

Course-Section: RUSS 101 0101
 Title BASIC RUSSIAN I
 Instructor: RUSINKO, ELAINE
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1448
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	2	1	4	17	4.50	615/1639	4.72	4.22	4.27	4.08	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	16	4.65	360/1639	4.79	4.15	4.22	4.17	4.65	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	18	4.71	334/1397	4.79	4.37	4.28	4.18	4.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	0	7	11	4.47	512/1583	4.70	4.18	4.19	4.01	4.47	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	7	13	4.29	544/1532	4.38	4.10	4.01	3.88	4.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	329/1504	4.78	4.04	4.05	3.78	4.56	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	6	8	10	4.17	913/1612	4.44	4.02	4.16	4.10	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	24	0	4.00	1497/1635	4.13	4.38	4.65	4.56	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	3	10	4	4.06	859/1579	4.25	4.00	4.08	3.95	4.06	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	670/1518	4.81	4.23	4.43	4.38	4.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	776/1520	4.91	4.67	4.70	4.61	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	462/1517	4.67	4.15	4.27	4.20	4.62	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	7	13	4.52	614/1550	4.76	4.27	4.22	4.17	4.52	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	1	3	2	5	8	3.84	776/1295	4.02	3.77	3.94	3.84	3.84	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	1	4	6	4.17	695/1398	4.21	4.18	4.07	3.85	4.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	557/1391	4.42	4.51	4.30	4.07	4.58	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	821/1388	4.01	4.35	4.28	4.01	4.27	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	1	1	3	3	0	3	3.10	834/ 958	3.30	4.02	3.93	3.71	3.10	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	9	0.00-0.99 0	A 14	Required for Majors 13	Graduate 0 Major 2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 3	General 1	Under-grad 24 Non-major 22
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 0	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 1		
			I 0	Other 7	
			? 0		

Course-Section: RUSS 101 0201
 Title BASIC RUSSIAN I
 Instructor: RUSINKO, ELAINE
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1449
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	14	4.93	120/1639	4.72	4.22	4.27	4.08	4.93	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	102/1639	4.79	4.15	4.22	4.17	4.93	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	189/1397	4.79	4.37	4.28	4.18	4.87	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	128/1583	4.70	4.18	4.19	4.01	4.92	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	10	4.47	377/1532	4.38	4.10	4.01	3.88	4.47	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1504	4.78	4.04	4.05	3.78	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	259/1612	4.44	4.02	4.16	4.10	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	4	4.27	1342/1635	4.13	4.38	4.65	4.56	4.27	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	450/1579	4.25	4.00	4.08	3.95	4.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1518	4.81	4.23	4.43	4.38	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1520	4.91	4.67	4.70	4.61	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	335/1517	4.67	4.15	4.27	4.20	4.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1550	4.76	4.27	4.22	4.17	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	505/1295	4.02	3.77	3.94	3.84	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	625/1398	4.21	4.18	4.07	3.85	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	816/1391	4.42	4.51	4.30	4.07	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	3	1	3	3.75	1095/1388	4.01	4.35	4.28	4.01	3.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	1	1	0	2	2	3.50	725/ 958	3.30	4.02	3.93	3.71	3.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 224	****	4.00	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.75	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.67	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.60	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.80	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.20	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	3.00	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.33	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: RUSS 101 0201
 Title BASIC RUSSIAN I
 Instructor: RUSINKO, ELAINE
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1449
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: RUSS 201 0101
 Title BASIC RUSSIAN III
 Instructor: VINOGRADOVA, PO
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1450
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	9	4.35	797/1639	4.35	4.22	4.27	4.35	4.35	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	9	4.29	822/1639	4.29	4.15	4.22	4.27	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	383/1397	4.65	4.37	4.28	4.39	4.65		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	392/1583	4.58	4.18	4.19	4.28	4.58	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	3	5	5	3.93	883/1532	3.93	4.10	4.01	4.09	3.93	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	8	5	4.06	791/1504	4.06	4.04	4.05	4.09	4.06	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	2	13	4.59	408/1612	4.59	4.02	4.16	4.21	4.59	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	15	2	4.12	1447/1635	4.12	4.38	4.65	4.63	4.12	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	8	5	4.20	725/1579	4.20	4.00	4.08	4.14	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	8	9	4.53	782/1518	4.53	4.23	4.43	4.48	4.53	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	597/1520	4.88	4.67	4.70	4.78	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	428/1517	4.65	4.15	4.27	4.34	4.65	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	545/1550	4.59	4.27	4.22	4.33	4.59	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	1	0	4	2	3	3.60	929/1295	3.60	3.77	3.94	4.07	3.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	6	5	5	3.76	958/1398	3.76	4.18	4.07	4.14	3.76	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	380/1391	4.76	4.51	4.30	4.35	4.76	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	3	5	8	4.18	882/1388	4.18	4.35	4.28	4.37	4.18	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	6	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	386/ 958	4.18	4.02	3.93	4.00	4.18	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors 10	Graduate 0 Major 3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 5	C 2	General 2	Under-grad 17 Non-major 14
84-150	7	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 4	
			? 0		

