

Course-Section: HAPP 100 0101  
 Title SURVEY US HLTH CARE SY  
 Instructor: RILEY, JOYCE L.  
 Enrollment: 37  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 849  
 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	3	7	10	4.24	870/1481	4.24	4.26	4.29	4.14	4.24	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	11	4.38	682/1481	4.38	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	12	4.48	535/1249	4.48	4.37	4.27	4.14	4.48	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	818/1424	4.18	4.27	4.21	4.06	4.18	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	5	2	4	6	3.25	1199/1396	3.25	4.07	3.98	3.89	3.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	12	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	542/1342	4.25	4.12	4.07	3.88	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	5	14	4.57	378/1459	4.57	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.64	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	6	9	4	3.89	981/1450	3.89	4.10	4.09	3.97	3.89	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	261/1409	4.85	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.85	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	5	14	4.60	1031/1407	4.60	4.77	4.69	4.57	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	459/1399	4.60	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	4	15	4.60	492/1400	4.60	4.35	4.27	4.19	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	2	1	2	6	7	3.83	739/1179	3.83	3.94	3.96	3.85	3.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	1	3	10	4.25	570/1262	4.25	4.18	4.05	3.77	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	3	4	8	4.19	826/1259	4.19	4.40	4.29	4.06	4.19	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	2	3	10	4.38	698/1256	4.38	4.34	4.30	4.08	4.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	6	2	3	1	2	2	2.90	731/ 788	2.90	4.03	4.00	3.80	2.90	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	4.26	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	4.08	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	4.45	4.40	4.33	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.37	4.20	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.42	4.04	4.02	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General	8	Under-grad	21	Non-major	4
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: HAPP 200 0101  
 Title HMN DEV IMPL HLTH/DISE  
 Instructor: JEFFREY, JEANET  
 Enrollment: 37  
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 850  
 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	3	0	1	2	3	7	20	4.30	780/1481	4.30	4.26	4.29	4.40	4.30	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	8	9	15	4.15	917/1481	4.15	4.26	4.23	4.29	4.15	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	1	1	1	1	12	17	4.34	671/1249	4.34	4.37	4.27	4.36	4.34	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	14	0	1	4	3	11	4.26	728/1424	4.26	4.27	4.21	4.28	4.26	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	4	3	1	7	5	13	3.83	861/1396	3.83	4.07	3.98	3.94	3.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	19	1	1	2	2	8	4.07	713/1342	4.07	4.12	4.07	4.05	4.07	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	1	0	5	3	23	4.47	520/1459	4.47	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	1	1	4	25	2	3.79	1436/1480	3.79	4.64	4.68	4.68	3.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	2	1	5	7	13	4.00	836/1450	4.00	4.10	4.09	4.15	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	4	7	9	12	3.82	1236/1409	3.82	4.46	4.42	4.47	3.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	2	0	2	29	4.76	823/1407	4.76	4.77	4.69	4.78	4.76	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	7	7	18	4.27	810/1399	4.27	4.30	4.26	4.29	4.27	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	2	5	6	18	4.19	921/1400	4.19	4.35	4.27	4.34	4.19	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	2	3	7	10	9	3.68	836/1179	3.68	3.94	3.96	4.05	3.68	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	0	4	5	10	4.00	708/1262	4.00	4.18	4.05	4.11	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	0	2	5	13	4.38	694/1259	4.38	4.40	4.29	4.34	4.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	3	5	13	4.48	603/1256	4.48	4.34	4.30	4.28	4.48	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	10	2	2	2	1	4	3.27	686/ 788	3.27	4.03	4.00	3.98	3.27	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	35	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 249	****	4.08	4.11	4.32	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	34	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.67	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	34	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	4.07	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	34	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	4.64	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	34	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	3.68	4.26	4.69	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 55	****	3.90	4.55	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	34	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.28	4.75	4.50	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	19	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	6	Under-grad	36	Non-major	17
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	0						

Course-Section: HAPP 401 0101  
 Title OCCUPTNL HLTH POL & PR  
 Instructor: NETZER, MICHAEL  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 851  
 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	3	9	14	4.42	652/1481	4.42	4.26	4.29	4.45	4.42	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	2	7	14	4.42	646/1481	4.42	4.26	4.23	4.32	4.42	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	5	4	16	4.35	671/1249	4.35	4.37	4.27	4.44	4.35	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	1	7	16	4.42	533/1424	4.42	4.27	4.21	4.35	4.42	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	1	4	2	14	3.96	754/1396	3.96	4.07	3.98	4.09	3.96	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	2	1	0	4	4	12	4.24	557/1342	4.24	4.12	4.07	4.21	4.24	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	1	2	5	16	4.50	460/1459	4.50	4.19	4.16	4.25	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.64	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	1	4	7	10	4.18	702/1450	4.18	4.10	4.09	4.28	4.18	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	2	7	15	4.44	839/1409	4.44	4.46	4.42	4.51	4.44	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	2	22	4.84	636/1407	4.84	4.77	4.69	4.79	4.84	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	5	17	4.52	545/1399	4.52	4.30	4.26	4.36	4.52	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	5	16	4.54	551/1400	4.54	4.35	4.27	4.38	4.54	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	3	9	11	4.35	378/1179	4.35	3.94	3.96	4.07	4.35	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	264/1262	4.67	4.18	4.05	4.33	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	276/1259	4.83	4.40	4.29	4.57	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	0	1	16	4.78	332/1256	4.78	4.34	4.30	4.60	4.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	5	0	1	4	1	7	4.08	377/ 788	4.08	4.03	4.00	4.26	4.08	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 249	****	4.08	4.11	3.87	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	4.68	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 69	****	4.26	4.53	4.64	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 63	****	4.24	4.44	4.49	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 69	****	4.19	4.35	4.53	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 68	****	3.98	3.92	4.10	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	4.56	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	4.91	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	3.68	4.26	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	3.50	4.42	4.83	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	3.90	4.55	4.86	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	4.28	4.75	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	4.42	4.65	4.71	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.83	5.00	****	

