

Course-Section: LLC 600B 0101
 Title INTRODUCTION TO LLC
 Instructor: BICKEL, BEVERLY
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1008
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	8	4.67	415/1576	4.67	4.64	4.30	4.43	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	279/1576	4.75	4.50	4.27	4.32	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.76	4.32	4.38	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	249/1520	4.75	4.61	4.25	4.36	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	341/1465	4.55	4.56	4.12	4.25	4.55	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	218/1434	4.73	4.67	4.14	4.35	4.73	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	608/1547	4.45	4.48	4.19	4.24	4.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	813/1574	4.73	4.90	4.64	4.75	4.73	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	180/1554	4.78	4.45	4.10	4.18	4.78	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	505/1488	4.75	4.54	4.47	4.52	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	501/1493	4.92	4.88	4.73	4.80	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	468/1486	4.67	4.52	4.32	4.37	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	378/1489	4.75	4.61	4.32	4.38	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	366/1277	4.44	4.30	4.03	4.08	4.44	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	2	8	4.33	603/1279	4.33	4.47	4.17	4.34	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	412/1270	4.75	4.73	4.35	4.53	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.78	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	164/ 878	4.67	4.54	4.05	4.11	4.67	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	4.81	4.72	4.79	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	4.81	4.69	4.77	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 72	5.00	4.81	4.64	4.70	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	4.81	4.61	4.70	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	171/ 375	4.33	4.37	4.01	4.10	4.33	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	6	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	6	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: LLC 612 0101
 Title LANG, RACE & ETHNICITY
 Instructor: MALLINSON, CHRI
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1009
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	3	4.75	301/1576	4.75	4.64	4.30	4.43	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	279/1576	4.75	4.50	4.27	4.32	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.76	4.32	4.38	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.61	4.25	4.36	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.56	4.12	4.25	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.67	4.14	4.35	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.48	4.19	4.24	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.90	4.64	4.75	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	395/1554	4.50	4.45	4.10	4.18	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	505/1488	4.75	4.54	4.47	4.52	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.88	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.52	4.32	4.37	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.61	4.32	4.38	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	309/1277	4.50	4.30	4.03	4.08	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	262/1279	4.75	4.47	4.17	4.34	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	412/1270	4.75	4.73	4.35	4.53	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.78	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.54	4.05	4.11	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: LLC 616 0101
 Title CYBERSPACE CULTURE & S
 Instructor: MALONEY-KRICHMA
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1010
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	2	0	5	6	4.15	1050/1576	4.15	4.64	4.30	4.43	4.15
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	3	0	3	5	3.67	1345/1576	3.67	4.50	4.27	4.32	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	240/1342	4.80	4.76	4.32	4.38	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	5	5	3.92	1141/1520	3.92	4.61	4.25	4.36	3.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	1	4	4	3.82	1059/1465	3.82	4.56	4.12	4.25	3.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	0	4	4	3.73	1111/1434	3.73	4.67	4.14	4.35	3.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	4	1	0	3	4	3.17	1432/1547	3.17	4.48	4.19	4.24	3.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	911/1574	4.67	4.90	4.64	4.75	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	4	0	4	3.78	1152/1554	3.78	4.45	4.10	4.18	3.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	2	2	5	3.91	1316/1488	3.91	4.54	4.47	4.52	3.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	1089/1493	4.64	4.88	4.73	4.80	4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	2	1	7	4.00	1101/1486	4.00	4.52	4.32	4.37	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	3	1	6	3.92	1184/1489	3.92	4.61	4.32	4.38	3.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	1	1	4	5	3.92	791/1277	3.92	4.30	4.03	4.08	3.92
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	3	1	6	4.09	774/1279	4.09	4.47	4.17	4.34	4.09
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	559/1270	4.60	4.73	4.35	4.53	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	858/1269	4.18	4.78	4.35	4.55	4.18
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	1	1	1	1	5	3.89	566/ 878	3.89	4.54	4.05	4.11	3.89
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	68/ 85	4.44	4.81	4.72	4.79	4.44
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	60/ 79	4.44	4.81	4.69	4.77	4.44
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	53/ 72	4.44	4.81	4.64	4.70	4.44
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	57/ 80	4.44	4.81	4.61	4.70	4.44
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	1	1	0	1	6	4.11	179/ 375	4.11	4.37	4.01	4.10	4.11

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 5
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	5
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		8
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
				Other	4

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: LLC 645 0101
 Title QUANT RESEARCH MTHDS 1
 Instructor: GALINDO, CLAUDI
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1011
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	1	0	5	4.29	916/1576	4.29	4.64	4.30	4.43	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	1138/1576	4.00	4.50	4.27	4.32	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	0	5	4.00	972/1342	4.00	4.76	4.32	4.38	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	945/1520	4.17	4.61	4.25	4.36	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	3	3	4.00	850/1465	4.00	4.56	4.12	4.25	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	345/1434	4.57	4.67	4.14	4.35	4.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	838/1547	4.25	4.48	4.19	4.24	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.90	4.64	4.75	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	1132/1554	3.80	4.45	4.10	4.18	3.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	1329/1488	3.86	4.54	4.47	4.52	3.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	986/1493	4.71	4.88	4.73	4.80	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	2	1	2	3.43	1355/1486	3.43	4.52	4.32	4.37	3.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	1118/1489	4.00	4.61	4.32	4.38	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	0	5	1	3.71	916/1277	3.71	4.30	4.03	4.08	3.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	802/1279	4.00	4.47	4.17	4.34	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	814/1270	4.29	4.73	4.35	4.53	4.29	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	644/1269	4.50	4.78	4.35	4.55	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	2	4	0	3.67	671/ 878	3.67	4.54	4.05	4.11	3.67	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.37	4.01	4.10	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate 4
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 3
Grad.	4	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: LLC 650 0101
 Title ADV QUALITATIVE METHOD
 Instructor: MALLINSON, CHRI
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1012
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.64	4.30	4.43	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.50	4.27	4.32	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.61	4.25	4.36	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.56	4.12	4.25	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.67	4.14	4.35	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.48	4.19	4.24	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.90	4.64	4.75	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.45	4.10	4.18	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.54	4.47	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.88	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.52	4.32	4.37	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.61	4.32	4.38	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.30	4.03	4.08	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	335/1279	4.67	4.47	4.17	4.34	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.73	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.78	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.54	4.05	4.11	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	5.00	4.48	4.40	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 48	5.00	5.00	4.40	4.76	5.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 44	5.00	5.00	4.73	4.88	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 45	5.00	5.00	4.57	4.65	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	5.00	4.03	4.10	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: LLC 750A 0101
 Title INEQUALITY IN K-12 EDU
 Instructor: GALINDO, CLAUDI
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1013
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	7	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.64	4.30	4.43	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	187/1576	4.86	4.50	4.27	4.32	4.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.76	4.32	4.38	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	179/1520	4.83	4.61	4.25	4.36	4.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.56	4.12	4.25	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.67	4.14	4.35	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.48	4.19	4.24	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.90	4.64	4.75	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	146/1554	4.83	4.45	4.10	4.18	4.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.54	4.47	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.88	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.52	4.32	4.37	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.61	4.32	4.38	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	585/1277	4.20	4.30	4.03	4.08	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.47	4.17	4.34	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.73	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.78	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.54	4.05	4.11	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	4.81	4.72	4.79	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	4.81	4.69	4.77	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 72	5.00	4.81	4.64	4.70	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	4.81	4.61	4.70	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	146/ 375	4.67	4.37	4.01	4.10	4.67	

Frequency Distribution

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