

Course-Section: RUSS 102 0101
 Title BASIC RUSSIAN II
 Instructor: VINOGRADOVA, PO
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1330
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	1	0	1	0	2	2	19	4.58	442/1504	4.58	4.24	4.27	4.13	4.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	0	0	5	17	4.46	572/1503	4.46	4.22	4.20	4.16	4.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	19	4.64	367/1290	4.64	4.32	4.28	4.19	4.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	1	3	0	2	15	4.29	741/1453	4.29	4.22	4.21	4.11	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	2	1	0	5	13	4.24	563/1421	4.24	4.08	4.00	3.91	4.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	1	2	3	15	4.36	462/1365	4.36	4.11	4.08	3.96	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	0	4	19	4.60	349/1485	4.60	4.20	4.16	4.13	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	2	0	1	0	5	11	4.53	322/1483	4.53	4.07	4.06	3.97	4.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	0	4	18	4.65	587/1425	4.65	4.41	4.41	4.36	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	596/1426	4.86	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	3	19	4.67	378/1418	4.67	4.29	4.25	4.20	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	0	4	18	4.54	583/1416	4.54	4.34	4.26	4.21	4.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	1	2	6	11	4.19	542/1199	4.19	3.95	3.97	3.82	4.19
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	1	0	6	12	4.19	632/1312	4.19	4.12	4.00	3.69	4.19
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	0	3	17	4.71	401/1303	4.71	4.39	4.24	3.93	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	3	2	14	4.45	634/1299	4.45	4.34	4.25	3.94	4.45
4. Were special techniques successful	4	5	1	0	2	5	8	4.19	333/ 758	4.19	4.05	4.01	3.80	4.19
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.07	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	4.12	4.09	4.07	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	4.49	4.40	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.40	4.23	4.01	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	4.22	4.09	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.60	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.54	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	4.32	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.41	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	4.17	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.98	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	4.12	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.68	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.32	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.61	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.28	4.53	4.52	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	35	****	4.43	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	36	****	4.38	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	20	****	5.00	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	5.00	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: RUSS 102 0101
 Title BASIC RUSSIAN II
 Instructor: VINOGRADOVA, PO
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1330
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	4	Under-grad	25	Non-major	2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	2						

Course-Section: RUSS 202 0101
 Title CONTINUING RUSSIAN I
 Instructor: BLYUKHER, ALLA
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1331
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5							
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	153/1504	4.88	4.24	4.27	4.26	4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	357/1503	4.63	4.22	4.20	4.18	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	152/1290	4.88	4.32	4.28	4.27	4.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	270/1453	4.67	4.22	4.21	4.20	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	101/1421	4.88	4.08	4.00	3.90	4.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	94/1365	4.88	4.11	4.08	4.00	4.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	329/1485	4.63	4.20	4.16	4.15	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	1	4.13	1368/1504	4.13	4.68	4.69	4.68	4.13
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	211/1483	4.67	4.07	4.06	4.02	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	492/1425	4.71	4.41	4.41	4.40	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	317/1418	4.71	4.29	4.25	4.22	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	198/1416	4.86	4.34	4.26	4.24	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1199	5.00	3.95	3.97	3.95	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	364/1312	4.50	4.12	4.00	3.98	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	563/1303	4.50	4.39	4.24	4.23	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	741/1299	4.33	4.34	4.25	4.21	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	154/ 758	4.60	4.05	4.01	3.89	4.60

