

Course Section: CHIN 101 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY CHINESE I
 Instructor: GUO, XIAONAN
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 351
 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	0	0	2	13	4.87	159/1669	4.73	4.33	4.23	4.02	4.87	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	412/1666	4.65	4.28	4.19	4.11	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	177/1421	4.83	4.36	4.24	4.11	4.87	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	1	5	8	4.27	790/1617	4.38	4.27	4.15	3.99	4.27	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	153/1555	4.75	4.17	4.00	3.92	4.79	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	516/1543	4.49	4.19	4.06	3.86	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	7	5	3.88	1187/1647	4.10	4.18	4.12	4.06	3.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.60	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	1	1	7	4	4.08	871/1605	4.21	4.13	4.07	3.96	4.08	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	1003/1514	4.54	4.39	4.39	4.32	4.36	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	917/1551	4.87	4.72	4.66	4.55	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	491/1503	4.64	4.31	4.24	4.17	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	225/1506	4.79	4.40	4.26	4.17	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	2	3	1	0	1	2.29	1258/1311	3.14	3.78	3.85	3.68	2.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	622/1490	4.27	4.26	4.05	3.85	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	256/1502	4.84	4.54	4.26	4.06	4.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	299/1489	4.74	4.43	4.29	4.07	4.89	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	199/1006	4.49	4.14	4.00	3.81	4.60	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.42	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	4.00	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	3.00	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	3.50	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 105	****	4.00	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	4.33	4.22	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	5	Under-grad	16	Non-major	15
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				

Course Section: CHIN 101 0201
 Title ELEMENTARY CHINESE I
 Instructor: GUO, XIAONAN
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 352
 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	2	2	11	4.60	478/1669	4.73	4.33	4.23	4.02	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	359/1666	4.65	4.28	4.19	4.11	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	217/1421	4.83	4.36	4.24	4.11	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	496/1617	4.38	4.27	4.15	3.99	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	195/1555	4.75	4.17	4.00	3.92	4.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	325/1543	4.49	4.19	4.06	3.86	4.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	759/1647	4.10	4.18	4.12	4.06	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.60	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	8	6	4.33	591/1605	4.21	4.13	4.07	3.96	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	505/1514	4.54	4.39	4.39	4.32	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1551	4.87	4.72	4.66	4.55	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	323/1503	4.64	4.31	4.24	4.17	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	407/1506	4.79	4.40	4.26	4.17	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	1	0	2	2	5	4.00	587/1311	3.14	3.78	3.85	3.68	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	742/1490	4.27	4.26	4.05	3.85	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	336/1502	4.84	4.54	4.26	4.06	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	596/1489	4.74	4.43	4.29	4.07	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	322/1006	4.49	4.14	4.00	3.81	4.38	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 12	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 4	Under-grad 15 Non-major 14
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 0		

Course Section: CHIN 201 0101
 Title INTERMEDIATE CHINESE I
 Instructor: BROWN, WILLIAM
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 353
 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	19	4.75	269/1669	4.75	4.33	4.23	4.34	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	21	4.83	157/1666	4.83	4.28	4.19	4.29	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	20	4.79	229/1421	4.79	4.36	4.24	4.35	4.79	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	288/1617	4.70	4.27	4.15	4.24	4.70	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	159/1555	4.77	4.17	4.00	3.96	4.77	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	195/1543	4.74	4.19	4.06	4.10	4.74	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	3	8	12	4.25	862/1647	4.25	4.18	4.12	4.19	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	18	6	4.25	1382/1668	4.25	4.60	4.67	4.59	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	201/1605	4.71	4.13	4.07	4.15	4.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	21	4.88	240/1514	4.88	4.39	4.39	4.39	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.72	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	21	4.88	154/1503	4.88	4.31	4.24	4.29	4.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	20	4.75	353/1506	4.75	4.40	4.26	4.33	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	11	1	1	2	1	8	4.08	552/1311	4.08	3.78	3.85	3.96	4.08	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	214/1490	4.80	4.26	4.05	4.11	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.54	4.26	4.31	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.43	4.29	4.36	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	2	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	105/1006	4.88	4.14	4.00	3.99	4.88	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.42	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.36	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.00	4.38	4.59	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.00	4.20	4.63	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	4.20	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.33	4.22	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	5.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 55	****	4.42	4.34	4.67	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	4.33	4.45	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	5.00	4.34	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 16	Required for Majors 15	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C 2	General 6	Under-grad 24	Non-major 24
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	5	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 1			

I	0	Other	1
?	0		

Course Section: CHIN 301 0101
 Title ADVANCED CHINESE I
 Instructor: BROWN, WILLIAM
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 354
 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	0	4	6	4.60	478/1669	4.60	4.33	4.23	4.28	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	319/1666	4.70	4.28	4.19	4.20	4.70	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	683/1421	4.40	4.36	4.24	4.25	4.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	673/1617	4.38	4.27	4.15	4.22	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	340/1555	4.50	4.17	4.00	4.03	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	344/1543	4.56	4.19	4.06	4.14	4.56	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	651/1647	4.40	4.18	4.12	4.14	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	1039/1668	4.70	4.60	4.67	4.68	4.70	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	654/1605	4.29	4.13	4.07	4.09	4.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	584/1514	4.67	4.39	4.39	4.46	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	567/1551	4.89	4.72	4.66	4.70	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	254/1503	4.78	4.31	4.24	4.28	4.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	188/1506	4.89	4.40	4.26	4.30	4.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	142/1311	4.75	3.78	3.85	3.97	4.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	192/1490	4.83	4.26	4.05	4.11	4.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	486/1502	4.67	4.54	4.26	4.28	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	532/1489	4.67	4.43	4.29	4.35	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	479/1006	4.00	4.14	4.00	4.10	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: CHIN 309 0101
 Title BUSINESS CHINESE
 Instructor: BROWN, WILLIAM
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 355
 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	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1409/1669	3.67	4.33	4.23	4.28	3.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	549/1666	4.50	4.28	4.19	4.20	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	197/1421	4.83	4.36	4.24	4.25	4.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	323/1617	4.67	4.27	4.15	4.22	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	773/1555	4.00	4.17	4.00	4.03	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	130/1543	4.83	4.19	4.06	4.14	4.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	302/1647	4.67	4.18	4.12	4.14	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	1329/1668	4.33	4.60	4.67	4.68	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	591/1605	4.33	4.13	4.07	4.09	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.39	4.39	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.72	4.66	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.31	4.24	4.28	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.40	4.26	4.30	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	389/1311	4.33	3.78	3.85	3.97	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1490	5.00	4.26	4.05	4.11	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	632/1502	4.50	4.54	4.26	4.28	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.43	4.29	4.35	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1006	****	4.14	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.17	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.13	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 112	5.00	4.00	4.38	4.53	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	68/ 97	4.00	3.00	4.36	4.12	4.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	42/ 92	4.50	3.50	4.22	4.47	4.50	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	72/ 105	4.00	4.00	4.20	4.45	4.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	28/ 98	4.50	4.00	3.95	4.15	4.50	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.33	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.00	3.97	3.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	5.00	4.33	3.49	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	31/ 55	4.50	4.42	4.34	4.03	4.50	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	4.33	4.45	4.13	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 29	5.00	5.00	4.34	4.13	5.00	

Course Section: CHIN 309 0101
 Title BUSINESS CHINESE
 Instructor: BROWN, WILLIAM
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 355
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	6	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	8	Non-major	8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						