

Course Section: HAPP 100 0101  
 Title SURVEY US HLTH CARE SY  
 Instructor: RILEY, JOYCE L.  
 Enrollment: 55  
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 995  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	0	5	22	4.71	318/1669	4.71	4.73	4.23	4.02	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	27	4.86	134/1666	4.86	4.79	4.19	4.11	4.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	26	4.93	121/1421	4.93	4.80	4.24	4.11	4.93	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	242/1617	4.74	4.53	4.15	3.99	4.74	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	1	4	10	10	3.82	1004/1555	3.82	4.25	4.00	3.92	3.82	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	18	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	226/1543	4.70	4.53	4.06	3.86	4.70	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	26	4.93	89/1647	4.93	4.84	4.12	4.06	4.93	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	3	7	11	4.38	525/1605	4.38	4.55	4.07	3.96	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	26	4.93	151/1514	4.93	4.72	4.39	4.32	4.93	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	27	4.96	205/1551	4.96	4.95	4.66	4.55	4.96	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	25	4.86	173/1503	4.86	4.66	4.24	4.17	4.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	26	4.93	131/1506	4.93	4.75	4.26	4.17	4.93	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	2	4	9	11	4.00	587/1311	4.00	4.31	3.85	3.68	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	3	7	9	4.20	742/1490	4.20	4.51	4.05	3.85	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	2	3	3	12	4.25	880/1502	4.25	4.46	4.26	4.06	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	564/1489	4.63	4.75	4.29	4.07	4.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	9	2	0	1	0	6	3.89	614/1006	3.89	4.07	4.00	3.81	3.89	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.09	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	16	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	7	Under-grad	29	Non-major	19
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						

Course Section: HAPP 200 0101  
 Title HMN DEV IMPL HLTH/DISE  
 Instructor: JEFFREY, JEANET  
 Enrollment: 38  
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 996  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	2	2	3	21	4.41	719/1669	4.41	4.73	4.23	4.34	4.41	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	0	2	3	22	4.48	577/1666	4.48	4.79	4.19	4.29	4.48	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	2	2	4	20	4.50	557/1421	4.50	4.80	4.24	4.35	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	11	3	0	3	4	8	3.78	1240/1617	3.78	4.53	4.15	4.24	3.78	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	1	5	4	16	4.11	709/1555	4.11	4.25	4.00	3.96	4.11	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	13	0	1	3	3	9	4.25	659/1543	4.25	4.53	4.06	4.10	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	2	5	20	4.45	583/1647	4.45	4.84	4.12	4.19	4.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	15	13	4.41	1265/1668	4.41	4.75	4.67	4.59	4.41	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	2	3	3	16	4.38	538/1605	4.38	4.55	4.07	4.15	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	3	1	2	3	16	4.12	1160/1514	4.12	4.72	4.39	4.39	4.12	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	1	0	0	24	4.88	567/1551	4.88	4.95	4.66	4.72	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	3	2	2	2	16	4.04	1045/1503	4.04	4.66	4.24	4.29	4.04	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	3	0	2	2	18	4.28	884/1506	4.28	4.75	4.26	4.33	4.28	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	4	3	1	0	4	13	4.10	542/1311	4.10	4.31	3.85	3.96	4.10	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	2	0	5	11	4.21	726/1490	4.21	4.51	4.05	4.11	4.21	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	2	2	1	2	13	4.10	975/1502	4.10	4.46	4.26	4.31	4.10	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	2	3	13	4.47	718/1489	4.47	4.75	4.29	4.36	4.47	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	11	2	0	2	2	3	3.44	789/1006	3.44	4.07	4.00	3.99	3.44	
Field Work															
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	5.00	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	28	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	5.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.67	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	28	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 10			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C 7	General 5	Under-grad 30	Non-major 24
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	7	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 20		
				? 0			

