

Course-Section: VPA 121H 0101
 Title INTRODUCTION TO ARTS I
 Instructor: RUBIN, ANNA I.
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1493
 JUN 14, 2005
 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		

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	6	3	2	3.42	1388/1504	3.42	3.80	4.27	4.13	3.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	6	2	1	2.92	1436/1503	2.92	3.75	4.20	4.16	2.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1290	****	4.08	4.28	4.19	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	6	1	3.50	1282/1453	3.50	4.04	4.21	4.11	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	5	0	2	2	0	2.11	1408/1421	2.11	2.78	4.00	3.91	2.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	6	1	3.50	1153/1365	3.50	3.89	4.08	3.96	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	5	3	0	0	3	2.36	1467/1485	2.36	3.84	4.16	4.13	2.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	1087/1504	4.50	4.46	4.69	4.66	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	7	3	0	3.30	1314/1483	3.30	3.84	4.06	3.97	3.30

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	1257/1425	3.75	4.40	4.41	4.36	3.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	572/1426	4.88	4.93	4.69	4.56	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	1110/1418	3.88	4.43	4.25	4.20	3.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	1	6	0	3.50	1248/1416	3.50	4.35	4.26	4.21	3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	394/1199	4.38	4.00	3.97	3.82	4.38

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	651/1312	4.17	4.47	4.00	3.69	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	851/1303	4.17	4.57	4.24	3.93	4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	855/1299	4.17	4.63	4.25	3.94	4.17
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	648/ 758	3.25	4.18	4.01	3.80	3.25

Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	1	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	68/ 76	3.89	4.44	4.61	4.64	3.89
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	1	1	1	1	5	1	3.44	61/ 70	3.44	3.97	4.35	4.43	3.44
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	5	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	63/ 67	2.60	3.80	4.34	3.88	2.60
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	57/ 76	4.10	4.55	4.44	4.51	4.10
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	4	1	2	1	2	2.60	69/ 73	2.60	3.80	4.17	3.83	2.60

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	3						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: VPA 225 0101
 Title IDEAS IN TH ARTS
 Instructor: REHM, CINDY J
 Enrollment: 44
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1494
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean					
	NR	NA	1	2						3	4	5	Mean	Rank

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	5	8	8	7	3.43	1380/1504	3.43	3.80	4.27	4.26	3.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	8	7	13	4.03	1033/1503	4.03	3.75	4.20	4.18	4.03
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	21	1	1	1	3	3	3.67	1109/1290	3.67	4.08	4.28	4.27	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	3	2	4	9	9	3.70	1214/1453	3.70	4.04	4.21	4.20	3.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	0	10	9	6	3.45	1150/1421	3.45	2.78	4.00	3.90	3.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	1	11	5	9	3.55	1128/1365	3.55	3.89	4.08	4.00	3.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	3	10	8	7	3.68	1218/1485	3.68	3.84	4.16	4.15	3.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	1	0	0	7	20	4.61	1030/1504	4.61	4.46	4.69	4.68	4.61
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	2	10	8	1	3.38	1283/1483	3.38	3.84	4.06	4.02	3.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	2	8	16	4.36	951/1425	4.36	4.40	4.41	4.40	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	4	23	4.79	773/1426	4.79	4.93	4.69	4.71	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	6	8	13	4.26	848/1418	4.26	4.43	4.25	4.22	4.26
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	6	6	14	4.22	896/1416	4.22	4.35	4.26	4.24	4.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	2	1	5	6	12	3.96	680/1199	3.96	4.00	3.97	3.95	3.96
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	3	9	11	4.25	592/1312	4.25	4.47	4.00	3.98	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	4	19	4.75	356/1303	4.75	4.57	4.24	4.23	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	5	17	4.63	484/1299	4.63	4.63	4.25	4.21	4.63
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	1	1	5	6	11	4.04	382/ 758	4.04	4.18	4.01	3.89	4.04
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	28	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	4.30	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 244	****	5.00	4.09	4.24	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.52	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.22	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	4.44	4.61	4.22	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 70	****	3.97	4.35	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 67	****	3.80	4.34	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	4.55	4.44	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 73	****	3.80	4.17	4.24	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	4.41	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 56	****	5.00	4.23	4.24	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	4.50	4.65	4.51	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.65	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.44	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	4.50	4.53	4.44	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	35	****	5.00	4.49	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	36	****	5.00	4.60	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	20	****	5.00	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	16	****	5.00	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: VPA 225 0101
 Title IDEAS IN TH ARTS
 Instructor: REHM, CINDY J
 Enrollment: 44
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1494
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	9	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	5	Under-grad	30	Non-major	29
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	2						

