	5	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo)T	
28-55	1			~		1				4	The diese		_	NT			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0		Ge	nera	.1				4	Under-g	rad	6	Non-	-major	
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0								0			.1			.1-
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 0	F 0		EL	ecti	ves				0	#### -					jn
			P 0									respons	es to k	e sign	ıiicar	1t	

Other

1

Course-Section: EHS 330 0101 University of Maryland

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Title MANAGEMENT:SEARCH/RESC Instructor: (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 23
Questionnaires: 6

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 633 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

~				~										
			Fre	eque	ncie	S		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	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	6	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.60	4.30	4.30	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	392/1576	4.67	4.53	4.27	4.28	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	406/1342	4.67	4.69	4.32	4.30	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	179/1520	4.83	4.56	4.25	4.25	4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	366/1465	4.50	4.45	4.12	4.09	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	748/1434	4.20	4.35	4.14	4.15	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	527/1547	4.50	4.46	4.19	4.21	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	606/1574	4.83	4.69	4.64	4.61	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	924/1554	4.20	4.13	4.10	4.09	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1488	4.83	4.70	4.47	4.47	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1493	5.00	4.76	4.73	4.70	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1486	4.83	4.68	4.32	4.32	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1489	4.67	4.62	4.32	4.34	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1277	4.50	4.67	4.03	4.11	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	219/1279	4.80	4.76	4.17	4.20	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	559/1270	4.60	4.84	4.35	4.42	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	386/1269	4.80	4.85	4.35	4.41	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	283/ 878	4.40	4.70	4.05	4.09	4.40
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	4.95	4.48	4.37	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	27/ 48	4.50	4.60	4.40	3.92	4.50
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	35/ 44	4.50	4.70	4.73	4.63	4.50
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	36/ 45	4.25	4.50	4.57	4.50	4.25
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	139/ 326	4.75	4.72	4.03	4.23	4.75
Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ty	pe			Majors	\$

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	6	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: EHS 350 0101 University of Maryland Title SUPERVISION: EHS SYSTEM Baltimore County

Instructor: WALZ, BRUCE J

Enrollment: 8
Questionnaires: 7

Grad.

0

3.50-4.00

F

Ρ

I

?

0

0

0

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Spring 2009

Page 634 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

					1		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect					
		Question	ıs		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did vo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	757/1576	4.43	4.60	4.30	4.30	4.43
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	910/1576		4.53	4.27	4.28	4.29
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	683/1342		4.69	4.32	4.30	4.43
	_	uations reflect		_	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	826/1520	4.29	4.56	4.25	4.25	4.29
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	850/1465	4.00	4.45	4.12	4.09	4.00
	-	-		o what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	878/1434	4.00	4.35	4.14	4.15	4.00
		g system clearl			0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	445/1547	4.57	4.46	4.19	4.21	4.57
	-	was class cand			0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	567/1574	4.86	4.69	4.64	4.61	4.86
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	532/1554	4.40	4.13	4.10	4.09	4.40
		Lectur	·e															
1. Were t	the instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	589/1488	4.71	4.70	4.47	4.47	4.71
		ctor seem inter			1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.76	4.73	4.70	5.00
				xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	393/1486	4.71	4.68	4.32	4.32	4.71
		es contribute t			0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	251/1489	4.86	4.62	4.32	4.34	4.86
	d audiovisual techniques enhance your understand				0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	181/1277	4.71	4.67	4.03	4.11	4.71
	Discussion																	
1. Did c	lass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.76	4.17	4.20	5.00
2. Were a	all stude	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.84	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did th	he instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.85	4.35	4.41	5.00
4. Were	special t	echniques succe	essful		5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.70	4.05	4.09	5.00
		Field	Work															
1. Did f	ield expe	rience contribu	ite to w	hat you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.95	4.48	4.37	****
2. Did yo	ou clearl	y understand yo	ur eval	uation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.60	4.40	3.92	****
		ctor available			6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.70	4.73	4.63	****
		could you disc			6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	4.50	4.57	4.50	****
5. Did co	onference	s help you carr	y out f	ield activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	4.72	4.03	4.23	****
		Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n											
Credits I	Expected Grant Expect							Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00 27														- 				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2 B 4		ке	quir	ea I	or Ma	ijori	S	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo)r.	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0			a -		7				0	TTm d a sc		7	Mari		0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ge	nera	Τ				0	Under-g	rad	7	non-	-major	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D 0														

Electives

Other

0

7

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Course-Section: EHS 351 0101 Title

FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT:E

Instructor: KRUMPERMAN, KUR

Enrollment: 11 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 635 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	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	Λ	Λ	Λ	Λ	Λ	4	6	4.60	500/1576	4.60	4.60	4.30	4.30	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	759/1576	4.40	4.53	4.27	4.28	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0		5	4.50	583/1342	4.50	4.69	4.32	4.30	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	395/1520	4.60	4.56	4.25	4.25	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	454/1465	4.44	4.45	4.12	4.09	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	524/1434	4.40	4.35	4.14	4.15	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.30	784/1547	4.30	4.46	4.19	4.21	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	6		1003/1574	4.60	4.69	4.64	4.61	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	n	0	4	4	4.50	395/1554		4.13	4.10	4.09	4.50
J. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	O	U	U	U	-	1	1.50	323/1331	1.50	1.13	1.10	1.00	1.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	995/1488	4.40	4.70	4.47	4.47	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	0	2	7	4.40	1286/1493	4.40	4.76	4.73	4.70	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	821/1486	4.40	4.68	4.32	4.32	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	579/1489	4.60	4.62	4.32	4.34	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	148/1277	4.78	4.67	4.03	4.11	4.78
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.76	4.17	4.20	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.84	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.85	4.35	4.41	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.70	4.05	4.09	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	10	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: EHS 360 0101 University of Maryland Title INSTRUCT ISSUES IN EHS Baltimore County Instructor: MITCHELL, JEFFR

Spring 2009

Page 636

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 13 Questionnaires: 12 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

					Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	this course	0	0	3	0	3	2	4	3.33	1494/1576	3.33	4.60	4.30	4.30	3.33
		ctor make clear			0	0	1	0	2	2	7		1023/1576		4.53	4.27	4.28	4.17
		estions reflect			0	6	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	406/1342	4.67	4.69	4.32	4.30	4.67
4. Did ot	her evalu	ations reflect	the exp	pected goals	0	0	3	0	1	3	5	3.58	1336/1520	3.58	4.56	4.25	4.25	3.58
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to v	what you learned	0	0	3	0	1	4	4	3.50	1242/1465	3.50	4.45	4.12	4.09	3.50
6. Did wr	ritten ass	signments contri	ibute to	what you learned	0	1	2	0	1	3	5	3.82	1057/1434	3.82	4.35	4.14	4.15	3.82
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearly	y explai	ned	1	0	2	1	1	2	5	3.64	1289/1547	3.64	4.46	4.19	4.21	3.64
8. How ma	ny times	was class cance	elled		1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	645/1574	4.82	4.69	4.64	4.61	4.82
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	2	1	2	2	1	1	3	3.11	1428/1554	3.11	4.13	4.10	4.09	3.11
		Lecture	e.															
1. Were t	he instru	actor's lecture	_	prepared	0	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	774/1488	4.58	4.70	4.47	4.47	4.58
		ctor seem inter			0	0	1	0	1	1	9		1278/1493		4.76	4.73	4.70	4.42
		plained clearly	0	0	1	0	1	3	7	4.25	959/1486	4.25	4.68	4.32	4.32	4.25		
		ou learned	0	0	2	0	1	3	6	3.92	1184/1489	3.92	4.62	4.32	4.34	3.92		
5. Did au	diovisual	our understanding	0	0	1	0	0	2	9	4.50	309/1277	4.50	4.67	4.03	4.11	4.50		
		Discus			_					_	_			4 0 5			4 00	
				what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	194/1279		4.76	4.17	4.20	4.86
				d to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	307/1270		4.84	4.35	4.42	4.86
				d open discussion	5	0 1	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	491/1269	4.71	4.85	4.35	4.41	4.71
4. Were s	special te	echniques succes	ssiul		5	Τ	U	U	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.70	4.05	4.09	5.00
				Freq	uency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	}
00-27	0	 A 9			 quir					0	Graduat		0	Majo		10		
28-55	0	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0	А 9 В 3		Re	quir	eu I	JT IMS	ajors	ò	U	Graduat	е	U	мајс	Σ	10
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ge	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad 1	2	Non-	-major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D 0		GC.	iici a.	L				_	onder -g	Luu I	۷.	14011	ilia JOI	2
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0		E1.	ecti	zes				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enous	rh
oraa.	Ü	3.30 1.00	3	P 0			2001					_	respons				_	
				I O		Ot.	her					8	10050110	00 0	91			
				? 0		20.						-						