Course Section: HAPP 402 0101  
 Title ENVRNMTL HLTH POL & PR  
 Instructor: KEENAN, KIP  
 Enrollment: 39  
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 997  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	3	28	4.90	128/1669	4.90	4.73	4.23	4.39	4.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	1	29	4.90	103/1666	4.90	4.79	4.19	4.22	4.90	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	1	30	4.97	61/1421	4.97	4.80	4.24	4.38	4.97	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	3	27	4.84	146/1617	4.84	4.53	4.15	4.22	4.84	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	2	0	4	4	19	4.31	508/1555	4.31	4.25	4.00	4.08	4.31	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	5	0	0	3	4	19	4.62	290/1543	4.62	4.53	4.06	4.18	4.62	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	0	2	28	4.93	78/1647	4.93	4.84	4.12	4.14	4.93	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	1	14	15	4.47	1223/1668	4.47	4.75	4.67	4.70	4.47	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	99/1605	4.90	4.55	4.07	4.16	4.90	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	0	0	30	4.87	240/1514	4.87	4.72	4.39	4.45	4.87	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	30	4.97	205/1551	4.97	4.95	4.66	4.73	4.97	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	29	4.94	88/1503	4.94	4.66	4.24	4.27	4.94	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	29	4.97	66/1506	4.97	4.75	4.26	4.29	4.97	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	1	1	1	26	4.79	121/1311	4.79	4.31	3.85	3.88	4.79	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	1	1	15	4.67	340/1490	4.67	4.51	4.05	4.26	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	2	1	15	4.72	427/1502	4.72	4.46	4.26	4.46	4.72	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	0	0	1	16	4.72	467/1489	4.72	4.75	4.29	4.52	4.72	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	6	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	155/1006	4.73	4.07	4.00	4.21	4.73	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	31	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.61	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.40	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	30	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.39	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.56	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.20	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.74	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	4.48	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	4.27	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.86	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.50	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 21	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0	Major 25
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 7			
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C 0	General 5	Under-grad 33	Non-major 8
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	7	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 23		
				? 0			

Course Section: HAPP 411 0101  
 Title HEALTH PLANNING & REGU  
 Instructor: SCHUMACHER, JOH  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 998  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	143/1669	4.89	4.73	4.23	4.39	4.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	218/1666	4.78	4.79	4.19	4.22	4.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	392/1421	4.67	4.80	4.24	4.38	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	195/1617	4.78	4.53	4.15	4.22	4.78	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	159/1555	4.78	4.25	4.00	4.08	4.78	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	164/1543	4.78	4.53	4.06	4.18	4.78	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	128/1647	4.88	4.84	4.12	4.14	4.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	769/1668	4.88	4.75	4.67	4.70	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	591/1605	4.33	4.55	4.07	4.16	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	408/1514	4.78	4.72	4.39	4.45	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.95	4.66	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	510/1503	4.56	4.66	4.24	4.27	4.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	471/1506	4.67	4.75	4.26	4.29	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	305/1311	4.44	4.31	3.85	3.88	4.44	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	162/1490	4.88	4.51	4.05	4.26	4.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	266/1502	4.88	4.46	4.26	4.46	4.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.75	4.29	4.52	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	617/1006	3.88	4.07	4.00	4.21	3.88	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.74	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	4.48	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	4.27	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.86	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: HAPP 497 0101  
 Title HLTH PLNG & ADMIN  
 Instructor: COAKLEY, PAUL E  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 999  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	306/1669	4.73	4.73	4.23	4.39	4.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	103/1666	4.91	4.79	4.19	4.22	4.91	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	76/1421	4.95	4.80	4.24	4.38	4.95	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	4	14	4.52	475/1617	4.52	4.53	4.15	4.22	4.52	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	2	5	12	4.24	575/1555	4.24	4.25	4.00	4.08	4.24	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	4	3	13	4.29	628/1543	4.29	4.53	4.06	4.18	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1647	5.00	4.84	4.12	4.14	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.70	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	182/1605	4.73	4.55	4.07	4.16	4.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	189/1514	4.90	4.72	4.39	4.45	4.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	256/1551	4.95	4.95	4.66	4.73	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	126/1503	4.90	4.66	4.24	4.27	4.90	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	164/1506	4.90	4.75	4.26	4.29	4.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	11	1	0	2	0	7	4.20	483/1311	4.20	4.31	3.85	3.88	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	1	1	14	4.59	400/1490	4.59	4.51	4.05	4.26	4.59	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	2	1	1	0	16	4.35	800/1502	4.35	4.46	4.26	4.46	4.35	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	168/1489	4.94	4.75	4.29	4.52	4.94	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	8	0	2	0	0	8	4.40	307/1006	4.40	4.07	4.00	4.21	4.40	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.61	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.40	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.74	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	4.48	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	4.27	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.86	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	3.94	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.80	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.78	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.81	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.50	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.92	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	2.00	****	

Course Section: HAPP 497 0101  
 Title HLTH PLNG & ADMIN  
 Instructor: COAKLEY, PAUL E  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 999  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	18	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	22	Non-major	7
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	0						