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: RUSS 302 0101
 Title CONTINUING RUSSIAN III
 Instructor: YOUNG, STEVEN
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1332
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	1	3	4.75	262/1504	4.75	4.24	4.27	4.27	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	495/1503	4.50	4.22	4.20	4.22	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	937/1290	4.00	4.32	4.28	4.31	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	775/1453	4.25	4.22	4.21	4.23	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.08	4.00	4.01	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	139/1365	4.75	4.11	4.08	4.08	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	761/1485	4.25	4.20	4.16	4.17	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1467/1504	3.75	4.68	4.69	4.65	3.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	850/1483	4.00	4.07	4.06	4.08	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	784/1425	4.50	4.41	4.41	4.43	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	1128/1426	4.50	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1013/1418	4.00	4.29	4.25	4.26	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	623/1416	4.50	4.34	4.26	4.27	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	636/1199	4.00	3.95	3.97	4.02	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	592/1312	4.25	4.12	4.00	4.09	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	563/1303	4.50	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	922/1299	4.00	4.34	4.25	4.30	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	387/ 758	4.00	4.05	4.01	4.00	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: RUSS 311 0101
 Title 20TH C RUSSIAN LIT&POL
 Instructor: RUSINKO, ELAINE
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1333
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	1	0	0	0	2	9	14	4.48	579/1504	4.48	4.24	4.27	4.27	4.48
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	10	12	4.32	765/1503	4.32	4.22	4.20	4.22	4.32
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	8	14	4.44	588/1290	4.44	4.32	4.28	4.31	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	3	4	16	4.36	643/1453	4.36	4.22	4.21	4.23	4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	7	17	4.64	223/1421	4.64	4.08	4.00	4.01	4.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	1	1	8	10	4.19	645/1365	4.19	4.11	4.08	4.08	4.19
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	8	14	4.44	536/1485	4.44	4.20	4.16	4.17	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	21	3	4.08	1389/1504	4.08	4.68	4.69	4.65	4.08
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	3	8	12	4.39	469/1483	4.39	4.07	4.06	4.08	4.39
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	143/1425	4.92	4.41	4.41	4.43	4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	201/1426	4.96	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	4	18	4.60	450/1418	4.60	4.29	4.25	4.26	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	20	4.72	380/1416	4.72	4.34	4.26	4.27	4.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	2	4	9	8	4.00	636/1199	4.00	3.95	3.97	4.02	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	1	4	13	4.53	350/1312	4.53	4.12	4.00	4.09	4.53
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	333/1303	4.78	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	0	2	15	4.72	385/1299	4.72	4.34	4.25	4.30	4.72
4. Were special techniques successful	8	4	4	2	1	4	3	3.00	680/ 758	3.00	4.05	4.01	4.00	3.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	6	Under-grad	25	Non-major	5
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: RUSS 332 0101
 Title STRUCTURE OF RUSSIAN
 Instructor: YOUNG, STEVEN
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1334
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	549/1504	4.50	4.24	4.27	4.27	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	751/1503	4.33	4.22	4.20	4.22	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	853/1290	4.17	4.32	4.28	4.31	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1001/1453	4.00	4.22	4.21	4.23	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	320/1421	4.50	4.08	4.00	4.01	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	782/1365	4.00	4.11	4.08	4.08	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1485	5.00	4.20	4.16	4.17	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	1337/1504	4.17	4.68	4.69	4.65	4.17
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	5	0	3.83	1061/1483	3.83	4.07	4.06	4.08	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.41	4.41	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1013/1418	4.00	4.29	4.25	4.26	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	806/1416	4.33	4.34	4.26	4.27	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1199	****	3.95	3.97	4.02	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	255/1312	4.67	4.12	4.00	4.09	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.39	4.24	4.27	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.34	4.25	4.30	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: RUSS 402 0101
 Title ADVANCED RUSSIAN II
 Instructor: BLYUKHER, ALLA
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1335
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	0	6	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.24	4.27	4.33	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	312/1503	4.67	4.22	4.20	4.18	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	344/1290	4.67	4.32	4.28	4.32	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	270/1453	4.67	4.22	4.21	4.22	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	115/1421	4.83	4.08	4.00	4.02	4.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	105/1365	4.83	4.11	4.08	4.09	4.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	455/1485	4.50	4.20	4.16	4.14	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	1221/1504	4.33	4.68	4.69	4.73	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	119/1483	4.80	4.07	4.06	4.11	4.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.41	4.41	4.38	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.29	4.25	4.25	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.34	4.26	4.26	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1199	5.00	3.95	3.97	4.05	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1312	5.00	4.12	4.00	4.07	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	299/1303	4.80	4.39	4.24	4.34	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.34	4.25	4.38	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 758	5.00	4.05	4.01	4.17	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	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	6	Non-major	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						