

Course-Section: KORE 102 01  
 Title Elementary Korean II  
 Instructor: Yoon,Kyung-Eun  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 891  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	353/1447	4.71	4.31	4.31	4.18	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	154/1447	4.86	4.34	4.27	4.30	4.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	231/1241	4.81	4.48	4.33	4.25	4.81
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	129/1402	4.86	4.36	4.24	4.15	4.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	237/1358	4.67	4.26	4.11	4.03	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	196/1316	4.71	4.27	4.14	3.99	4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	237/1427	4.71	4.21	4.19	4.24	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	12	4.57	1036/1447	4.57	4.66	4.69	4.68	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	230/1434	4.67	4.12	4.10	4.10	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	200/1387	4.90	4.45	4.46	4.46	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	528/1387	4.90	4.78	4.73	4.71	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	253/1386	4.81	4.35	4.32	4.32	4.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	159/1380	4.90	4.43	4.32	4.31	4.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	4	3	12	4.30	440/1193	4.30	4.02	4.02	3.99	4.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	487/1172	4.38	4.26	4.15	3.95	4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	553/1182	4.50	4.56	4.35	4.18	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	576/1170	4.50	4.41	4.38	4.17	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	13	1	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	318/ 800	4.29	4.17	4.06	3.95	4.29
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
-----										
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 1	General	9	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives	6	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P 0						
				I 0	Other	0				
				? 1						

Course-Section: KORE 201 01  
 Title Intermediate Korean I  
 Instructor: Krippes, Yeon K.  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 892  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	518/1447	4.56	4.31	4.31	4.31	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	633/1447	4.44	4.34	4.27	4.23	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	12	4.56	487/1241	4.56	4.48	4.33	4.35	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	2	12	4.67	314/1402	4.67	4.36	4.24	4.24	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	1	3	10	4.40	452/1358	4.40	4.26	4.11	4.12	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	12	4.56	332/1316	4.56	4.27	4.14	4.08	4.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	0	5	9	4.25	775/1427	4.25	4.21	4.19	4.14	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	754/1447	4.80	4.66	4.69	4.70	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	341/1434	4.50	4.12	4.10	3.97	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	291/1387	4.85	4.45	4.46	4.42	4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.78	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	1	0	11	4.62	496/1386	4.62	4.35	4.32	4.24	4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	534/1380	4.62	4.43	4.32	4.30	4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	100/1193	4.80	4.02	4.02	4.04	4.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	323/1172	4.60	4.26	4.15	4.12	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	303/1182	4.80	4.56	4.35	4.30	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	576/1170	4.50	4.41	4.38	4.32	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 800	****	4.17	4.06	4.01	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 7	Under-grad 16	Non-major 16
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	243/1447	4.81	4.31	4.31	4.31	4.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	270/1447	4.73	4.34	4.27	4.23	4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	222/1241	4.81	4.48	4.33	4.35	4.81
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	292/1402	4.69	4.36	4.24	4.24	4.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	137/1358	4.80	4.26	4.11	4.12	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	434/1316	4.47	4.27	4.14	4.08	4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	2	2	10	4.40	596/1427	4.40	4.21	4.19	4.14	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	339/1447	4.93	4.66	4.69	4.70	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	0	0	5	5	4.18	712/1434	4.18	4.12	4.10	3.97	4.18
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	383/1387	4.79	4.45	4.46	4.42	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	656/1387	4.86	4.78	4.73	4.71	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	366/1386	4.71	4.35	4.32	4.24	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	392/1380	4.71	4.43	4.32	4.30	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	236/1193	4.58	4.02	4.02	4.04	4.58
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	152/1172	4.86	4.26	4.15	4.12	4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	229/1182	4.88	4.56	4.35	4.30	4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	275/1170	4.86	4.41	4.38	4.32	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	114/ 800	4.71	4.17	4.06	4.01	4.71
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	****	3.00	4.34	4.47	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	****	4.00	4.34	4.38	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 187	****	3.67	4.33	4.46	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	****	3.67	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	3.99	4.58	4.43	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	4.90	4.56	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.80	4.41	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.55	4.42	4.36	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	4.45	4.09	3.70	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.49	2.25	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	4.70	4.25	3.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.00	4.30	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	4.50	4.43	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.57	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.64	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	****	****

Course-Section: KORE 202 01  
 Title Intermediate Korean II  
 Instructor: Krippes, Yeon K.  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 893  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	4	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	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	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: KORE 302 01  
 Title Advanced Korean II  
 Instructor: Yoon,Kyung-Eun  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 894  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	254/1447	4.80	4.31	4.31	4.32	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	196/1447	4.80	4.34	4.27	4.23	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	231/1241	4.80	4.48	4.33	4.33	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	165/1402	4.80	4.36	4.24	4.24	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	187/1358	4.73	4.26	4.11	4.10	4.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	96/1316	4.87	4.27	4.14	4.13	4.87
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	422/1427	4.53	4.21	4.19	4.15	4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	1060/1447	4.53	4.66	4.69	4.65	4.53
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	0	2	7	4.40	454/1434	4.40	4.12	4.10	4.09	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.45	4.46	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.78	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	182/1386	4.87	4.35	4.32	4.30	4.87
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	204/1380	4.87	4.43	4.32	4.32	4.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	1	1	1	1	6	4.00	652/1193	4.00	4.02	4.02	4.05	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	302/1172	4.64	4.26	4.15	4.24	4.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	292/1182	4.82	4.56	4.35	4.42	4.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	223/1170	4.91	4.41	4.38	4.49	4.91
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	180/ 800	4.55	4.17	4.06	4.12	4.55

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 15	Non-major 15
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 0			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	118/1447	4.93	4.31	4.31	4.32	4.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	89/1447	4.93	4.34	4.27	4.23	4.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	186/1241	4.86	4.48	4.33	4.33	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	186/1402	4.79	4.36	4.24	4.24	4.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	69/1358	4.92	4.26	4.11	4.10	4.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	102/1316	4.86	4.27	4.14	4.13	4.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	120/1427	4.86	4.21	4.19	4.15	4.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	786/1447	4.79	4.66	4.69	4.65	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	206/1434	4.70	4.12	4.10	4.09	4.70
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.45	4.46	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	422/1387	4.92	4.78	4.73	4.71	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	109/1386	4.92	4.35	4.32	4.30	4.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	127/1380	4.92	4.43	4.32	4.32	4.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	262/1193	4.55	4.02	4.02	4.05	4.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.26	4.15	4.24	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.56	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.41	4.38	4.49	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 800	5.00	4.17	4.06	4.12	5.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	****	3.00	4.34	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	****	4.00	4.34	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.36	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 187	****	3.67	4.33	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	****	3.67	4.20	4.02	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	3.99	4.58	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	4.90	4.56	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.80	4.41	2.87	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.55	4.42	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	4.45	4.09	3.38	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.49	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	4.70	4.25	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	4.46	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.00	4.30	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	4.50	4.43	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.57	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.64	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	5.00	****

Course-Section: KORE 309 01  
 Title Business Korean  
 Instructor: Yoon, Kyung-Eun  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 895  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						