Course-Section: RUSS 301 0101
 Title CONTINUING RUSSIAN II
 Instructor: YOUNG, STEVEN
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1451
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	0	1	4	4.80	257/1639	4.80	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	199/1639	4.80	4.15	4.22	4.20	4.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	230/1397	4.80	4.37	4.28	4.26	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	239/1583	4.75	4.18	4.19	4.24	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	146/1532	4.80	4.10	4.01	4.05	4.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	150/1504	4.80	4.04	4.05	4.12	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1612	5.00	4.02	4.16	4.12	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.38	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	382/1579	4.50	4.00	4.08	4.07	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	454/1518	4.75	4.23	4.43	4.39	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.67	4.70	4.68	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	299/1517	4.75	4.15	4.27	4.23	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	351/1550	4.75	4.27	4.22	4.20	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	978/1295	3.50	3.77	3.94	3.95	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	426/1398	4.50	4.18	4.07	4.13	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.51	4.30	4.35	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.35	4.28	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	307/ 958	4.33	4.02	3.93	3.97	4.33	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		6
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	Non-major
			P 0		4
			I 0		
			? 1	Other	
					3

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: RUSS 303 0101
 Title CONTINUING RUSS CONV I
 Instructor: ZHDANOVYCH, VIR
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1452
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	990/1639	4.17	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	774/1639	4.33	4.15	4.22	4.20	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1397	****	4.37	4.28	4.26	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1324/1583	3.67	4.18	4.19	4.24	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1184/1532	3.60	4.10	4.01	4.05	3.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1116/1504	3.67	4.04	4.05	4.12	3.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1612	5.00	4.02	4.16	4.12	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.38	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1170/1579	3.75	4.00	4.08	4.07	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	602/1518	4.67	4.23	4.43	4.39	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.67	4.70	4.68	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	800/1517	4.33	4.15	4.27	4.23	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	972/1550	4.17	4.27	4.22	4.20	4.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	783/1295	3.83	3.77	3.94	3.95	3.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1030/1398	3.67	4.18	4.07	4.13	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	300/1391	4.83	4.51	4.30	4.35	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	647/1388	4.50	4.35	4.28	4.34	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	786/ 958	3.33	4.02	3.93	3.97	3.33	

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	1	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate 1
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 5
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	3
			? 0		

Course-Section: RUSS 401 0101
 Title ADVANCED RUSSIAN I
 Instructor: ZHDANOVYCH, VIR
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1453
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	1/1639	5.00	4.22	4.27	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.15	4.22	4.29	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.37	4.28	4.38	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.18	4.19	4.31	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1532	5.00	4.10	4.01	4.07	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.04	4.05	4.20	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	490/1612	4.50	4.02	4.16	4.18	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.38	4.65	4.72	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.00	4.08	4.21	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.23	4.43	4.51	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.67	4.70	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	597/1517	4.50	4.15	4.27	4.34	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.27	4.22	4.24	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	265/1295	4.50	3.77	3.94	4.01	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

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