Course-Section: EHS 474 0101 Title

University of Maryland INTRO TO MED EMERGENCI Baltimore County Spring 2009

Instructor: POLK, DWIGHT A

Enrollment: 8 Questionnaires: 7

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 637 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

	Questions		NA	Fr 1	_	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean			Sect Mean
	General														
1. Did you gain new	insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.60	4.30	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructo	r make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.53	4.27	4.35	5.00
_	he exam questions reflect the expected goals					0	1	6	4.86	209/1342	4.86	4.69	4.32	4.46	4.86
4. Did other evaluat	4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals					0	1	6	4.86	167/1520	4.86	4.56	4.25	4.38	4.86
5. Did assigned read	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.45	4.12	4.22	5.00	
6. Did written assig	5. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned					0	1	6	4.86	130/1434	4.86	4.35	4.14	4.30	4.86
7. Was the grading s	ystem clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.46	4.19	4.24	5.00
8. How many times wa	s class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	832/1574	4.71	4.69	4.64	4.69	4.71
9. How would you gra	de the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	924/1554	4.00	4.13	4.10	4.24	4.00
	Lecture	0	0	0	0										
	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared					0	0	7	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.70	4.47	4.55	5.00
	r seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.76	4.73	4.80	5.00
	ial presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.68	4.32	4.41	5.00
	contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.62	4.32	4.38	5.00
5. Did audiovisual t	echniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	385/1277	4.43	4.67	4.03	4.04	4.43
	Discussion														
1 Did alaga digaya	ions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	Λ	5	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.76	4.17	4.31	5.00
	actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.84	4.35	4.53	5.00
	er encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	584/1269	4.60	4.85	4.35	4.55	4.60
4. Were special tech		2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	129/ 878	4.80	4.70	4.05	4.33	4.80
i. Were special econ	miques successiui	2	U	O	O	O	_	1	1.00	125/ 070	1.00	1.70	1.05	1.55	1.00
	Seminar														
1. Were assigned top	oics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.44	4.72	4.77	****
2. Was the instructo	or available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.69	****
3. Did research proj	ects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.64	****
4. Did presentations	contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.25	4.61	4.52	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear				0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.40	4.01	3.90	****
	quency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n										
Gradita Barrad	Cham CDD Earne at all Caralan	_			D -		_			m				M	
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA Expected Grades	5			ке	asons	5			Ty	pe			Majors	

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

Course-Section: EHS 481 0101 Title

ALS FIELD & CLIN EXP I

Instructor: COONEY, MICHAEL

Enrollment: 8 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 638 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Frequencies			Inst	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect		
Questions	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	5	4.57	541/1576	4.57	4.60	4.30	4.46	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	728/1576	4.43	4.53	4.27	4.35	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.69	4.32	4.46	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	768/1520	4.33	4.56	4.25	4.38	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	0	1		****/1465	****	4.45	4.12	4.22	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	398/1434	4.50	4.35	4.14	4.30	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	0	0	5	4.14	939/1547	4.14	4.46	4.19	4.24	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	3		1177/1574	4.43	4.69	4.64	4.69	4.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	924/1554	4.00	4.13	4.10		4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	870/1488	4.50	4.70	4.47	4.55	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	734/1493	4.83	4.76	4.73	4.80	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	468/1486	4.67	4.68	4.32	4.41	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	696/1489	4.50	4.62	4.32	4.38	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.67	4.03	4.04	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	335/1279	4.67	4.76	4.17	4.31	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.84	4.35	4.53	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.85	4.35	4.55	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.70	4.05	4.33	5.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.28	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 240	5.00	5.00	4.35	4.45	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.56	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	****	4.20	4.19	****
nd old woods														
Field Work	_	0	•	_	_	-		4 00	22/ 50	4 00	4 05	4 40	4 50	4 00
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	33/ 52	4.80	4.95	4.48	4.70	4.80
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	31/ 48	4.40	4.60	4.40	4.30	4.40
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	31/ 44	4.80	4.70	4.73	4.60	4.80
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	27/ 45	4.50	4.50	4.57	4.34	4.50
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	149/ 326	4.40	4.72	4.03	3.97	4.40
Frequ	ency	, Dis	trib	utio	n									
- 1	_													

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

Course-Section: EHS 483 0101 University of Maryland Title ALS FIELD & CLIN EXP I

Baltimore County Spring 2009

COONEY, MICHAEL Instructor:

