

Course-Section: ENCH 225 0101
 Title CHEM ENG PROB SOLVING
 Instructor: GOOD, THERESA
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 606
 JUN 13, 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	2	9	13	4.46	613/1481	4.46	4.26	4.29	4.40	4.46	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	9	11	4.25	822/1481	4.25	4.26	4.23	4.29	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	4	7	10	4.09	861/1249	4.09	4.37	4.27	4.36	4.09	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	6	15	4.52	416/1424	4.52	4.27	4.21	4.28	4.52	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	2	4	5	6	2	3.11	1272/1396	3.11	4.07	3.98	3.94	3.11	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	8	12	4.25	542/1342	4.25	4.12	4.07	4.05	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	8	5	9	3.91	1039/1459	3.91	4.19	4.16	4.17	3.91	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	351/1480	4.96	4.64	4.68	4.68	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	4	14	3	3.95	904/1450	3.95	4.10	4.09	4.15	3.95	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	5	10	7	4.09	1125/1409	4.09	4.46	4.42	4.47	4.09	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	5	17	4.63	1008/1407	4.63	4.77	4.69	4.78	4.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	8	7	6	3.82	1140/1399	3.82	4.30	4.26	4.29	3.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	9	9	4.13	961/1400	4.13	4.35	4.27	4.34	4.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	11	1	1	3	3	0	3.00	1041/1179	3.00	3.94	3.96	4.05	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	****/1262	****	4.18	4.05	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/1259	****	4.40	4.29	4.34	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/1256	****	4.34	4.30	4.28	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	21	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 788	****	4.03	4.00	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	3	4	11	4.44	89/ 246	4.44	4.26	4.20	4.51	4.44	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	76/ 249	4.50	4.08	4.11	4.32	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	69/ 242	4.72	4.45	4.40	4.63	4.72	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	71/ 240	4.72	4.37	4.20	4.58	4.72	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	61/ 217	4.56	4.42	4.04	4.28	4.56	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 12		Graduate 0
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 24
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	18
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENCH 427 0101
 Title TRANS PROC II:MASS TRA
 Instructor: BAYLES, TARYN
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 607
 JUN 13, 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	0	5	11	4.53	531/1481	4.53	4.26	4.29	4.45	4.53	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	8	8	4.35	715/1481	4.35	4.26	4.23	4.32	4.35	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	8	7	4.24	757/1249	4.24	4.37	4.27	4.44	4.24	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	9	5	4.13	885/1424	4.13	4.27	4.21	4.35	4.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	4	5	5	3.71	959/1396	3.71	4.07	3.98	4.09	3.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	4	2	7	3.93	845/1342	3.93	4.12	4.07	4.21	3.93	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	231/1459	4.71	4.19	4.16	4.25	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	421/1480	4.94	4.64	4.68	4.74	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	231/1450	4.64	4.10	4.09	4.28	4.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	588/1409	4.65	4.46	4.42	4.51	4.65	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	919/1407	4.71	4.77	4.69	4.79	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	4	9	4.24	846/1399	4.24	4.30	4.26	4.36	4.24	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	11	4.47	624/1400	4.47	4.35	4.27	4.38	4.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	11	0	2	2	0	2	3.33	972/1179	3.33	3.94	3.96	4.07	3.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	6	1	6	4.00	708/1262	4.00	4.18	4.05	4.33	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	5	2	5	3.85	1007/1259	3.85	4.40	4.29	4.57	3.85	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	5	1	5	3.83	1012/1256	3.83	4.34	4.30	4.60	3.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	8	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 788	****	4.03	4.00	4.26	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 1
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	0
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 16
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	16
			? 1		

Course-Section: ENCH 440 0101
 Title CHEM ENGINEERING KINET
 Instructor: ROSS, JULIA
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 608
 JUN 13, 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	3	12	4.80	233/1481	4.80	4.26	4.29	4.45	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	8	7	4.47	574/1481	4.47	4.26	4.23	4.32	4.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	8	7	4.47	548/1249	4.47	4.37	4.27	4.44	4.47	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	2	3	3	5	3.85	1130/1424	3.85	4.27	4.21	4.35	3.85	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	1	6	5	4.00	707/1396	4.00	4.07	3.98	4.09	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	8	1	3	3.46	1135/1342	3.46	4.12	4.07	4.21	3.46	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	611/1459	4.40	4.19	4.16	4.25	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.64	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	334/1450	4.50	4.10	4.09	4.28	4.50	

Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	682/1409	4.57	4.46	4.42	4.51	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	986/1407	4.64	4.77	4.69	4.79	4.64	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	733/1399	4.36	4.30	4.26	4.36	4.36	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	4	9	4.50	591/1400	4.50	4.35	4.27	4.38	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	1041/1179	3.00	3.94	3.96	4.07	3.00	

Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1262	****	4.18	4.05	4.33	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1259	****	4.40	4.29	4.57	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1256	****	4.34	4.30	4.60	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 1	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 9		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	0
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 15
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	13
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENCH 441 0101
 Title RXN KINETICS IN BIOENG
 Instructor: ROSS, JULIA
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 609
 JUN 13, 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	4	5	4.56	505/1481	4.56	4.26	4.29	4.45	4.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	1	3.67	1253/1481	3.67	4.26	4.23	4.32	3.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	1066/1249	3.71	4.37	4.27	4.44	3.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	740/1424	4.25	4.27	4.21	4.35	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	4	0	2	3.25	1199/1396	3.25	4.07	3.98	4.09	3.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	3	2	1	3.43	1155/1342	3.43	4.12	4.07	4.21	3.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	0	4	3.78	1142/1459	3.78	4.19	4.16	4.25	3.78	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.64	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	546/1450	4.33	4.10	4.09	4.28	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	6	2	4.11	1116/1409	4.11	4.46	4.42	4.51	4.11	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	1069/1407	4.56	4.77	4.69	4.79	4.56	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	855/1399	4.22	4.30	4.26	4.36	4.22	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	6	1	2	3.56	1217/1400	3.56	4.35	4.27	4.38	3.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1041/1179	3.00	3.94	3.96	4.07	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1262	****	4.18	4.05	4.33	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1259	****	4.40	4.29	4.57	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1256	****	4.34	4.30	4.60	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 788	****	4.03	4.00	4.26	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	155/ 246	4.00	4.26	4.20	4.45	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	3	0	0	0	0	1.00	249/ 249	1.00	4.08	4.11	3.87	1.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	225/ 242	3.67	4.45	4.40	4.45	3.67	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	195/ 240	3.67	4.37	4.20	4.43	3.67	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	180/ 217	3.33	4.42	4.04	3.86	3.33	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 9
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	8
			? 2		

Course-Section: ENCH 442 0101
 Title CHEM ENGINEERING SYS A
 Instructor: SMITH, JEFFREY
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 610
 JUN 13, 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	3	5	3	4.00	1069/1481	4.00	4.26	4.29	4.45	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	801/1481	4.27	4.26	4.23	4.32	4.27	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	726/1249	4.27	4.37	4.27	4.44	4.27	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	0	6	1	3.88	1108/1424	3.88	4.27	4.21	4.35	3.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	4	3	0	3.11	1266/1396	3.11	4.07	3.98	4.09	3.11	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	4	3	1	3.63	1060/1342	3.63	4.12	4.07	4.21	3.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	4	3	3.82	1117/1459	3.82	4.19	4.16	4.25	3.82	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	1025/1480	4.55	4.64	4.68	4.74	4.55	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	6	5	0	3.45	1245/1450	3.45	4.10	4.09	4.28	3.45	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	1074/1409	4.18	4.46	4.42	4.51	4.18	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	1145/1407	4.45	4.77	4.69	4.79	4.45	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	6	2	3.91	1096/1399	3.91	4.30	4.26	4.36	3.91	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	754/1400	4.36	4.35	4.27	4.38	4.36	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	10	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1179	****	3.94	3.96	4.07	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	1146/1262	3.00	4.18	4.05	4.33	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1067/1259	3.67	4.40	4.29	4.57	3.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1069/1256	3.67	4.34	4.30	4.60	3.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 788	****	4.03	4.00	4.26	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 11
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	11
			? 1		

