# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | HCST 100 01 | | | | Term - Fall 2012 | | | | | | | Enrollment: 41 | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Human Context/Sci/Techn | | | | | | | | | | | Questionnaires: 13 | | | |
| Instructor: | Brown,Eric J | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | 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 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 3.54 | 1490/1589 | 3.54 | 4.13 | 4.32 | 4.20 | 3.54 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3.62 | 1441/1589 | 3.62 | 3.81 | 4.29 | 4.28 | 3.62 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/1391 | **** | 4.00 | 4.34 | 4.29 | **** |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 4.00 | 1081/1552 | 4.00 | 4.07 | 4.25 | 4.16 | 4.00 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 4.38 | 553/1495 | 4.38 | 4.41 | 4.14 | 4.07 | 4.38 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 4.08 | 835/1457 | 4.08 | 3.97 | 4.15 | 3.99 | 4.08 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 2 | 3.62 | 1360/1572 | 3.62 | 3.74 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 3.62 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 4.92 | 373/1589 | 4.92 | 4.79 | 4.66 | 4.59 | 4.92 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 3.55 | 1347/1569 | 3.66 | 4.08 | 4.13 | 4.08 | 3.66 |
| **Lecture** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 3.67 | 1447/1530 | 3.88 | 4.30 | 4.49 | 4.45 | 3.88 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 4.75 | 959/1533 | 4.83 | 4.88 | 4.75 | 4.69 | 4.83 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 3 | 3.92 | 1246/1528 | 3.96 | 4.34 | 4.35 | 4.31 | 3.96 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 3 | 3.83 | 1294/1529 | 3.87 | 4.29 | 4.36 | 4.31 | 3.87 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 4.40 | 435/1393 | 4.14 | 4.54 | 4.06 | 3.99 | 4.14 |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/1337 | **** | 4.86 | 4.17 | 4.01 | **** |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3.67 | ****/1331 | **** | 5.00 | 4.35 | 4.18 | **** |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | ****/1333 | **** | 4.86 | 4.40 | 4.22 | **** |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | HCST 100 01 | | Term - Fall 2012 | | Enrollment: | 41 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Human Context/Sci/Techn | | | | Questionnaires: | 13 |
| Instructor: | Brown,Eric J | | | | | |

| | | | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 10 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/1014 | **** | 4.33 | 4.05 | 3.91 | **** |

## Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 7 | Required for Majors | 3 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 6 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C | 0 | General | 5 | Under-grad | 13 | Non-major | 1 |
| 84-150 | 1 | 3.00-3.49 | 3 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 3 | F | 0 | Electives | 3 | **** - Means there are not enough responses | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | to be significant | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 1 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | HCST 100 01 | Term - Fall 2012 | | Enrollment: 41 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Human Context/Sci/Techn | | | Questionnaires: 13 |
| Instructor: | Tatarewicz,Jose | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
| | | | 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 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 3.54 | 1490/1589 | 3.54 | 4.13 | 4.32 | 4.20 | 3.54 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3.62 | 1441/1589 | 3.62 | 3.81 | 4.29 | 4.28 | 3.62 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/1391 | **** | 4.00 | 4.34 | 4.29 | **** |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 4.00 | 1081/1552 | 4.00 | 4.07 | 4.25 | 4.16 | 4.00 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 4.38 | 553/1495 | 4.38 | 4.41 | 4.14 | 4.07 | 4.38 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 4.08 | 835/1457 | 4.08 | 3.97 | 4.15 | 3.99 | 4.08 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 2 | 3.62 | 1360/1572 | 3.62 | 3.74 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 3.62 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 4.92 | 373/1589 | 4.92 | 4.79 | 4.66 | 4.59 | 4.92 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 3.78 | 1193/1569 | 3.66 | 4.08 | 4.13 | 4.08 | 3.66 |
| **Lecture** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 4.10 | 1281/1530 | 3.88 | 4.30 | 4.49 | 4.45 | 3.88 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 4.90 | 586/1533 | 4.83 | 4.88 | 4.75 | 4.69 | 4.83 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 4.00 | 1171/1528 | 3.96 | 4.34 | 4.35 | 4.31 | 3.96 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 3.90 | 1251/1529 | 3.87 | 4.29 | 4.36 | 4.31 | 3.87 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 3.89 | 922/1393 | 4.14 | 4.54 | 4.06 | 3.99 | 4.14 |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/1337 | **** | 4.86 | 4.17 | 4.01 | **** |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3.67 | ****/1331 | **** | 5.00 | 4.35 | 4.18 | **** |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | ****/1333 | **** | 4.86 | 4.40 | 4.22 | **** |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | HCST 100 01 | | Term - Fall 2012 | | | | | | | | | Enrollment: | 41 |
| Title: | Human Context/Sci/Techn | | | | | | | | | | | Questionnaires: | 13 |
| Instructor: | Tatarewicz,Jose | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Questions** | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 10 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/1014 | **** | 4.33 | 4.05 | 3.91 | **** |

## Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 7 | Required for Majors | 3 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 6 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C | 0 | General | 5 | Under-grad | 13 | Non-major | 1 |
| 84-150 | 1 | 3.00-3.49 | 3 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 3 | F | 0 | Electives | 3 | **** - Means there are not enough responses | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | to be significant | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 1 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | HCST 100H 02 | Term - Fall 2012 | | Enrollment: 7 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Hum Contxt of Sci/Tech | | | Questionnaires: 7 |
| Instructor: | Brown,Eric J | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Instructor Mean | Rank | Course Mean | Org Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **General** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 4.71 | 366/1589 | 4.71 | 4.13 | 4.32 | 4.20 | 4.71 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4.00 | 1151/1589 | 4.00 | 3.81 | 4.29 | 4.28 | 4.00 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4.00 | 1061/1391 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 4.34 | 4.29 | 4.00 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 4.14 | 965/1552 | 4.14 | 4.07 | 4.25 | 4.16 | 4.14 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 4.43 | 508/1495 | 4.43 | 4.41 | 4.14 | 4.07 | 4.43 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 3.86 | 1042/1457 | 3.86 | 3.97 | 4.15 | 3.99 | 3.86 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3.86 | 1226/1572 | 3.86 | 3.74 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 3.86 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4.67 | 956/1589 | 4.67 | 4.79 | 4.66 | 4.59 | 4.67 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.86 | 129/1569 | 4.50 | 4.08 | 4.13 | 4.08 | 4.50 |
| **Lecture** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4.71 | 559/1530 | 4.71 | 4.30 | 4.49 | 4.45 | 4.71 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.86 | 729/1533 | 4.93 | 4.88 | 4.75 | 4.69 | 4.93 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.86 | 227/1528 | 4.71 | 4.34 | 4.35 | 4.31 | 4.71 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4.71 | 458/1529 | 4.71 | 4.29 | 4.36 | 4.31 | 4.71 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1393 | 4.93 | 4.54 | 4.06 | 3.99 | 4.93 |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.86 | 186/1337 | 4.86 | 4.86 | 4.17 | 4.01 | 4.86 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1331 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 4.35 | 4.18 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.86 | 313/1333 | 4.86 | 4.86 | 4.40 | 4.22 | 4.86 |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | HCST 100H 02 | | Term - Fall 2012 | | Enrollment: | 7 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Hum Contxt of Sci/Tech | | | | Questionnaires: | 7 |
| Instructor: | Brown,Eric J | | | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Instructor Mean | Instructor Rank | Course Mean | Org Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4.33 | 341/1014 | 4.33 | 4.33 | 4.05 | 3.91 | 4.33 |

## Frequency Distribution

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

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | HCST 100H 02 | | Term - Fall 2012 | | | | | | | | Enrollment: 7 | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Hum Contxt of Sci/Tech | | | | | | | | | | Questionnaires: 7 | | | |
| Instructor: | Tatarewicz,Jose | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 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 | 0 | 6 | 4.71 | 366/1589 | 4.71 | 4.13 | 4.32 | 4.20 | 4.71 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4.00 | 1151/1589 | 4.00 | 3.81 | 4.29 | 4.28 | 4.00 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4.00 | 1061/1391 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 4.34 | 4.29 | 4.00 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 4.14 | 965/1552 | 4.14 | 4.07 | 4.25 | 4.16 | 4.14 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 4.43 | 508/1495 | 4.43 | 4.41 | 4.14 | 4.07 | 4.43 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 3.86 | 1042/1457 | 3.86 | 3.97 | 4.15 | 3.99 | 3.86 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3.86 | 1226/1572 | 3.86 | 3.74 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 3.86 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4.67 | 956/1589 | 4.67 | 4.79 | 4.66 | 4.59 | 4.67 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 4.14 | 829/1569 | 4.50 | 4.08 | 4.13 | 4.08 | 4.50 |
| **Lecture** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4.71 | 559/1530 | 4.71 | 4.30 | 4.49 | 4.45 | 4.71 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1533 | 4.93 | 4.88 | 4.75 | 4.69 | 4.93 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 4.57 | 607/1528 | 4.71 | 4.34 | 4.35 | 4.31 | 4.71 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4.71 | 458/1529 | 4.71 | 4.29 | 4.36 | 4.31 | 4.71 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.86 | 102/1393 | 4.93 | 4.54 | 4.06 | 3.99 | 4.93 |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.86 | 186/1337 | 4.86 | 4.86 | 4.17 | 4.01 | 4.86 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1331 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 4.35 | 4.18 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.86 | 313/1333 | 4.86 | 4.86 | 4.40 | 4.22 | 4.86 |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | HCST 100H 02 | Term - Fall 2012 | | Enrollment: 7 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Hum Contxt of Sci/Tech | | | Questionnaires: 7 |
| Instructor: | Tatarewicz,Jose | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Instructor Mean | Instructor Rank | Course Mean | Org Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4.33 | 341/1014 | 4.33 | 4.33 | 4.05 | 3.91 | 4.33 |

## Frequency Distribution

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