Enrollment: 7 Questionnaires: 7

Page 639 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

a. 1 .	~			
Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestior	naire

		Ouestion	ıs		NR	NA	Fr 1	_	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera								_	_							
		w insights,ski			0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	203/1576	4.86	4.60	4.30	4.46	4.86
		tor make clear			0	0	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	728/1576	4.43	4.53	4.27	4.35	4.43
		estions reflec			0	2	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.69	4.32	4.46	5.00
		ations reflect			0	1 1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.56	4.25	4.38	5.00
	_	-	ags contribute to what you learned				0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.45	4.12	4.22	5.00
			ments contribute to what you learned				0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.35	4.14	4.30	5.0
	the grading system clearly explained					0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	154/1547	4.86	4.46	4.19	4.24	4.8
	. How many times was class cancelled				0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	567/1574	4.86	4.69	4.64	4.69	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness					2	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	194/1554	4.75	4.13	4.10	4.24	4.75
		Lectur	·e															
		ctor's lecture			2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.70	4.47	4.55	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.76	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly						0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	271/1486	4.80	4.68	4.32	4.41	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	309/1489	4.80	4.62	4.32	4.38	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding					2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	132/1277	4.80	4.67	4.03	4.04	4.80
		Discus	sion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.76	4.17	4.31	5.00
2. Were al	ll student	ts actively en	courage	ed to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.84	4.35	4.53	5.00
3. Did the	e instruct	tor encourage	fair an	nd open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.85	4.35	4.55	5.00
4. Were sp	pecial ted	chniques succe	essful		5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.70	4.05	4.33	5.00
		Field	Work															
1. Did fie	eld exper:	ience contribu	ite to v	what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	4.95	4.48	4.70	5.00
				luation criteria	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 48	5.00	4.60	4.40	4.30	5.00
_	_	tor available			4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 44	5.00	4.70	4.73	4.60	5.00
4. To what	degree o	could you disc	uss you	ır evaluations	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 45	5.00	4.50	4.57	4.34	5.00
				field activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.72	4.03	3.97	5.00
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	rnod	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				D.	agona	,			т	00			Majora	,
CTEATER FO		Cuiii. GPA	·	Expected Grades					asons	> 			Ту:	 he			Majors 	• - – – – –
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors				S	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	5		
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 1	_				_			_			_			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General					0	Under-g	rad	7	Non-	-major	2		
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0					_									
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives						0	<pre>#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant</pre>					gh	
				P 0								respons	es to k	oe sign	ificar	ıt		

Other

7

I

?

0

1

Course-Section: EHS 492 0101

SR PARAMEDIC SEMINAR I

Title Instructor: COONEY, MICHAEL

Enrollment: 7

Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 640 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions			Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	-	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General	^	0	0	^	_	-1	_	4 06	000/1576	4 06	4 60	4 20	1 16	4 06
 Did you gain new insights, skills from this course Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 	0	0	0	0	0	1	6 6	4.86	203/1576 187/1576	4.86	4.60	4.30	4.46	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	1 1	_	4.86	240/1342	4.86 4.80	4.53	4.27	4.35	4.86 4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.69 4.56	4.32	4.46	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.45	4.25	4.38	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	5 5	4.83	138/1434	4.83	4.45	4.14	4.22	4.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	5 5	4.83	280/1547	4.83	4.35	4.14	4.24	4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	0	5 5		1177/1574	4.43	4.40	4.19	4.69	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1554		4.13	4.10	4.24	5.00
7. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	U	U	U	U	U	5	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.13	4.10	4.24	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	355/1488	4.83	4.70	4.47	4.55	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	734/1493	4.83	4.76	4.73	4.80	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	241/1486	4.83	4.68	4.32	4.41	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	274/1489	4.83	4.62	4.32	4.38	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	132/1277	4.80	4.67	4.03	4.04	4.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.76	4.17	4.31	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.84	4.35	4.53	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.85	4.35	4.55	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.70	4.05	4.33	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 85	****	4.44	4.72	4.77	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.64	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 80	****	4.25	4.61	4.52	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.40	4.01	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	_	0	0	0	0	0	1	г оо	****/ 52	****	4 05	4 40	4 70	****
	6 6	0	0	0	0	0	1		,	****	4.95 4.60	4.48	4.70	****
Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 48 ****/ 44	****	4.60	4.40	4.30	****
	6	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 45	****			4.80	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 326	****	4.50 4.72	4.57	3.97	****
5. Did conterences nerp you carry out freed activities	O	U	U	U	U	U	Τ	5.00	/ 326		4./2	4.03	3.9/	
Frequ	iencv	7 Dist	trib	ation	ı									
11040														

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