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	3	0	3	4	8	3.78	1242/1481	3.78	4.26	4.29	4.45	3.78	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	4	4	4	6	3.67	1253/1481	3.67	4.26	4.23	4.32	3.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	2	4	2	1	3.22	1169/1249	3.22	4.37	4.27	4.44	3.22	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	5	6	6	3.89	1101/1424	3.89	4.27	4.21	4.35	3.89	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	16	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1396	****	4.07	3.98	4.09	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	454/1342	4.35	4.12	4.07	4.21	4.35	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	3	4	7	2	0	2.50	1429/1459	2.50	4.19	4.16	4.25	2.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	1	0	3	2	10	4.25	1215/1480	4.25	4.64	4.68	4.74	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	4	8	5	4.06	808/1450	4.06	4.10	4.09	4.28	4.06	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	2	2	2	3	1	2.90	1377/1409	2.90	4.46	4.42	4.51	2.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	1184/1407	4.40	4.77	4.69	4.79	4.40	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	1	3	1	3	1	3.00	1325/1399	3.00	4.30	4.26	4.36	3.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	5	2	1	1	0	1.78	1396/1400	1.78	4.35	4.27	4.38	1.78	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	6	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1179	****	3.94	3.96	4.07	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1262	****	4.18	4.05	4.33	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1259	****	4.40	4.29	4.57	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1256	****	4.34	4.30	4.60	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 788	****	4.03	4.00	4.26	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	3.90	4.55	4.86	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	4.28	4.75	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 51	****	4.42	4.65	4.71	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.83	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.82	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	1
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENCH 450 0101
 Title CHEM PROCESS DEVELOPME
 Instructor: KELLER, DAVID G
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 612
 JUN 13, 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	4	10	4.33	749/1481	4.33	4.26	4.29	4.45	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	6	7	4.11	950/1481	4.11	4.26	4.23	4.32	4.11	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	2	1	4	9	4.25	742/1249	4.25	4.37	4.27	4.44	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	5	0	1	3	2	5	4.00	959/1424	4.00	4.27	4.21	4.35	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	11	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	877/1396	3.80	4.07	3.98	4.09	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	5	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	707/1342	4.08	4.12	4.07	4.21	4.08	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	2	2	5	6	3.65	1210/1459	3.65	4.19	4.16	4.25	3.65	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	2	11	4	4.12	1316/1480	4.12	4.64	4.68	4.74	4.12	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	3	5	7	4.27	620/1450	4.27	4.10	4.09	4.28	4.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	2	1	10	4.43	865/1409	4.43	4.46	4.42	4.51	4.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	728/1407	4.80	4.77	4.69	4.79	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	459/1399	4.60	4.30	4.26	4.36	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	492/1400	4.60	4.35	4.27	4.38	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	5	0	1	3	3	2	3.67	840/1179	3.67	3.94	3.96	4.07	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1262	****	4.18	4.05	4.33	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1259	****	4.40	4.29	4.57	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1256	****	4.34	4.30	4.60	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 788	****	4.03	4.00	4.26	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 10		Graduate 3
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	6
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 16
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	14
			? 1		

Course-Section: ENCH 484 0101
 Title BIOMEDICAL ENGINEERING
 Instructor: JENNIE, LEACH
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 613
 JUN 13, 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	1	8	4.89	173/1481	4.89	4.26	4.29	4.45	4.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	854/1481	4.22	4.26	4.23	4.32	4.22	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	846/1249	4.11	4.37	4.27	4.44	4.11	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	509/1424	4.44	4.27	4.21	4.35	4.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	225/1396	4.63	4.07	3.98	4.09	4.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	649/1342	4.14	4.12	4.07	4.21	4.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	460/1459	4.50	4.19	4.16	4.25	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.64	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	6	1	4.00	836/1450	4.00	4.10	4.09	4.28	4.00	

Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.46	4.42	4.51	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	713/1399	4.38	4.30	4.26	4.36	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	468/1400	4.63	4.35	4.27	4.38	4.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	590/1179	4.00	3.94	3.96	4.07	4.00	

Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	345/1262	4.50	4.18	4.05	4.33	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.40	4.29	4.57	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	457/1256	4.67	4.34	4.30	4.60	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	763/ 788	2.50	4.03	4.00	4.26	2.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 2
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	3
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 7
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	6
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENCH 485L 0101
 Title BIOCHEM ENGINEERING LA
 Instructor: RAO, GOVIND
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 614
 JUN 13, 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	2	4	1	3.86	1193/1481	3.86	4.26	4.29	4.45	3.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	925/1481	4.14	4.26	4.23	4.32	4.14	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	959/1424	4.00	4.27	4.21	4.35	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	4	1	1	3.50	1083/1396	3.50	4.07	3.98	4.09	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	257/1342	4.57	4.12	4.07	4.21	4.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	5	1	0	3.00	1380/1459	3.00	4.19	4.16	4.25	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.64	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	546/1450	4.33	4.10	4.09	4.28	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1409	****	4.46	4.42	4.51	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1407	****	4.77	4.69	4.79	****	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1399	****	4.30	4.26	4.36	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1400	****	4.35	4.27	4.38	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 246	5.00	4.26	4.20	4.45	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	189/ 249	3.67	4.08	4.11	3.87	3.67	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	159/ 242	4.33	4.45	4.40	4.45	4.33	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	82/ 240	4.67	4.37	4.20	4.43	4.67	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	160/ 217	3.67	4.42	4.04	3.86	3.67	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENCH 489R 0101
 Title SPEC TOPICS IN ENVR EN
 Instructor: GHOSH, UPAL
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 615
 JUN 13, 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	2	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.26	4.29	4.45	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	517/1481	4.50	4.26	4.23	4.32	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.44	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	437/1424	4.50	4.27	4.21	4.35	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	707/1396	4.00	4.07	3.98	4.09	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	303/1342	4.50	4.12	4.07	4.21	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	460/1459	4.50	4.19	4.16	4.25	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.64	4.68	4.74	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.46	4.42	4.51	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.30	4.26	4.36	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.35	4.27	4.38	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1179	5.00	3.94	3.96	4.07	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	345/1262	4.50	4.18	4.05	4.33	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	588/1259	4.50	4.40	4.29	4.57	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.34	4.30	4.60	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 788	5.00	4.03	4.00	4.26	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENCH 630 0101
 Title TRANSPORT PHENOMENA
 Instructor: FREY, DOUGLAS
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 616
 JUN 13, 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	3	6	4.27	818/1481	4.27	4.26	4.29	4.28	4.27	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	1000/1481	4.00	4.26	4.23	4.11	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	655/1249	4.36	4.37	4.27	4.24	4.36	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	706/1424	4.29	4.27	4.21	4.16	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	4	1	2	3.71	950/1396	3.71	4.07	3.98	4.00	3.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	603/1342	4.18	4.12	4.07	4.18	4.18	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	4	5	4.09	914/1459	4.09	4.19	4.16	4.01	4.09	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	2	4.20	1260/1480	4.20	4.64	4.68	4.74	4.20	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	609/1450	4.27	4.10	4.09	3.96	4.27	

Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	466/1409	4.73	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	500/1407	4.91	4.77	4.69	4.73	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	969/1399	4.09	4.30	4.26	4.16	4.09	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	988/1400	4.09	4.35	4.27	4.17	4.09	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	4	2	3	3.70	827/1179	3.70	3.94	3.96	3.81	3.70	

Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	0	0	1	2	3.20	1092/1262	3.20	4.18	4.05	4.07	3.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	0	1	1	1	2.80	1199/1259	2.80	4.40	4.29	4.30	2.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	1	0	2	1	3.20	1151/1256	3.20	4.34	4.30	4.33	3.20	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	7	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	4	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENCH 640 0101
 Title ADV CHEM REACTN KINETI
 Instructor: MARTEN, MARK
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 617
 JUN 13, 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	8	3	4.27	818/1481	4.27	4.26	4.29	4.28	4.27	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	704/1481	4.36	4.26	4.23	4.11	4.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1001/1249	3.86	4.37	4.27	4.24	3.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	595/1424	4.38	4.27	4.21	4.16	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	484/1396	4.27	4.07	3.98	4.00	4.27	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	354/1342	4.45	4.12	4.07	4.18	4.45	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	217/1459	4.73	4.19	4.16	4.01	4.73	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	6	3	2	3.64	1447/1480	3.64	4.64	4.68	4.74	3.64	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	7	3	4.30	578/1450	4.30	4.10	4.09	3.96	4.30	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	1152/1409	4.00	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	880/1407	4.73	4.77	4.69	4.73	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	7	3	4.18	892/1399	4.18	4.30	4.26	4.16	4.18	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	5	2	3.73	1160/1400	3.73	4.35	4.27	4.17	3.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	590/1179	4.00	3.94	3.96	3.81	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	228/1262	4.73	4.18	4.05	4.07	4.73	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	211/1259	4.91	4.40	4.29	4.30	4.91	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.34	4.30	4.33	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	9	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 788	****	4.03	4.00	3.97	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 7
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 4
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	11
			? 1		

Course-Section: ENCH 662 0101
 Title GMP'S FOR BIOPROCESSES
 Instructor: ANTONIO, MORIRA
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 618
 JUN 13, 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	2	2	1	3.80	1225/1481	3.80	4.26	4.29	4.28	3.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	1364/1481	3.40	4.26	4.23	4.11	3.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	742/1249	4.25	4.37	4.27	4.24	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.27	4.21	4.16	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	193/1396	4.67	4.07	3.98	4.00	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	755/1342	4.00	4.12	4.07	4.18	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.19	4.16	4.01	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	1114/1480	4.40	4.64	4.68	4.74	4.40	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	1189/1450	3.60	4.10	4.09	3.96	3.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	648/1409	4.60	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	212/1399	4.80	4.30	4.26	4.16	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	1017/1400	4.00	4.35	4.27	4.17	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	340/1179	4.40	3.94	3.96	3.81	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	887/1262	3.75	4.18	4.05	4.07	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	451/1259	4.67	4.40	4.29	4.30	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	901/1256	4.00	4.34	4.30	4.33	4.00	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 249	****	4.08	4.11	3.93	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	4.23	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.19	4.35	4.16	****	

Frequency Distribution

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