Course-Section: VPA 325 0101
 Title CONTEMP ART IN PROCESS
 Instructor: REHM, CINDY J
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1495
 JUN 14, 2005
 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		

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	700/1504	4.05	3.80	4.27	4.27	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1052/1503	3.93	3.75	4.20	4.22	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1453	4.33	4.04	4.21	4.23	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	420/1365	4.13	3.89	4.08	4.08	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	591/1485	4.38	3.84	4.16	4.17	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	1314/1504	4.39	4.46	4.69	4.65	4.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	850/1483	4.17	3.84	4.06	4.08	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1425	4.63	4.40	4.41	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.93	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1418	4.68	4.43	4.25	4.26	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1416	4.68	4.35	4.26	4.27	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	364/1312	4.65	4.47	4.00	4.09	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	563/1303	4.64	4.57	4.24	4.27	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1299	4.79	4.63	4.25	4.30	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 758	4.71	4.18	4.01	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	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	5	Non-major	5
84-150	2	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						

Course-Section: VPA 325 0201
 Title CONTEMP ART IN PROCESS
 Instructor: REHM, CINDY J
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1496
 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	1	1	1	4	4.14	1010/1504	4.05	3.80	4.27	4.27	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1052/1503	3.93	3.75	4.20	4.22	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	507/1290	4.50	4.08	4.28	4.31	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	0	5	4.00	1001/1453	4.33	4.04	4.21	4.23	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1421	****	2.78	4.00	4.01	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	782/1365	4.13	3.89	4.08	4.08	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	890/1485	4.38	3.84	4.16	4.17	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1047/1504	4.39	4.46	4.69	4.65	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	338/1483	4.17	3.84	4.06	4.08	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	784/1425	4.63	4.40	4.41	4.43	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.93	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	171/1418	4.68	4.43	4.25	4.26	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	221/1416	4.68	4.35	4.26	4.27	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1199	3.67	4.00	3.97	4.02	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	137/1312	4.65	4.47	4.00	4.09	4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	652/1303	4.64	4.57	4.24	4.27	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	523/1299	4.79	4.63	4.25	4.30	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	101/ 758	4.71	4.18	4.01	4.00	4.75

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	7	Non-major	7
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	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	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: VPA 325 0301
 Title CONTEMP ART IN PROCESS
 Instructor: REHM, CINDY J
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1497
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		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	1	1	2	3.60	1322/1504	4.05	3.80	4.27	4.27	3.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1183/1503	3.93	3.75	4.20	4.22	3.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1290	4.50	4.08	4.28	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1001/1453	4.33	4.04	4.21	4.23	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1421	****	2.78	4.00	4.01	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	782/1365	4.13	3.89	4.08	4.08	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	349/1485	4.38	3.84	4.16	4.17	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	1173/1504	4.39	4.46	4.69	4.65	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	850/1483	4.17	3.84	4.06	4.08	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	900/1425	4.63	4.40	4.41	4.43	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.93	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	905/1418	4.68	4.43	4.25	4.26	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	921/1416	4.68	4.35	4.26	4.27	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	860/1199	3.67	4.00	3.97	4.02	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	297/1312	4.65	4.47	4.00	4.09	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1303	4.64	4.57	4.24	4.27	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	303/1299	4.79	4.63	4.25	4.30	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	132/ 758	4.71	4.18	4.01	4.00	4.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 244	5.00	5.00	4.09	4.20	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 76	5.00	4.44	4.61	4.84	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	45/ 70	4.50	3.97	4.35	4.24	4.50
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 67	5.00	3.80	4.34	3.98	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 76	5.00	4.55	4.44	4.51	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 73	5.00	3.80	4.17	4.25	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 58	5.00	5.00	4.43	4.52	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 56	5.00	5.00	4.23	4.13	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	32/ 44	4.50	4.50	4.65	4.77	4.50
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	22/ 39	4.50	4.50	4.44	4.47	4.50
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	28/ 40	4.50	4.50	4.53	4.74	4.50

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/	35	5.00	5.00	4.49	4.36	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/	36	5.00	5.00	4.60	4.63	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/	20	5.00	5.00	4.24	5.00	5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/	16	5.00	5.00	4.51	3.95	5.00

Course-Section: VPA 325 0301
 Title CONTEMP ART IN PROCESS
 Instructor: REHM, CINDY J
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1497
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	4	Required for Majors	0	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	0	Under-grad	5	Non-major	5
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						