Course-Section: HAPP 401 0101  
 Title OCCUPTNL HLTH POL & PR  
 Instructor: NETZER, MICHAEL  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 851  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	14	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	27	Non-major	11
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	11	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	16				
				?	0						

Course-Section: HAPP 411 0101  
 Title HEALTH PLANNING & REGU  
 Instructor: SCHUMACHER, JOH  
 Enrollment: 28  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 852  
 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	1	5	15	4.67	395/1481	4.67	4.26	4.29	4.45	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	9	11	4.48	560/1481	4.48	4.26	4.23	4.32	4.48	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	16	4.67	334/1249	4.67	4.37	4.27	4.44	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	11	9	4.38	582/1424	4.38	4.27	4.21	4.35	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	193/1396	4.67	4.07	3.98	4.09	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	7	12	4.43	384/1342	4.43	4.12	4.07	4.21	4.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	189/1459	4.76	4.19	4.16	4.25	4.76	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	13	6	4.25	1215/1480	4.25	4.64	4.68	4.74	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	10	6	4.29	588/1450	4.29	4.10	4.09	4.28	4.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	574/1409	4.65	4.46	4.42	4.51	4.65	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	19	4.90	500/1407	4.90	4.77	4.69	4.79	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	2	15	4.60	459/1399	4.60	4.30	4.26	4.36	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	8	12	4.60	492/1400	4.60	4.35	4.27	4.38	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	223/1179	4.58	3.94	3.96	4.07	4.58	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	3	4	5	3.92	779/1262	3.92	4.18	4.05	4.33	3.92	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	1	1	10	4.54	564/1259	4.54	4.40	4.29	4.57	4.54	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	428/1256	4.69	4.34	4.30	4.60	4.69	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	2	0	3	0	5	3.60	584/ 788	3.60	4.03	4.00	4.26	3.60	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	4.08	4.11	3.87	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	4.68	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 69	****	4.26	4.53	4.64	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	4.24	4.44	4.49	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.19	4.35	4.53	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	3.98	3.92	4.10	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	4.56	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	4.91	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	3.90	4.55	4.86	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.28	4.75	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	4.42	4.65	4.71	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.83	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.82	5.00	****	

Course-Section: HAPP 411 0101  
 Title HEALTH PLANNING & REGU  
 Instructor: SCHUMACHER, JOH  
 Enrollment: 28  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 852  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	8	Under-grad	21	Non-major	3
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	1						

Course-Section: HAPP 498 0101  
 Title FIN. MGMT. DECISION S  
 Instructor: COAKLEY, PAUL  
 Enrollment: 28  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 853  
 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	18	4.86	196/1481	4.86	4.26	4.29	4.45	4.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	115/1481	4.90	4.26	4.23	4.32	4.90	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	142/1249	4.90	4.37	4.27	4.44	4.90	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	165/1424	4.83	4.27	4.21	4.35	4.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	241/1396	4.60	4.07	3.98	4.09	4.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	3	14	4.55	270/1342	4.55	4.12	4.07	4.21	4.55	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	161/1459	4.80	4.19	4.16	4.25	4.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	10	4.48	1065/1480	4.48	4.64	4.68	4.74	4.48	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	131/1450	4.82	4.10	4.09	4.28	4.82	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	188/1409	4.90	4.46	4.42	4.51	4.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	20	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	1	19	4.95	77/1399	4.95	4.30	4.26	4.36	4.95	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	146/1400	4.90	4.35	4.27	4.38	4.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	359/1179	4.38	3.94	3.96	4.07	4.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	1	14	4.69	254/1262	4.69	4.18	4.05	4.33	4.69	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	148/1259	4.94	4.40	4.29	4.57	4.94	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.34	4.30	4.60	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	6	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	218/ 788	4.40	4.03	4.00	4.26	4.40	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	4.26	4.20	4.45	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	4.08	4.11	3.87	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	4.45	4.40	4.45	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 16	Required for Majors 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 4	
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5	C 0	General 0
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	4	D 0	Under-grad 21
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Non-major 3
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	Electives 0
					Other 20

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